

President/Président: GERARD NADDAF *York University*
Editors/Rédaction: ERIC DAYTON *University of Saskatchewan*
MATHIEU MARION *Université du Québec à Montréal*

Board of Referees/Comité d'experts

JENNIFER ASHWORTH *University of Waterloo*
JOCELYN BENOIST *CNRS, Paris*
SAM BLACK *Simon Fraser University*
CLAUDIA CARD *University of Wisconsin*
SÉBASTIEN CHARLES *Université de Sherbrooke*
RYOA CHUNG *Université de Montréal*
LORRAINE CODE *York University*
CATHERINE COLLOBERT *Université d'Ottawa*
RONNIE DESOUSA *University of Toronto*
FRED DRETSKE *Stanford University*
DANIEL DUMOUCHEL *Université de Montréal*
LUC FAUCHER *Université du Québec à Montréal*
ELISABETH GEDGE *McMaster University*
NICHOLAS GRIFFIN *McMaster University*
DAVID HYDER *Université d'Ottawa*
WILL KYMLICKA *Queen's University*

LUC LANGLOIS *Université Laval*
DOMINIQUE LEYDET *Université du Québec à Montréal*
PETER LOFTSON *University of Guelph*
DUNCAN MACINTOSH *Dalhousie University*
JACK MACINTOSH *University of Calgary*
CARL MATHESON *University of Manitoba*
JEFF MITSCHERLING *University of Guelph*
KATHLEEN OKRUHLIK *University of Western Ontario*
CLAUDE PANACCIO *Université du Québec à Montréal*
JEFF PELLETIER *University of Alberta*
PETER RAILTON *University of Michigan*
WILL SWEET *St. Francis Xavier University*
CHRISTINE TAPPOLET *Université de Montréal*
RICHARD VALLÉE *Université de Moncton - Campus Shippagan*

Editorial Policy

Dialogue publishes, in English and French, articles in all branches of philosophy and is open to contributions from any philosophical perspective. The articles and reviews in *Dialogue* are peer reviewed.

Politique éditoriale

Dialogue publie en anglais et en français des textes appartenant aux divers domaines de la philosophie, sans discrimination d'allégeance philosophique. Les articles et les études critiques soumis à *Dialogue* font l'objet d'une évaluation par les pairs.

Bibliographic Indexing/Indexation bibliographique *Dialogue* is indexed in: *Dialogue* est répertoriée dans: *The Philosopher's Index*; *The Modern Language Directory of Periodicals*; *L'année philologique*; *Bulletin signalétique*, 519: *Philosophie*; *Répertoire bibliographique de la philosophie*.

DIALOGUE

ISSN 0012-2173

Published by Wilfrid Laurier University Press for the Canadian Philosophical Association. This journal has been prepared from camera-ready copy provided by the Editors of *Dialogue*. / Publiée par Wilfrid Laurier University Press pour l'Association canadienne de philosophie. Cette revue a été produite à partir de prêts-à-photographier fournis par les rédacteurs de *Dialogue*.

Published quarterly for the Canadian Philosophical Association with grant support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. The assistance and support of the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Quebec in Montréal is also gratefully acknowledged. / Revue trimestrielle de l'Association canadienne de philosophie publiée avec l'assistance financière du Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines. *Dialogue* bénéficie également du soutien de l'Université du Québec à Montréal et de l'Université de Saskatchewan.

Printed in Canada/Imprimé au Canada

We acknowledge the financial assistance of the Government of Canada, through the Publications Assistance Program (PAP), toward our mailing costs. / Nous reconnaissons l'aide financière du gouvernement du Canada, par l'entremise du Programme d'aide aux publications (PAP), pour nos dépenses d'envoi postal.

Publications Mail Registration/Poste-publications enregistrement #9827
Agreement No./N° de la convention 41123551
Postage paid at Kitchener/Port payé à Kitchener

Canada

DIALOGUE

Canadian Philosophical Review/Revue canadienne de philosophie

Vol. XLV, No. 2 Spring/Printemps 2006

Articles

Bentham and the Death Penalty

BRIAN CALVERT 211

La destination communautaire de l'interprétation,

le *De doctrina christiana* d'Augustin

PATRICK THÉRIAULT 233

Kant and Dependency Relations: Kant on the State's Right to Redistribute Resources to Protect the Rights of Dependents

HELGA VARDEN 257

Heidegger en dialogue : par-delà Ernst Jünger, un retour à Nietzsche

MARTINE BÉLAND 285

Book Symposium/Tribune du livre

Human Experience: Philosophy, Neurosis, and the Elements

of *Everyday Life* JOHN RUSSON

On Human Identity: The Intersubjective Path from Body to Mind

JOHN RUSSON 307

The Open Figure of Experience and Mind

DAVID MORRIS 315

The Search for Agency: Comments on John Russon's *Human Experience*

JOHN CHRISTMAN 327

Some Experiences, Some Values, and Some Philosophies: On Russon's Account of Experience, Neurosis, and Philosophy

JOHN J. STUHR 337

The Virtue of Stoicism: On First Principles in Philosophy and Life

JOHN RUSSON 347

Intervention/Discussion

Miracles, Evidence, Evil, and God: A Twenty-Year Debate

CHRISTINE OVERALL 355

jugement comme condition de l'effectivité d'une représentation. Certes, l'emploi du «*wenn*» («lorsque») peut faire pencher pour cette interprétation conditionnelle. Seulement, deux évidences, l'une interne au texte même, l'autre relative à une formule brentanienne à laquelle renvoie ici implicitement Husserl, contredisent cette interprétation. La première est l'usage du signe d'égalité entre «effectif» et «vrai»; si Husserl désignait vraiment, dans ce passage, une conditionnelle, il n'aurait pas employé ce signe. Aussi, le «*wenn*» est-il à comprendre ici au sens de «*genau dann wenn*» («si et seulement si»). Le second élément à l'appui d'une interprétation en termes d'équivalence est à chercher dans les cours de logique de Brentano, que Husserl connaissait bien : le passage de la vérité d'un jugement à l'effectivité de sa représentation sujet n'y est pas présenté comme causal. Pour Brentano et pour Husserl «A est vrai» et «da représentation sujet de A est effective» sont en relation d'équivalence. De surcroît, mis à part un détail terminologique, Bolzano entérine également cette équivalence. Contrairement à ce qu'affirme Lavigne, il n'y a donc pas ici d'abandon de la théorie brentanienne par Husserl qui se trouve justifié par le passage cité de la lettre à Marty de juillet 1901.

GUILLAUME FRÉCHETTE *Université de Hambourg*

Descartes's Method of Doubt

JANET BROUGHTON

Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002, xv + 217 pp., \$16.95 paper

In *Descartes's Method of Doubt* Janet Broughton undertakes a close study of how Descartes uses doubt in the first three *Meditations* in order to set the foundations for subsequent knowledge claims. This is a masterful, insightful, and ambitious treatment of the topic. Broughton is careful and precise in her writing, philosophical argumentation, and attention to texts. The care in detail is joined by an engaging treatment of broader implications, both for Descartes's philosophy itself and for its relation to ancient and contemporary concerns. The book is divided into two parts, the first of which deals with the development of doubt in the *Meditations*, and the second of which deals with the way Descartes uses the method of doubt in that work. The first part addresses such issues as the nature of the doubter (the meditator), the relation of Descartes's form of scepticism to ancient forms, the strategic nature of his method of doubt, Descartes's motivations for posing his method of doubt, and the relation of this scepticism to common-sense beliefs. In the second part, Broughton proposes an original way of understanding the way Descartes uses his method of doubt to achieve his goal of uncovering foundational knowledge, knowledge which includes one's existence and certain self-attributions (for example, "I am doubting"), the existence of God as one's creator, and the causal principle that nothing comes from nothing. This book is not for beginners in philosophy, but it is essential—and pleasurable—reading for the serious Descartes scholar.

The *First* and *Second Meditations* present the reader with the following curious fact that demands explanation: within the class of clear and distinct perceptions, there are those that are unassailable, surviving all of Descartes's four "radical grounds for doubt—lunacy, dreaming, God, and 'fate or chance'" (p. 63)—and there are those that are unable to withstand the supposition of the deceiving God.

"Among those favored ideas are 'I exist'. . . 'I seem to see a light'. . . But mathematical ideas are *not* among the favored few [ideas that are indubitably true], despite their clarity and distinctness" (p. 181). In order to explain how Descartes is able to divide the class of clear and distinct ideas in this way, Broughton argues that we must reconsider the way he uses his method of doubt in the early *Meditations*. According to an extremely common interpretation of that method, we start from the belief that "we ought to pursue knowledge in our inquiries; knowledge requires certainty; and certainty requires ruling out radical skeptical doubts" (p. 8). Accordingly, what is prior is Descartes's conception of knowledge as that which is wholly certain. His method of doubt, on this interpretation, is consequently invoked as a tool to help us arrive at such knowledge. The belief that Descartes "has a prior commitment to a very demanding conception of knowledge" (p. 17) gets the order of Descartes's method wrong, says Broughton. Rather, "[m]ightn't Descartes's use of the method of doubt be what explains the very demanding account of knowledge that he articulates?" (p. 10). But, if radical scepticism is prior to and gives rise to Descartes's conception of knowledge as certainty, what motivates the method of doubt itself? Acknowledging a number of commentators who have offered various answers to this question (pp. 10-16), she argues that "Descartes's use of the method of doubt enables him to execute a simple and coolly calculated strategy for establishing the first principles of philosophy he believes to be true" (p. 17), which will allow him "a way to achieve sturdy and lasting results in the sciences . . . to discover, establish, and embrace the fundamental truths that should replace the basic errors that took root in his mind during his early cognitive development" (p. 50). It is a strategy that should convince others to believe what he takes to be true.

To substantiate her interpretation, and thereby show how Descartes is able to draw a principled and useful distinction within the class of clear and distinct perceptions between the truly indubitable and all the rest, Broughton proposes that Descartes's various arguments introduced to rescue specific beliefs from radical doubt are actually "dependence arguments." What does this mean? Broughton writes: "What I believe Descartes aimed to do was to establish the absolute certainty of some of his beliefs *by showing that their truth is a condition of his using the method of doubt*" (p. 98). The fact of Descartes's proceeding with the method of doubt *depends* upon certain beliefs being true. These beliefs, consequently, are ones "that I cannot rationally doubt . . . I would be able to be absolutely certain about [them]" (p. 99). One significant consequence of reading Descartes's *Second Meditations* arguments as dependence arguments is that this would establish both the truth of *and* certainty in the beliefs that are the conditions for using doubt. Broughton resists calling these arguments "transcendental" for reasons she develops in the final chapter of the book (pp. 186-96). (This is one example of Broughton's ability to connect the themes of her investigation of Descartes with the broader history of philosophy, including contemporary interests, without being anachronistic. Indeed, while the book is a superb study of Descartes's epistemology, it will also appeal to those with interests in epistemology more generally.)

After giving the details of different kinds of dependence arguments found in the *Second Meditations*, and some textual support for them, Broughton proceeds to show how Descartes's *Second* and *Third Meditations* could be read as employing these arguments to secure the truth of and our certainty in a number of beliefs about "inner conditions" (chap. 7), such as "I exist," and about "outer conditions"

(chap. 8), such as “from nothing, nothing comes.” Broughton argues, for example, that (at least in the *Meditations*) “I exist” is a belief that the meditator establishes as true and holds with certainty, not by first asserting the utter certainty (and so truth) of “I think,” and then inferring “I exist” from that certainty. In fact, in the *Second Meditation*, he establishes his existence a full three paragraphs before asserting his certainty in the belief that he is thinking (p. 112). Rather, Descartes employs a dependence argument. “His existence is a *necessary condition of his doubting* whether sky, earth, body, or minds exist. ‘I exist’ must be true if I am to doubt, and so one thing I cannot rationally doubt, as I doubt everything possible, is that ‘I exist’ is true” (p. 116).

Not all clear and distinct ideas are necessary conditions of the meditator’s doubting. For instance, $2 + 3 = 5$ is not, and so it does not emerge from the method of doubt as necessarily true and so impossible to not believe with certainty. And, indeed, the deceptive God could have made the meditator think this belief to be true because clear and distinct, even if it were not true. The “favoured” clear and distinct perceptions are protected from the deceptive God strategy not by their clarity and distinctness but by their status (established by the dependence arguments) as necessarily true beliefs. This, Broughton argues, provides Descartes with a powerful tool for avoiding the infamous Cartesian circle (pp. 175–86). Briefly, the circle results by claiming jointly that certainty in God’s existence requires certainty in clear and distinct perceptions, and that certainty in clear and distinct perceptions requires certainty in God’s existence. A sketch of Broughton’s solution is that some clear and distinct perceptions emerge from dependence arguments and do not, therefore, depend upon the existence of a benevolent God. These clear and distinct perceptions are then used to establish God’s existence.

This is a clever attempt to exonerate Descartes of the charge of circularity, and it is one example of a string of astute moves in this book. Determining whether it works will depend upon a careful examination of the dependence arguments, including an examination of their foundations and justification. This is one of many lines of investigation that Broughton’s terse and rich book opens up. The book itself, and the debate it should spur, will advance Descartes scholarship significantly.

KAREN DETLEFSEN *University of Pennsylvania*

Tales of the Mighty Dead: Historical Essays in the Metaphysics of Intentionality

ROBERT B. BRANDOM

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002, x + 430 pp.

Matching its title, *Tales of the Mighty Dead: Historical Essays in the Metaphysics of Intentionality*, Robert Brandom’s book has an unusual, even strange, construction. It is composed of two parts, the first entitled “Talking with a Tradition,” the second, coming in at twice the length of the first, entitled “Historical Essays.” The historical essays of the second part—Brandom calls these “the substantive essays” (p. 33)—were, however, historically first, having been written over a period of twenty-five years. But it would be wrong to read Part 1 as merely a long hindsighted introduction to Professor Brandom’s first volume of collected papers. That

is not the nature or construction of the book and will not begin to do justice to the peculiar and fascinating way in which, in these *Tales*, the nose wags the dog.

The subtitle *Historical Essays in the Metaphysics of Intentionality* signals two plotlines running through the entire book and which, as narrative moments, give rise to a third plotline found only in and dominating Part 1.

There is then, as one plotline, the history—Brandom’s exposition of the views of a select group of six eminent figures in the history of philosophy, viz., Spinoza, Leibniz, Hegel, Frege, Heidegger, and Sellars. The second narrative moment or plotline, by contrast with the first, is the ahistorical, putatively “right story” about intentionality (*an und für sich*). It is, of course, Brandom’s story, some large portions of which are retailed in his magnum opus, *Making It Explicit* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994). This in turn gives rise (some might say by a dialectic of defensiveness) to a third narrative moment or plotline devoted to elaborating a complex story of the relation between the historical essays and the ahistorical thesis about intentionality.

The core of the second narrative moment or ahistorical plotline (the right account of intentionality by Brandom’s lights) is the affirmation of an internal connection between rationality and intentionality. More specifically, rationality is here conceived on an “inferential model” (“On this view, to be rational is to play the game of giving and asking for reasons. . . . Conceptual contents [of utterances and mental states] are functional inferential roles” [p. 6]), and intentionality is conceived “in a sense broad enough to include both what it is to have a thought that things are thus and so, and what it is to be thinking of or about things in a certain way” (pp. 16–17). Brandom’s central historical claim (narrative moment one) is that his central ahistorical claim (narrative moment two—the “right” account of the metaphysics of intentionality) may be found in or extracted from each of the six historical figures. They each, one way or another and by degrees of more or less inchoativity, have the right stuff. The question raised by the historical claim, and yielding the third narrative moment, is: By what right? By what right does Brandom find his preferred view of intentionality in each of the six? More to the point, indeed more pointedly, might he not be “projecting”?

This is a question to which Brandom is very (perhaps overly) sensitive. The sin of having pulled “a Strawson” (i.e., extracting one’s own view from that of another philosopher [Kant]), is one that many of us only wish we had the genius to commit (even were it justly imputed to Strawson). In different ways and, it may be said, in different senses, Brandom repudiates the charge. That is, his responses to the charge range from denying that he has committed any such sin to denying that there is any such sin to commit. Of four distinguishable responses to the charge, two straightforwardly aim to undermine the justice of the charge, and two, more interestingly, aim to undermine the very sense of the charge.

Brandom, at first flatly, or almost so, denies the charge of having foisted a set of views on the historical figures: “The essays were written over a period of twenty-five years. . . . They were certainly not written in an attempt to fill in some antecedent picture that I had of a tradition to which they belong. On the contrary that picture (and the tradition it retrospectively constitutes) was the cumulative product of detailed investigations of the sort epitomized here” (pp. 133–34). Earlier he had said that his historical figures generally offer functionalist, inferentialist, holist, normative, and social pragmatist explanations of intentionality and that his “claim