

8

On Hegel's Critique of Kant's Subjectivism in the Transcendental Deduction

8.1 Introduction

G.W.F. Hegel may rightly be seen as one of the most discerning readers of Kant. Of course, already in his early, most expansive, account of Kant in *Faith and Knowledge* (1802) his interpretation is heavily slanted towards reading Kant's philosophy from the perspective of an inchoate form of what comes to be known as 'absolute idealism', Hegel's own form of idealism that departs from Kant's transcendental idealism in a number of ways. But especially in *Faith and Knowledge*, and also later in the Greater and Lesser Logics, despite his misgivings about Kant's general strategies, Hegel shows great understanding of the spirit and at least some of the core details of the Transcendental Deduction (TD). He believes that Kant's notion of the original-synthetic unity of apperception is "one of the most profound principles for speculative

I owe a debt of gratitude to my erstwhile MA supervisor Kees Jan Brons for first introducing me to and discussing Hegel, starting with his inspiring classes on *Faith and Knowledge* in the early 1990s and through our many fruitful conversations afterwards about how to read Hegel 'a-metaphysically', also in relation to Kant. We may not agree on all of the details, but I think that with my most recent essay on the topic (Schulting 2016c) my global view on the matter of Hegel's relation to Kant is converging with his.

development” (WL, 12:22/SL, 520). In contrast to most Kantians,¹ and despite his misgivings about Kant's procedure (WL, 12:43–44), Hegel also rightly sees TD as concerned with deriving the principles of the objective determination of representations, i.e. the categories, *from* the principle of the transcendental unity of apperception, from self-consciousness (WL, 12:18; Enz, 8:117). Further, he rightly sees, contrary to some Kantians (see again Chap. 4), that there is no discrepancy between the object and the objective unity of representations, which “is the unity of the ‘I’ with itself” (WL, 12:18/SL, 515), that is, that the object is identical to the subject's original-synthetic unity of representations. For Hegel, as for Kant, the conditions of the identity of self-consciousness are in fact the same conditions that govern the identity of the *object* of my consciousness. Hegel thus correctly identifies Kant's argument, in §17 of the B-Deduction, about the objective unity of representations, which is grounded on the transcendental unity of self-consciousness and first defines an object, as concerning the very objectivity of thought itself,² indeed, the “*identity* of concept and thing, which is *truth*” (WL, 12:23/SL, 521; emphasis added).

But it is also clear that Hegel misinterprets many other crucial aspects of Kant's arguments, and that his reading reveals his own philosophical agenda against Kant's general strategy. In this chapter, however, I am interested in Hegel's reading of TD, in *Faith and Knowledge*, purely as an interpretation; I shall not specifically focus on the extent to which his interpretation of Kant is biased towards, and forms an integral part of his proposal for, absolute idealism, which is only really developed in the later accounts of the *Phenomenology of Spirit* and the *Science of Logic*. The intrinsic value of Hegel's own system of thought compared to Kant's will thus not be a topic of my discussion here. I also concentrate on the early account of Kant in *Faith and Knowledge*, as I believe that it provides the essential framework for Hegel's view of Kant that remains consistent throughout his later accounts of Kant, especially the ones in both Logics (WL, 12:17–28 *et passim* and Enz, 8:112–147) and in the lectures on the history of philosophy (VGPh, 20:329–386).³

It has been argued in the literature on the early Hegel (e.g. Düsing 1995, 2013:169) that *Faith and Knowledge* is fundamentally framed in a Schellingean conceptual constellation and I think that at least

the language and the main interest of Hegel's essay are indeed firmly rooted in it. Among other things, this can be seen from the central use of such terminology as 'absolute identity', *Potenzen*, and the general dismissiveness with regard to subjectivity in general, which is much more outspoken than, or maybe even contradictory to, Hegel's stance in, for example, the *Greater Logic* of 10 years later. For example, the Schellingean roots of Hegel's account are manifest in a passage such as the following, which seems to be taken straight from Schelling's *System of Transcendental Idealism*, published just 2 years earlier:

If the intellect is to be considered for itself as abstraction of the form in its triplicity, it is all one whether it be regarded as intellect of consciousness or as intellect of nature, as the form of conscious or of non-conscious intelligence: just as in the Ego the intellect is thought of as conceptualized [*intellektualisiert*], so in nature it is thought of as realized. (GuW, 4:334/FK, 79)

The Schellingean terminology, particularly the notion of 'absolute identity', will nonetheless prove instrumental, I shall argue, in determining the way in which Hegel emphasises and weighs particular aspects of TD and in establishing the grounds on which Hegel believes Kant does not follow through on what he deems are the valuable, genuinely 'idealist' elements, what he calls the *Keim des Spekultativen* (GuW, 4:335), in Kant's thought. Another closely related reason why Hegel's account of Kant's TD is of interest is the way in which Hegel can be seen as the paradigmatic critic of Kantian nonconceptualism, namely, the thesis that some sensible content is not or indeed cannot be subsumed under the concepts of the understanding and that intuition does not require the functions of the understanding (as Kant argues at B122–3, in the run-up to TD) (see Chap. 5). Hegel believes that Kant is a nonconceptualist, but also that this contradicts Kant's firm conceptualism (cf. Hanna 2013), that is, that Kant espouses two conflicting theories about the relation between concepts and sensibility. Hegel thinks that the residual nonconceptualism in Kant must, *on Kantian grounds*, be exorcised and that properly conceived, without the unnecessary psychological and empiricist baggage, Kant can be considered a thorough-bred conceptualist.

This ties in with Hegel's bemoaning of Kant's alleged *subjectivism* (i.e. what I called 'bad subjectivism' in the introductory Chap. 1), namely, the position that the truth about objects is just the truth of our conceptual scheme, without our categories being actually exemplified by the real things in themselves. This is the kind of subjectivism that says that what we know is true relative *merely* to our own perspective, because that is just how we are psychologically (or culturally, or epistemologically, etc.) disposed, in contrast to the 'Critical' subjectivism that says that subjective agency is first constitutive of objectivity, so that there would not even *be* anything objective, any nature, at all without the subjective forms of the understanding. But Hegel does not distinguish between bad and 'Critical' subjectivism. For the Hegel of *Faith and Knowledge* at least, subjectivism is bad *tout court*.⁴ Why he thinks Kant's 'Critical' subjectivism is just another form of *bad* subjectivism will be discussed further below. The charge of subjectivism is directly related to the critique of Kant's so-called restriction thesis, namely, the idealist thesis that the categories of experience do not apply to things in themselves, which I shall also address.

For reasons of space, I shall not delve into the issues around nonconceptualism in relation to Hegel's critique of Kant (for this, see my account in Schulting 2016b).⁵ Hegel's critique of Kant's subjectivism and his putative 'psychological' idealism is discussed in Sect. 8.3. In Sect. 8.4, I address what I believe is the central flaw in Hegel's interpretation of Kant, one by means of which Hegel helps himself to reading the productive imagination as *Reason itself*, in clear contrast to Kant's own view of the imagination as "an effect of the *understanding* on sensibility" (B152; emphasis added). But first, I recount Hegel's more general grounds for his critique of Kant as a type of 'uncritical' reflection philosophy (Sect. 8.2).

8.2 Critique of Reflection Philosophy

In *Faith and Knowledge*, Hegel criticises what he calls 'reflection philosophy'—of which, Hegel claims, Kant's philosophy is a typical representative—for relinquishing the primary goal of philosophy, namely

thinking “the Absolute”, for instead advancing the idea that “Reason should renounce its existence [*ihr Sein*] in the Absolute” (GuW, 4:316/FK, 56). Hegel criticises Kant for resting content with the limited role of Reason as the mere empty form of the empirical and for arguing that Reason, in the guise of the understanding, “receives its content” (GuW, 4:319/FK, 60) only from the opposite at which it is directed, namely empirical content (GuW, 4:321) or “empirical reality” (GuW, 4:320/FK, 61). Further, Hegel finds it hugely problematic that in Kant’s view empirical content is considered absolute (GuW, 4:318–319), that is, taken for granted as the yardstick by which everything should be measured. Kant’s idea that conceptual claims about reality can be legitimated only if they have a basis in empirical experience is regarded by Hegel as wholly antithetical to what genuine philosophy should be aspiring to. It is the reason why Hegel criticises Kant’s philosophy for basically being a form of “philosophical empiricism” (*wissenschaftlichen Empirismus*) (GuW, 4:321/FK, 63).

Furthermore, for Kant, as Hegel rightly establishes, conceptuality and empirical content are connected only insofar as the formal nature of the understanding relies on external material content in the case of knowledge; that is, conceptual form and material content are combined only in terms of their “*relative* identity” (GuW, 4:320/FK, 61; emphasis added), and not conceived of in their “*absolute* identity” (GuW, 4:325/FK, 68; emphasis added), whereby concept and content are no longer *absolutely* opposed but genuinely thought in their true rational relation, even if they cannot be reduced to each other. This is an important aspect of Hegel’s critique, which says that Kant is not sufficiently consistent in his reflection on the relation between the various linked elements in cognition. Hegel speaks of a lack of “reflection on the opposition” (*Reflexion auf die Entgegensetzung*) (GuW, 4:320/FK, 62) in Kant, which means that the form of conceptuality, “unity”, and the content of the “manifold” (GuW, 4:320/FK, 62) are not thought in their reciprocal relation. That is to say, the opposition itself between the opposite terms is not thought objectively, so that the manifold is seen as the negative of conceptuality and at the same time conceptuality is seen as the negative of the manifold.⁶ Instead, the opposition is taken absolutely, as if it were pre-given (Hegel refers to this as “the stake

[*Pfahl*] of the absolute antithesis"; GuW, 4:323/FK, 65), so that unity of the concept and the empirical manifold "confront one another as abstractions" (GuW 4:320/FK, 62). What Hegel means by this is that the form of the concept and the matter of the empirical manifold are in fact considered, by Kant, to be merely formal, secondary, abstractions of the unity that they necessarily form in cognition, a unity that, according to Hegel's reading of Kant, they *always already* form. The abstractness of reflective considerations of the relation between unity and manifold is put thusly by Hegel:

[T]he manifold gets determined by the unity [...] just as the emptiness of identity gets plished by the manifold [...]. Whether active or passive, each supervenes to the other in a formal way, as something alien. This formal cognition only brings about impoverished identities, and allows the antithesis to persist in its complete absoluteness. (GuW, 4:344/FK, 94)

This abstractness is a direct consequence of the mode in which reflection philosophy operates, namely by way of a reflective approach, which starts from a formal point of view—"a fixed Ego-point" (*fixen Punkts der Egoität*) (GuW 4:332/FK, 77)—and seeks to combine its own formality (its forms and procedures) with a content that comes from outside it, from what is real (and not formal). The formal point of view is the point of view of the understanding as "the principle of opposition" (GuW, 4:334/FK, 79), which seeks to unite with external content, with which it never really coalesces. Such a formal perspective *mutatis mutandis* translates to all topics that reflection philosophy concerns itself with, regardless of whether it involves issues of theoretical or practical philosophy. This issues, as Hegel puts it, in a principle of "the *absoluteness* of finitude and, resulting from it, the *absolute antithesis* of finitude and infinity, reality and ideality, the sensuous and the supersensuous, and the beyondness of what is truly real and absolute" (GuW, 4:321/FK, 62; emphasis added). Indeed reflection philosophy, because of its formal starting point issuing in the hypostatisation of the antithesis, ipso facto fails to attain knowledge of what philosophy aims to be about: the Absolute, infinity, the truly real, that is, what is beyond *mere* belief and finite cognition and what is truly, unconditionally, the case in reality.

This, then, is the main characteristic of reflection philosophy: it remains stuck in its reflective oppositions (mind/world, form/content, a priori/a posteriori, subject/object, unity/manifold, reality/ideality, finitude/infinity, etc.), while failing to *reflect on* these reflective oppositions, to take these oppositions into account as unreflected assumptions (insofar as their putative absoluteness is concerned). Paradoxically, Hegel in fact accuses reflection philosophy, including Kant's, of a determinate *lack of reflection*, precisely by taking the reflective starting point absolutely, as an unproblematic assumption. The result of this is relativism, subjectivism, psychologism, and an idealism that has not thought through its own reflective constructions and its own theoretical assumptions, instead absolutises these presupposed oppositions, issuing in a dogmatic philosophical dualism, which is unable to achieve what it is striving for: knowledge of what is truly real, without it being uncritically constrained by any *unreflected* assumption or presupposition. The main problem with reflection philosophy, including Kant's, thus is its pervasive dualist outlook and the relativism or scepticism that this results in.

But especially in light of Kant's notion of the synthetic a priori—Hegel's appreciation of which will be addressed more in detail below—the dualism characteristic of reflection philosophy that one encounters in TD⁷ is *internally* inconsistent: for if conceptuality rests basically on an a priori synthesis, as Kant argues, “it surely contains determinateness and differentiation [*Unterschied*] *within* itself” (WL, 12:23/SL, 520; emphasis added) and, since determination is first established by means of a priori synthesis, determinateness—and thus the determinate *difference* or *antithesis* between form and content—is not provided by the sensible manifold, by content, externally, but is internal to a priori synthesis. It might seem that Hegel has a point that even if it is the case that the manifold is external to the concept, then *its* externality, and thus its distinction from the concept, is something that can only be *determined* from within the concept. To put this differently, “*differentiation* is an equally essential moment of the concept” (WL, 12:22/SL, 519). Material content and “empty reflective identity” or “abstract universality” are not opposed to each other in the sense that they are really external to each other and “intrinsically separate” (*an und für sich getrennt*) (WL, 12:22/SL, 519–520).

This is a conceptualist argument also often used by Kantians in fending off nonconceptualist readings of the relation between intuition and concept (see Schulting 2016b). But of course, saying that the distinction between intuition and concept can only be determined *within* the perspective of conceptuality if conceptuality is the necessary condition of determination, as it is on Kant's account, does not imply that intuition itself is conceptual, nor does it imply that intuition and concept are always coextensive (and intrinsically inseparable). This would appear to undercut any strong criticism of so-called dualist positions in reflection philosophy, specifically of what Hegel calls Kant's "psychological reflex" (WL, 12:22/SL, 520) of seeing conceptuality as constrained by sensibility; Hegel appears to want to conflate conceptuality and intuition, to the extent that intuition is not just necessarily combined with conceptuality *insofar as* cognitive claims (made by the understanding) about objects are made, but *is* in fact necessarily conjoined with conceptuality *simpliciter*, regardless of the question whether the understanding makes actual claims about objects. Hegel sees Kant's cognitive constraint, which can be expressed by the modal claim M^* ,⁸ discussed in Chap. 5, purely as the result of the aforementioned "psychological reflex" of a formal epistemological standpoint. But the result of such a strongly conceptualist critique of Kant's epistemological modesty is that the absolute distinction that Kant carefully made between the forms of conceptuality and the forms of sensibility, in the context of a critique of the rationalists' conceptual idealism, threatens to be blurred.⁹

8.3 Subjectivism and Kant's Putative "Psychological Idealism"

As a result of Kant's "reflective" bias, made manifest by his choice for a discursive type of logic, there is an emphasis, according to Hegel, on the purity of the concept, which consequently relies on empirical content to acquire meaning: Hegel speaks of the concept's "emptiness [*Leerheit*] [which] gets its content and dimensions quite exclusively [*schlechthin nur*] in, and hence through, its connection with the empirical"

(GuW, 4:321/FK, 63; cf. GuW, 4:344). And because of this, Hegel believes, Kant's idealism about objects (see Chap. 4) is nothing but a "completion and idealization of [Lockean] empirical psychology", for which the highest standpoint is that of the subject's viewpoint (GuW, 4:322/FK, 63; cf. GuW, 4:326). On this view, the Kantian thesis about the objectivity of objects, the main claim of TD, does not establish the truth about the very things that exist in the world (as things in themselves), but is *merely* about the way in which we, as cognising subjects, *take* objects to be, how they appear to us as finite human beings, not how things *are essentially*. Hence, Kant's idealism is merely a subjective idealism, "a *subjective* (banal) *idealism*" (Enz, 8:123/Enc, 91), an "idealism of the finite" (GuW, 4:322/FK, 64), which ultimately takes the form of a scepticism, and hence is not the true, objective idealism that *thinks* the opposition of finite and infinite, of the sensuous and the supersensuous, of mind and world, thereby thinking their true unity, and thus true or "authentic reality" (GuW, 4:325/FK, 68). Hegel sometimes puts this in terms of a "middle term" that is lacking in reflection philosophy, whereby each of two extremes are nullified, come to nothing, *in their very opposition or antithesis*: it is this nullification as opposites which constitutes what Hegel calls the Absolute or absolute identity (GuW, 4:344, *et passim*). This "middle term" is lacking in reflective thought, which merely thinks in abstract oppositions (finite/infinite, form/content, subject/object, etc.), and does not think the reciprocal mediation of the opposite terms.

It is clear that the premise of Hegel's critique of Kant is the possibility of thinking the absolute identity of the finite and the infinite, of the empirical manifold and the concept. Hegel dismisses Kant's absolute distinction between intuition and concept out of hand. This would appear to be begging the question against Kantian premises, as a result of which Hegel's critique seems to be misdirected from the get-go. It would of course be fair to say that Hegel rightly criticises Kant for just accepting that human reason should be directed to the empirical, and that anything that is not measured by a possible empirical application amounts to empty sloganeering if one disagrees with Kant's assertion that conceptual claims must have a basis in empirical reality, otherwise they lack real validity. It does seem, at first sight at least, that Hegel is

right to believe that in Kant's hands philosophy is but an uncritical "culture of reflection raised to a system" (GuW, 4:322/FK, 64), nothing more than a common sense philosophy in fact (GuW, 4:322), whereby "genuine" (*wahre*) (GuW, 4:325) philosophy in terms of a philosophy that has the idea of "absolute objectivity" as its central topic is degraded as "empty musing" (GuW, 4:325/FK, 67); absolute objectivity or identity is, for Kant, at most a "postulate never to be realized" (GuW, 4:325/FK, 68). And for Hegel, such a metaphilosophical stance smacks of an at heart anti-philosophical philosophy.

For Hegel, philosophy should rather start with, and have as its singular content, the idea of absolute objectivity—the idea that expresses the absolute "sublatedness of the antithesis" (*das absolute Aufgehobensein des Gegensatzes*) or "absolute identity", which is the "only authentic reality" (GuW, 4:325/FK, 68; trans. emended)—not end with it as a mere postulate, as Kant does. What is meant by this is that it would be odd to assume that, for example, the distinction between mind and world, between subject and object, is a pre-philosophical irreducible and absolute given; that would be uncritical from a purely philosophical point of view. Hegel accuses Kant of just such an uncritical assumption of a pre-philosophical given. The "only authentic reality" of which Hegel speaks is therefore not the truly true world *outside the mind*, but reality that no longer knows an absolute distinction *between* mind and world, a reality where mind is no longer external to the world, but also a reality where the world is no longer external to the mind. Hence, Hegel speaks of an "absolute identity of thought and being" (GuW, 4:345/FK, 94). Hegel's view of idealism is one of a realism *sans phrase*, where neither mind nor world are reduced to each other.

By contrast, Kant's Critical view requires an externally given, based on the fact that the logic to which Kant's thinking is indebted is discursive, demanding a strict separation of two irreducible stems of knowledge (A15/B29), which must be combined only for the purposes of acquiring knowledge (A51–2/B75–6). Hegel criticises Kant's reliance on sensations given in the empirical manifold in intuition as the only true means by which we have direct access to reality, i.e. to the things in themselves that affect us (cf. B182/A143). This givenness of sensations,

as the means to have access to reality, is never explained by Kant, but just assumed as a fact—Hegel calls it something “incomprehensible” (GuW, 4:332/FK, 76) in Kant’s system of thought, something that is not accounted for. However, the assumption of the givenness of sensations and their relation to reality does not imply that Kant assumes—as Hegel has us believe—that there is an absolute distinction between mind and world, which cannot be bridged. The distinction between a formal ‘I think’ and a material given content (see further below, Sect. 8.4) might be read as such, but does in fact not support the metaphysical position that says that mind and world are distinguished in an absolute sense. Such a position would moreover conflict with Kant’s restriction thesis about the possibility of cognition of absolute truths. We have no insight into the truth about things in themselves, hence we cannot posit an *absolute* distinction between mind and world, as this would suggest that we do have insight into the truth about a relation between things in themselves.

It is with the above-sketched view that Hegel reads Kant. A very different general conception of philosophy than Kant’s thus lies at the root of Hegel’s critique of Kant. Yet Hegel believes that his critique of Kant is, at least to some extent, internal to Kant’s thought itself. The germ of this idea Hegel finds in Kant’s adage that “neither the concept in isolation nor intuition in isolation is anything at all; [and] that intuition by itself is blind and the concept by itself is empty” (GuW, 4:326/FK, 68; cf. A51/B75). Here, Kant shows that only when both concept and intuition are connected with each other a form of objectivity, an identity between thought and being, is achieved. But the fact that Kant identifies this identity *in consciousness*, that is, in human experience, and does not qualify it in terms of a “rational cognition” (*vernünftige Erkenntnis*) (GuW, 4:326/FK, 68), means, according to Hegel, that Kant does not follow through on the promise of advancing the idea of absolute identity and absolute cognition (*Erkennen des Absoluten*) (GuW, 4:326/FK, 68), and thus “it falls back into absolute finitude and subjectivity” (GuW, 4:326/FK, 68). The identity here, the identity between concept (as the form of thought) and intuition (as the form of reality), is merely a “finite identity” (GuW, 4:326/FK, 68), namely only to the extent that *human, empirical* cognition is

concerned. But Hegel thinks that this step is unwarranted on Kant's *own premises*. This is the bad subjectivism that Hegel laments in Kant, namely, the 'mere' subjectivism that rests content with the finite identity of its cognition of empirical objects, and conflicts with the putative true speculative side of Kant's thought (more on this later, in Sect. 8.4).

And therefore, in Hegel's view, Kant's transcendental idealism is in effect nothing but a "psychological idealism" (GuW, 4:331/FK, 75), by which Hegel means that, importantly, the categories are "*only* determinations derived from self-consciousness" (WL, 12:22–23/SL, 520), but are not determinations of, or instantiated in, the things in themselves. The relation between the subjective and the objective is just two different sides "of my subjective viewpoint" (*meines subjektiven Betrachtens*) (GuW, 4:332/FK, 76).¹⁰ The immediate problem with such a formal, *merely* subjective viewpoint—Kant's alleged "psychological idealism" (GuW, 4:332/FK, 76)—is that the identity of the formal subject "finds itself immediately confronted by or next to an infinite non-identity, with which it must coalesce in some incomprehensible way" (GuW, 4:332/FK, 76). This "confrontation" concerns the subject's relation to things in themselves via, and only via, the subject's sensations. It is only by means of an act of determination, by the subject, of these sensations, which are encountered in inner sense, that the objects of our empirical cognition get their objective form (this occurs by means of the categories of quality: reality, negation, limitation).¹¹ The objectivity is, as it were, imposed on the things that we encounter by virtue merely of our sensibility, and only on their subjective *appearance*, in sensibility. The "realm" of things in themselves itself, apart from the good services of the determining subject, which applies categories to sensible content in intuition, i.e. "[o]nce it is abandoned by the categories, [...] cannot be anything but a formless lump" (GuW, 4:332/FK, 76); on Kant's account, the realm of things in themselves is in effect nothing but "an infinity of sensations" (GuW, 4:332/FK, 76). The manifold of sensibility, empirical consciousness, sensations, are all in themselves something "unintegrated" (*Unverbundenes*) (GuW, 4:330/FK, 74), and since sensibility is our only mode of access to things in themselves, if sensibility is not determined by the understanding, things in themselves have no determinacy either.

On Kant's view, then, "the world is in itself falling to pieces", which is only first given substantiality and objective coherence, *even possibility and actuality*, by the subject (GuW, 4:330/FK, 74). That even possibility (meant here is what Kant calls *real* possibility) and actuality are provided by the subject is only half true, for Kant makes a distinction between existence as given with things in themselves, and the *determination* of existence by means of the *category* of existence (see the discussion in Chap. 9): the subject by no means provides the modal condition for the existence *simpliciter* of things (cf. A92/B125). Yet, in Hegel's eyes, Kantian objective determination is solely and necessarily a determination projected by the human being (*welche der Mensch hin-sieht, und hinauswirft*) (GuW, 4:330) on the world and as such is unable to remove the antithesis between it and the things in themselves:

Objective determinateness and its forms first come in with the connection between them [the Ego and thing-in-itself]; [...] the thing in itself becomes object insofar as it obtains from the active subject some determination [...]. Apart from this they are completely heterogeneous. (GuW, 4:331/FK, 75)

In this way, the objectivity of the categories, and their necessity, becomes something contingent and subjective again, for it does not determine things in themselves as such, but only *from the perspective of subjective experience*, as appearances.¹² The knowledge *about* objects established by the understanding is not true knowledge of how things truly are. Notwithstanding the objective determination of objects that the understanding establishes by means of the categories, we remain fully incognisant of the *true* nature of objects, namely, as things in themselves. Or as Jacobi put it, "all our so-called knowledge is nothing but the organization of our ignorance" (as quoted by Harris 1977:15).

Hegel thus charges Kant's idealism with restricting our knowledge to appearances, and hence precluding genuine, real knowledge of things in themselves. In fact, Hegel accuses Kant of a contradiction: it does not stand to reason to say, on the one hand, that the forms of knowledge (the categories), by means of the original-synthetic unity of apperception, first establish the very *objectivity* of objects (the claim of B137

in the *Critique*), and then, on the other, to deny that those forms are instantiated by the objects whose essence is defined by them (WL, 12:24), and instead apply to the subject's own manifold of sensations only. But it seems that Hegel here just conflates the conditions for the *objectivity* of objects (of knowledge) and the conditions for the *existence* of objects, what makes objects things that have an existence independent of our knowledge of them (cf. the discussion in Chap. 4, Sect. 4.10). In Chap. 9, it shall be argued that what makes objects *objects* is not the same as what makes things *things*.

Strikingly, Hegel reasons that if what is determined by the understanding is only appearance, then the understanding itself can also only be appearance, and is nothing in itself:

The things, as they are cognized by the intellect, are only appearances. They are nothing in themselves, which is a perfectly truthful result. *The obvious conclusion, however, is that an intellect which has cognizance only of appearances and of nothing in itself, is itself only appearance and is nothing in itself.* But, on the contrary, Kant regards discursive intellect, with this sort of cognition, as in itself and absolute. Cognition of appearances is dogmatically regarded as the only kind of cognition there is, and rational cognition [*Vernunftkenntnis*] is denied. If the forms through which the object exists are nothing in themselves, they must also be nothing in themselves for cognitive Reason [*erkennende Vernunft*]. Yet Kant never seems to have had the slightest doubt that the intellect is the absolute of the human spirit. The intellect is (for him) the absolute immovable [*fixierte*], insuperable finitude of human Reason. (GuW 4:332–333/FK, 77)

The italicised sentence exhibits a strange inference: why would the fact that what we know by means of the understanding is only appearance and not knowledge of things in themselves, imply that the understanding is itself just an appearance, thereby undermining Kant's claim that what we know by means of the understanding is absolute, "fixed"? The apparent contradiction here is: what determines something only as appearance (*Erscheinung*) and not *an sich*, cannot itself be said to be an *an sich*, hence is itself nothing but illusion (*Schein*), and merely subjectively valid. But, apart from the fact that Kant clearly distinguishes between *Erscheinung* and *Schein* (cf. B69–70), Kant

never says that what the understanding determines is absolute, or that the understanding is itself absolute. Rather, we can determine that we only know appearances, precisely because we must determine from the *limited* perspective of the understanding—reason has no immediate insight into reality. Kant's reasoning is internally consistent, because on account of the Copernican hypothesis we can only determine a priori of things what we have put into things beforehand (Bxviii). This has got nothing to do with a dogmatic assertion about the scope of our cognition, but instead shows a modesty regarding the reach of the understanding (and of reason). Surely, one cannot interpret modesty as itself dogmatic (see Ameriks 2000:288–291), which is what Hegelians often argue, nor must an insight regarding our limitations by implication amount to a limited, *merely* subjective and thus not a true or objectively valid, perspective, or worse, be mere *Schein*. Of course, from the Hegelian perspective of the Absolute, what the understanding determines is mere appearance, but this perspective begs the question against Kant.¹³

In the *Science of Logic* (WL, 12:17ff.), Hegel is more forthcoming about why he thinks that Kant's conclusion that categorial knowledge is not about things in themselves is contradictory. In Hegel's reasoning, the object in the intuition is still something "external, alien", a mere "appearance" (WL, 12:18/SL, 516), which through thought is being changed into a *Gesetzsein*, a thing that is no longer just something that presents itself in its immediacy, but is something posited, by reason, *as* being a thing, an object. Although the object has *An-und-fürsichsein* already inchoately in intuition, it is only *really an und für sich* if it is so apprehended in thought. When the object is indeed apprehended in thought, in Hegel's view, it is no longer an *Erscheinung*, but genuinely a thing in itself that is also grasped as such by thought, something-in-and-for-itself. Its genuine *An-und-fürsichsein* is its objectivity for thought. Hegel thus has an entirely different understanding of *Erscheinung* than Kant, even though he presents it as in line with the essence at least of Kant's own view in TD. In Kant's view, however, clearly an *Erscheinung* does not get suddenly changed into a thing in itself, when it is determined by the categories of the understanding. This explains to a large extent why Hegel thinks Kant's idealism is a

defective, merely “psychological” idealism, but also, and by the same token, why Hegel is mistaken about a central plank of Kant's idealism about objects.

8.4 Distinguishing Between the “Empty ‘I’” and the “True ‘I’”: The Clue to Hegel's Misreading of TD

Despite Hegel's general dismissiveness about Kant having “decided without reservation for appearance” (GuW, 4:341/FK, 90), which shows his idealism to be “psychological” at heart, and that, in Kant's reflection philosophy, “the highest Idea [is] corrupted with full consciousness”, Hegel nonetheless does believe there to be a “truly speculative” side to Kant's philosophy (GuW, 4:343/FK, 92). This “truly speculative aspect of Kant's philosophy” (GuW, 4:343/FK, 92) concerns his notion of the productive or transcendental imagination. Hegel writes:

[W]e must [...] place Kant's merit [...] in his having put the Idea of authentic *a priori* in the form of transcendental imagination; and also in his having put the beginning of the Idea of Reason in the intellect itself. For he regarded thinking, or the form, not as something subjective, but as something in itself; not as something formless, not as empty apperception, but as intellect, as true form, namely as triplicity [*Triplizität*]. The germ of speculation [*Keim des Spekultativen*] lies in this triplicity alone. For the root judgment [*ursprüngliches Urteil*], or duality, is in it as well, and hence the very possibility of *a posteriority*, which in this way ceases to be absolutely opposed to the *a priori*, while the *a priori*, for this reason, also ceases to be formal identity. We will touch later on the still purer Idea of an intellect that is at the same time *a posteriori*, the Idea of an intuitive intellect as the absolute middle. (GuW, 4:334–335/FK, 79–80)

Apart from the imagination, there are two additional key terms that Hegel mentions here, which display the “germ of speculation” in the

argument of TD: *Triplizität* and the intuitive intellect. Though highly interesting and extremely relevant to an understanding of Hegel’s own project and his relation to Kant, I shall not be able to discuss the latter, as this would require a deeper analysis than I have space for here; the role and significance of the intuitive intellect in Hegel’s understanding of Kant is also not undisputed.¹⁴ At any rate, from the text of *Faith and Knowledge* it is evident that, one way or the other, like Schelling the early Hegel takes inspiration from Kant’s discussion of the intuitive intellect in §§76–77 of the *Third Critique*, which he takes as confirmation of his reading of Kant’s arguments in TD about the productive imagination as the original-synthetic unity.

Here, I shall concentrate on his notion of triplicity (*Triplizität*). What Hegel singles out for special status in Kant’s account in TD is the notion of the “original synthetic unity of apperception” (GuW, 4:327/FK, 69), or the “original identity of self-consciousness” (GuW, 4:328/FK, 71) (cf. B131–6), which Hegel identifies with the transcendental imagination. This original-synthetic unity is an important idea “because of its two-sidedness, the opposites being absolutely one in it” (GuW, 4:328/FK, 71). This, then, is what the notion of triplicity conveys: an original unity or identity in which opposites are primordially united and, importantly, within which they are also first differentiable; indeed, triplicity is reflected by Kant’s central idea of the synthetic a priori of concept and intuition.

As Kant indeed argues in §15 of the B-Deduction,¹⁵ the original-synthetic unity of apperception is not a synthetic unity that is an a posteriori aggregated unity, a unity of “an aggregate of manifolds which are first picked up” by a unifying subject, but, as Hegel argues, a “true synthetic unity or rational identity”, i.e. “that identity which is the connecting of the manifold with the empty identity, the Ego”, or “the concept”. From this original-synthetic unity, “the Ego as thinking subject” and “the manifold as body and world first detach themselves”. The productive imagination or the original-synthetic unity of apperception should not be seen as a “middle term” (*Mittelbegriff*) which is positioned *between*, on the one hand, “an existing absolute” but empty formal ‘I’ of the subject of understanding, and, on the other, the “difference” of the manifold in intuition, i.e. “an absolute existing

world". Rather, the productive imagination lies at the root of both the formal subject of understanding and the world of objects (GuW, 4:328–329/FK, 71, 73).

Here, then, lies the clue to Hegel's reading of Kant's notion of the synthetic a priori, while simultaneously suggesting that it is Kant's most speculative idea, showing the reality of absolute objectivity, and claiming that it provides an *internal* critique of Kant. This last aspect concerns the alleged fact that while Kant introduces the speculative idea, in the form of the original-synthetic unity of apperception, he does not himself adhere to it, for he reallocates this speculative principle to the *mere* understanding—that is, “he expresse[s] [the Idea] and [subsequently] consciously destroy[s] it again” (GuW, 4:335/FK, 80). The clue is the distinction that Hegel makes between, on the one hand, a so-called “empty identity”, or “formal identity”, or the “abstract Ego”, and, on the other, “the true Ego”, which is an “absolute, original synthetic identity, which is the principle” (all quotations from GuW, 4:328, 331/FK, 71–72, 75), namely, the principle of original-synthetic unity of apperception.¹⁶ Significantly, Hegel says that TD *cannot be understood* unless one distinguishes between the representing (accompanying) ‘I’ (Kant’s ‘I think’), which is the subject of thought, from the original-synthetic unity of apperception, that is, the productive imagination, between the “empty Ego” and the “true Ego”. What licenses Hegel to make a distinction between these two ‘Ego’s? And what is the connection with the notion of productive or transcendental imagination?

Hegel wants to argue that the transcendental imagination, which according to him is the “true ‘I’”, or the original-synthetic identity, is *not* the understanding, or the reflecting or judging or accompanying ‘I’, or judgement. For, as Hegel argues, the understanding, the reflecting ‘I’ and judgement first appear as *one of the opposites* that are originally united in the original-synthetic unity. The original-synthetic unity is present in both opposites respectively, in the understanding, which is the reflecting subject, as well as “immersed”, undifferentiated, in the manifold of intuition (GuW, 4:327/FK, 70). However, it is, logically, not present *as* the absolute identity of opposites, but merely as a *relative* identity, either implicitly, as in the sensible manifold, or explicitly,

as in the understanding, which differentiates itself from the manifold, or even more so in judgement, which *shows* that opposition literally, namely in the way predicates and subjects are visibly divorced (*S is P*).¹⁷ Whereas in the sensible manifold neither the relative difference nor the relative identity between it and the form of the understanding come to the fore—in it, “identity is completely identical with the difference just as it is in the magnet” (GuW, 4:327/FK, 70)—in the understanding a relative identity, and thus a relative difference, with the manifold in intuition *is* made explicit, by the manner in which the understanding or conceptuality places itself over against empirical content or sensibility. This “placing itself over against” marks out discursive (Kantian) conceptuality essentially; it shows the dualism inherent to discursive conceptuality. Hegel writes:

[T]he synthetic unity is only concept because it binds the difference in such a way that it also steps outside of it, and faces it in relative antithesis. In isolation the pure concept is the empty identity. It is only as being relatively identical with that which it stands against, that it is concept. (GuW, 4:328/FK, 70).

Hegel takes Kant at his word that through the accompanying ‘I’ no manifold is given (B135), hence it is an “empty ‘I’”. Since it is merely formal, the ‘I’ of the ‘I think’ is dependent on a manifold of representations for thought *content*. But he also takes Kant to mean that the “empty ‘I’” first arises out of the absolute identity with the manifold, so that the differentiation between the formal, empty ‘I’ and the manifold is secondary with respect to the original-synthetic unity, the absolute identity, which alone is the “true I”—which, in Hegel’s understanding, makes the formal, empty, accompanying ‘I’ a *derivative* ‘I’, compared to the original-synthetic unity of apperception. But this just begs the question against Kant, who argues, quite clearly, in §16 of the B-Deduction, that the accompanying ‘I’ of the ‘I think’ of self-consciousness *is* the non-derivative original ‘I’ of the identity of self-consciousness, which is grounded in an original act of a priori synthesis (for extensive discussion, see Schulting 2012, esp. Chap. 6). The fact that the act of accompanying is grounded

in the a priori synthesis does not license a sharp separation between the two, in the way that Hegel suggests, namely, that the one empty 'I' of the understanding is *derivative of and secondary to* the true 'I' of the transcendental imagination (i.e. the original-synthetic unity). The grounding is a logical grounding, which means that for every act of accompanying her representations by a reflective 'I', there is an instance of a priori synthesis, and, reciprocally, every instance of a priori synthesis *ipso facto entails* an act of accompanying. The analytic unity of the 'I think' accompanying her representations is "rigorously coextensive", as I put it in Schulting (2012), with a priori synthesis (see B133–4). This means that no a priori synthesis fails to result in an act of accompanying by the 'I think', and no act of such accompanying is not grounded in an a priori synthesis. For the 'I think' and original-synthetic apperception *reduce to the same* act of self-conscious thinking, for every actual instance of self-consciousness, that is, in Kant's account, every actual instance of judgement. There is nothing in Kant's account that suggests that the understanding, or judgement, or the accompanying 'I think' is not the original apperception, which is an original a priori act of synthesis or an original-synthetic unity.

I cannot here rehearse the very complicated story of Kant's view of original, transcendental self-consciousness, but the prising apart of the 'I' that accompanies her representations *from* the original self-consciousness, as Hegel does, is at any rate not at all warranted. Not only is it not warranted, but it also makes it hard to understand how Hegel's reading comports with Kant's emphatic notion of self-consciousness as having to do with an *act of spontaneity*: it appears that Hegel wants to divorce the idea of the original-synthetic unity or identity from any kind of activity on the part of the thinking subject, indeed from the 'I' that accompanies her representations (this seems similar to McDowell, as I suggested in Chap. 5). For Kant, the original-synthetic unity between subject and object, between the form of our thinking and the material content in sensibility is not a given, primordial identity, even if an a priori one, but something that needs to be established in an *act* of understanding, by a subject aware of her act of accompanying, and combining, her representations as her own, for every occurrent cognition.

Hegel accuses Kant of *both*, contradictorily, arguing that the original-synthetic unity lies at the root of every possible combination of opposites (understanding and sensibility) *and* assuming that *the very faculty that establishes* this original-synthetic unity is also opposed to that which it unites, in other words, *is also one of the opposites in the combination*. In other words, that which unites opposites cannot itself be a component in that unity, namely, one of the opposites. This charge is the nub of Hegel's claim that Kant's account is *internally* contradictory, or at least not true to its most speculatively promising insight. But the alleged contradiction arises only because Hegel distinguishes sharply between the empty 'I' and the true 'I', where only the latter is the unity of opposites, and the former is merely one of the opposites. Hegel's criticism thus begs the question against Kant's claim that the understanding, *by means of* the productive imagination in sensibility (cf. B151–2), *is* itself the original-synthetic unity of apperception.

By virtue of a misapprehension of the merely formal distinction between the accompanying 'I think', i.e. the 'I' expressing the *analytical* unity of apperception, and the true 'I' of the *original-synthetic* unity of apperception, Hegel unjustifiably prises apart the productive imagination and the understanding, and thereby subtly shifts the idea of a priori synthesis—as that which, *from a formal perspective*, combines material content (as in Kant)—to an idea of a priori synthesis that a priori combines form and material content *simpliciter*, i.e. absolutely. In the latter perspective, form can then no longer be seen as *outside* the a priori combination between form and content, because it is itself *part* of the combination. It would then be inconsistent for Kant, as Hegel argues, to hold that material content must be pre-given, that is, must be provided from outside form or the formal perspective of the combining subject of the understanding. Material content and form of thought are always already conjoined. But if the claim of unity in a manifold of representations in intuition is conditional, namely, *insofar as the manifold is united by an act of the understanding*, *is there a unity in the manifold in intuition*, then there is no inconsistency in Kant's argument in the way that Hegel claims. And indeed the inconsistency charge does not hold up, because for Kant the original-synthetic unity is never a unity between form and matter, mind and world, *simpliciter* or *unconditionally*. Only

insofar as content is a priori determined, by means of the binding capacity of the understanding by virtue of the imagination, is there a unity between form and content, sensibility and understanding (see Schulting 2016b). By contrast, Hegel believes this binding force, i.e. the original-synthetic unity of apperception, to be present already in sensibility *tout court* in an inchoate form, implicitly, and only subsequently made explicit in the understanding and judgement—this is similar to McDowell's reasoning that the conceptual capacities are already operative in sensibility but do not necessarily figure in discursive activity or in judgement (see the account of McDowell's position in Chap. 5). For Hegel, as for McDowell, the actualisation of conceptual capacities that originally bind form and content is not due to the understanding, or due to an act of judgement, even if it is or can (and must) be made explicit in judgement in order for a conceptual cognition to arise out of it. That which is responsible for such an actualisation in sensibility is, according to Hegel, purely and only the productive imagination.

It is clear that Hegel regards pure intuition and pure concepts as abstract, and empty forms, which do not have an independent being. It is not the case, in his view, that the dualism of manifold and understanding, the antithesis, must be seen as primordial. The manifold does not *exist* independently of the principle of synthetic unity, Hegel says (GuW, 4:328). This excludes the possibility of essentially nonconceptual content, content that is not always already conjoined with conceptual *form*, even if only rudimentarily. There is no reality outside conceptual form, which the latter must in some conceptually incomprehensible sense be applied to. Also in the Greater Logic (WL, 12:20–22), Hegel argues that Kant's transcendental philosophy mistakenly assumes an absolute opposition between the form of thought and material content, which should provide reality to the concept, as if this content as our access to reality were independently and beforehand available or present—this is in conformity with how Hegel interprets Kant's putative view that reality cannot be “conjur[ed] out of” (*heraus zu klauben*) (GuW, 4:325/FK, 67) concepts, alluding to Kant's critique of the ontological proof of God's existence (Kant indeed uses the term *ausklauben* at A603/B631). The stuff of sensibility or sensible content is not what “must be validated as the *real* in contrast

to the concept”, Hegel says (WL, 12:21/SL, 518).¹⁸ But Kant does of course not presuppose that objective reality is given *outside* determinate conceptuality. He does assume that objective reality is given (from the empirical perspective), even if this assumption is not thereby already *philosophically* justified (see the argument in Chap. 7, Sect. 7.2); yet he also argues that objective reality is necessarily grounded on certain conditions of possibility insofar as what is given is conceptually determined *as* objectively real (from the transcendental perspective). Sensibility, for Kant, *is* not the real, but merely refers to it, insofar as its material aspect is concerned, not insofar as its constitutive *form* is concerned (which is dependent on the understanding, and the forms of intuition, space and time). But of course, it cannot be denied that there remains an unbridgeable disparity between Kant’s and Hegel’s views of what amounts to objective reality.¹⁹

8.5 Conclusion: The “Speculative Idea” “Through the Shallowness” of the Deduction

In Hegel’s opinion, Kant privileges the “unity of reflection” (GuW, 4:325/FK, 67) as the highest standpoint of philosophy. He remains stuck in oppositions: mind and world, form and content, ‘I’ and nature, etc. Hegel’s view of philosophy, by contrast, is that the idea of “absolute objectivity” is the “absolute sublatedness [*Aufgehobensein*]” (GuW, 4:325/FK, 67–68; trans. emended) of such oppositions, which thus is the “only authentic reality” (GuW, 4:325/FK, 68) at which genuine philosophy should aim. True idealism is the acknowledgment that neither opposites (body/soul, ‘I’/nature, form/content, mind/world) have independent existence—that is, as such they are “nothing” (GuW, 4:325/FK, 68). Hegel sees this true idealism in Kant’s adage that neither concept nor intuition have independent existence (this is at any rate how he reads it), or indeed in his famous question “*How are synthetic a priori judgments possible?*” (GuW, 4:327/FK, 69), which expresses an original identity of heterogeneous elements. But unfortunately, when parsing Kant’s arguments in TD, Hegel believes “[o]ne can

[only] glimpse this Idea through the shallowness of the deduction of the categories" (GuW, 4:327/FK, 69). While this idea of a primordial identity of what is different or dissimilar is Kant's truly *vernünftige* insight, he again squanders it, Hegel says, by declaring finite cognition, in virtue of the merely "formal identity" of the understanding, to be the only legitimate form of knowledge.

But I have argued that Hegel's reading of Kant starts from a very different assumption, namely, that dualistic positions are uncritical and thus unjustifiable in real philosophy. Kant's methodological starting point is, *prima facie*, quite unlike. Kant thinks in terms of differentiable elements of cognition, through analysis, with a view to seeking their unity in cognition. The synthetic a priori is not an assumption; it must first be shown to obtain by virtue of an "*analysis of the faculty of the understanding*" (A65/B90). Hegel focuses on the synthetic character of thought in a much broader sense, not necessarily just empirical cognition, and it seems Hegel's basic assumption is the *reality* of the synthetic a priori, which can be shown to be manifest in the way that we think about being *tout court*, specifically in the Greater Logic. Both Kant and Hegel look for the element of synthetic unity that lies a priori in thought, whether in the narrower (Kant) or broader (Hegel) sense, but from a different angle: Hegel seeks consistently for the unity of *reason* in the employment of concepts, whereas Kant looks for the synthetic unity that lies in *acts of the understanding in empirical judgements* about objects, insofar as these judgements are objectively valid. Kant indeed works, as Hegel claims, with differential terms of reflection (form/content; a priori/a posteriori; subject/object; 'I'/nature), but he does not identify these with metaphysical entities; they just serve the formal analysis of the possibility of empirical cognition. Kant is not a metaphysical dualist by conviction. Yet Hegel charges Kant with "fixing" or "absolutising" the terms of reflection in their opposition, suggesting that Kant does give them a metaphysical status. The result of this "fixing", according to Hegel, is that one never achieves real *rational* unity, that is, unity from the perspective of *reason* (rather than from the perspective of the narrower understanding) between the various terms of reflection, and so real, unconditioned unity between subject and object, form and matter, mind and world, thought and being, etc.

But the difference between Hegel's and Kant's approaches cannot be sublated in a Hegelian-type dialectic, for, despite their shared focus on the synthetic unity in thought, their methodologies and starting assumptions are irreducibly different. To put it succinctly, Hegel's critique of Kant begs the question against Kant's own philosophical methodology, which is based on a discursive logic; it can therefore not be an *internal* critique if it does not accept the philosophical methodology (or at least account for the differences in methodologies, which to all appearances Hegel fails to do). Hegel's criticism of Kant's discursive logic is legitimate to the extent that we accept Hegel's general assumptions about what philosophy is supposed to be; but any critique of Kant must take into account those assumptions. No philosophical system is viewpoint neutral. Yet it is precisely Hegel's quintessential belief that philosophy must and indeed can be viewpoint neutral, and that his own absolute idealism provides just the means to achieving such viewpoint neutrality. Hegel's bias is one that consistently seeks the unity of thought from within the broad perspective of reason, asking the question of what is *rational*, while Kant's focus on unity is aimed at justifying the employment of a priori concepts in particular judgements about objects, that is, in order to make empirically justified knowledge claims about the world. Hegel's aim is more concerned with the intra-conceptual coherence or consistency of such and other knowledge claims or employment of concepts within the larger context of concept use and its systematic and historical conditions.²⁰

All in all, the Hegelian criticism that Kant's philosophical methodology must be seen as resulting from contradictions in Kant's *own* thought, or that Kant himself alludes to the viewpoint neutrality of absolute idealism, that is, the speculative idea of an absolute identity, even if merely inchoately, fails, as I have argued, because Hegel misapprehends the intimate relation between the accompanying (putatively merely reflective) 'I' of the understanding and the original-synthetic unity, the latter of which he rightly associates with the productive imagination but wrongly dissociates from the understanding. Hence, whatever the merits of Hegel's own philosophical beliefs and the consequences of his critique of Kant for his own thought, Hegel's so-called *internal* critique of Kant does not stand up to scrutiny.

Notes

1. For exceptions, see Reich (2001), Longuenesse (1998), and in particular Schulting (2012).
2. Cf. Pippin (2005:32). See also my discussion of Pippin's views in Chap. 3 (this volume).
3. See, by contrast, Houlgate (2005), who believes there is a chasm between Hegel's critique of Kant in *Faith and Knowledge* and Hegel's later philosophy. My view in this respect agrees with that of Sedgwick (2012), who thinks there is deep continuity between the early (*Faith and Knowledge*) and later (the Logics) views, even if of course Hegel's later system of thought has developed beyond the rudiments of the account in *Faith and Knowledge*.
4. For a recent discussion of Hegel's critique of Kant's subjectivism, see especially Houlgate (2015) and Ameriks (2015). To a large extent, I agree with Ameriks's criticisms of Houlgate, but I think that Ameriks underestimates Kant's own subjectivism, particularly concerning the so-called Copernican turn that Houlgate rightly highlights as involving our conceptuality as much as our sensibility. In other words, unlike Ameriks, I believe that Kant's idealism already affects his theory of concepts (see further Chap. 9).
5. I also largely refrain from commenting on the vast secondary literature on Hegel's critique of Kant's theoretical philosophy. Important discussions are found, among many more, in Ameriks (2000, 2015), Bowman (2013), Bristow (2007), Düsing (1995, 2013), Ferrarin (2016), Görland (1966), Horstmann (2004), Houlgate (2005, 2015), Longuenesse (2015, Part II), Kreines (2015), McDowell (2009), Pippin (1989, 1993, 2005, 2014, 2016), Redding (2010), Sedgwick (1992, 1993, 2001, 2005, 2012), the essays in Verra (1981) and Westphal (1996, 2000). See also my review of Bristow's book in Schulting (2009) and my review of Sedgwick (2012) in Schulting (2016a). I discuss Pippin's reading of Hegel's critique of Kant extensively in two separate essays (Schulting 2016b, c).
6. Sedgwick (2012, *passim*) highlights this element of Hegel's critique of Kant: conceptuality and sensibility are mutually determining, in contrast to Kant's emphasis on the determination, by the understanding, of sensibility, as the *merely* determinable.
7. "The entire deduction is [merely] an analysis of experience and it posits an absolute antithesis (*Antithesis*) and a dualism" (GuW, 4:334/FK, 78).

8. (M*) Necessarily, *if* intuitions are to be seen as contributing to possible knowledge of objects, *then* intuitions are subsumed under the categories as the conceptual conditions under which knowledge of objects is possible.
9. See further my account in Schulting (2016b).
10. This comment might appear to conflict with Hegel's later, true interpretation of Kant's main claim that objectivity is indeed nothing but the unity of self-consciousness (WL, 12:18). But the unity of self-consciousness that is meant there is the "true 'I'", of which Hegel speaks in *Faith and Knowledge*, not the so-called reflective or "empty 'I'" of the 'I think' accompanying my representations, which he dismisses as merely empirical. See further Sect. 8.4.
11. See Schulting (2012, Chap. 8). See also Chap. 9 (this volume).
12. See also WL, 12:21–22. Hegel's critique of Kant here is not arbitrary, for the claim that Kant's subjectivism/restriction thesis is not licensed follows from Hegel's belief that the manifold in intuition is already sublated in the concept, thus showing its essence, and so it cannot be claimed that in the end the concept is again *merely* applicable to the manifold in intuition.
13. But see Schulting (2016c) for a more favourable view of the relation between Kant's and Hegel's metaphysical logics.
14. See e.g. Westphal (2000).
15. Notice that, like Hegel, neither Kant sees the a priori synthetic unity as a *product* of an act of combination, but sees it as lying at the root of any necessary combination (see B129–31). Cf. Schulting (2012:141ff.).
16. Cf. Sedgwick (2005).
17. Judgement is paradigmatic for the relative identity of the formal 'I' or formal identity of the understanding, which is derivative of the "true 'I'" underlying it. The "true 'I'" is the original "identity, as the unconditioned, [which] sunders itself, and appears as separated into the form of a judgment, as subject and predicate, or particular and universal" (GuW, 4:328/FK, 72). Judgement is "the prevailing appearance of difference" (trans. mine), and the original identity is only visible in the *copula* in a judgement, but it "is not something thought, something cognized; on the contrary it expresses precisely our non-cognizance of the rational" (GuW 4:329/FK, 72). Judgement only shows the antithesis of the particular and the universal, of subject and object, not their identity or unity. It appears that Hegel takes the copula 'is' to be derivative of the Being that lies at the root of the judgement, reminiscent of

Hölderlin's view of judgement as the "diremption" of original Being. For Hegel, original Being is Reason itself.

18. Indeed, Hegel comes to argue, in the *Logic*, that reality is in fact derived or generated from the concept (WL, 12:24–25/SL, 522), contrary to Kant's view that existence cannot be produced by the understanding or reason. Reality is not something external, in Hegel's view, "but must be derived from the concept itself in accordance with scientific requirements" (WL, 12:21/SL, 518). The sensible or intuition is prior to, or given before, conceptual understanding, insofar as it will be made clear that reason is their condition. That reason is their ground is shown by the way that reason proceeds from "the dialectic" or "nothingness" of sensibility or intuition (WL, 12:21/SL, 519). Unlike for Kant, the truth of concepts is not at all conditioned on their being applied to sensibility or intuition (WL, 12:20–22). (Hegel does not distinguish between the formal and material, existential aspects of *reality*, as does Kant.)
19. See further Schulting (2016c).
20. See further the discussion in Schulting (2016c).

References

- Ameriks, K. 2000. Hegel's Critique of Kant's Theoretical Philosophy. In K. Ameriks, *Kant and the Fate of Autonomy. Problems in the Appropriation of the Critical Philosophy*, 267–308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ameriks, K. 2015. Some Persistent Presumptions of Hegelian Anti-Subjectivism. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume LXXXIX*: 43–60.
- Bowman, B. 2013. *Hegel and the Metaphysics of Absolute Negativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bristow, W. 2007. *Hegel and the Transformation of Philosophical Critique*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Düsing, K. 1995. *Das Problem der Subjektivität in Hegels Logik*, 3rd ed. Bonn: Bouvier.
- Düsing, K. 2013. Konstitution und Struktur der Identität des Ich. Kants Theorie der Apperzeption und Hegels Kritik. In K. Düsing, *Subjektivität und Freiheit. Untersuchungen zum Idealismus von Kant bis Hegel*, 2nd expanded ed., 143–180. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.

- Ferrarin, A. 2016. *Pensare e l'io. Hegel e la critica di Kant*. Rome: Carocci.
- Görland, I. 1966. *Die Kantkritik des jungen Hegel*. Frankfurt a/M: Klostermann.
- Hanna, R. 2013. Kant, Hegel, and the Fate of Non-Conceptual Content. *Hegel Bulletin* 34 (1): 1–32.
- Harris, H. 1977. Introduction. In G.W.F. Hegel, *Faith and Knowledge*, trans. and ed. W. Cerf and H. Harris, 1–50. Albany, NY: SUNY.
- Horstmann, R.-P. 2004. *Die Grenzen der Vernunft. Eine Untersuchung zu Zielen und Motiven des Deutschen Idealismus*, 3rd ed. Frankfurt a/M: Klostermann.
- Houlgate, S. 2005. Glauben und Wissen: Hegels immanente Kritik der kantischen Philosophie oder die (illegitime) „Ahnung eines Besseren“? In *Hegel-Jahrbuch: Glauben und Wissen. Dritter Teil*, ed. A. Arndt et al., 152–158. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Houlgate, S. 2015. Hegel's Critique of Kant. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume LXXXIX*: 21–41.
- Kreines, J. 2015. *Reason in the World. Hegel's Metaphysics and Its Philosophical Appeal*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Longuenesse, B. 1998. *Kant and the Capacity to Judge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Longuenesse, B. 2015. *Hegel et la critique de la métaphysique*, 2nd revised and expanded ed. Paris: Vrin.
- McDowell, J. 2009. *Having the World in View: Essays on Kant, Hegel, and Sellars*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pippin, R. 1989. *Hegel's Idealism: The Satisfactions of Self-Consciousness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pippin, R. 1993. Hegel's Original Insight. *International Philosophical Quarterly* XXXIII (3): 285–295.
- Pippin, R. 2005. Concept and Intuition: On Distinguishability and Separability. *Hegel-Studien* 39/40: 25–39.
- Pippin, R. 2014. The Significance of Self-Consciousness in Idealist Theories of Logic. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 114(2), pt. 2 (July): 145–166.
- Pippin, R. 2016. *Die Aktualität des deutschen Idealismus*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Redding, P. 2010. *Analytic Philosophy and the Return of Hegelian Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reich, K. 2001. *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. M. Baum. Hamburg: Meiner.
- Schulting, D. 2009. Review of W. Bristow, *Hegel and the Transformation of Philosophical Critique* (Oxford UP 2007). *Hegel Bulletin* 59/60: 82–88.
- Schulting, D. 2012. *Kant's Deduction and Apperception. Explaining the Categories*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Schulting, D. 2016a. Review of S. Sedgwick, *Hegel's Critique of Kant* (Oxford UP 2012). *Kant-Studien* 107 (2): 414–419.
- Schulting, D. 2016b. On an Older Dispute: Hegel, Pippin, and the Separability of Concept and Intuition in Kant. In *Kantian Nonconceptualism*, ed. D. Schulting, 227–255. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schulting, D. 2016c. Critical Notice of Robert Pippin's 'Logik und Metaphysik. Hegels "Reich der Schatten"', *Critique*, <https://virtualcritique.wordpress.com/2016/10/16/critical-notice-of-robert-pippins-logik-und-metaphysik-hegels-reich-der-schatten/>. Accessed 16 Oct 2016.
- Sedgwick, S. 1992. Hegel's Treatment of Transcendental Apperception in Kant. *Owl of Minerva* 23 (2): 151–163.
- Sedgwick, S. 1993. Pippin on Hegel's Critique of Kant. *International Philosophical Quarterly* XXXIII (3): 273–283.
- Sedgwick, S. 2001. "Genuine" Versus "Subjective" Idealism in Hegel's *Jenaer Schriften*. In *Idealismus als Theorie der Repräsentation?*, ed. R. Schumacher, 233–245. Paderborn: mentis.
- Sedgwick, S. 2005. The Emptiness of the 'I': Kant's Transcendental Deduction in "Glauben und Wissen". In *Hegel-Jahrbuch: Glauben und Wissen. Dritter Teil*, ed. A. Arndt et al., 171–175. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Sedgwick, S. 2012. *Hegel's Critique of Kant. From Dichotomy to Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Verra, V. (ed.). 1981. *Hegel Interprete di Kant*. Naples: Prismi.
- Westphal, K. 1996. Kant, Hegel, and the Transcendental Material Conditions of Possible Experience. *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 33 (Spring/Summer): 23–41.
- Westphal, K. 2000. Kant, Hegel, and the Fate of "the" Intuitive Intellect. In *The Reception of Kant's Critical Philosophy: Fichte, Schelling, Hegel*, ed. S. Sedgwick, 283–305. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.