**Philosophy of Kant: Critique of Pure Reason**  
**PHIL 4010/5010**  
**Spring 2012**  
**Bob Hanna**  
**Syllabus**

office: 142 Hellems  
office tel: 303-492-8289  
e-mail: robert.hanna@colorado.edu  
web-pages: http://www.colorado.edu/philosophy/fac_hanna.shtml  
http://spot.Colorado.EDU/~rhanna/  
office hrs: 5:00-6:00 pm Mon & Tues, or by appointment  
Discussion leader: Andrew Chapman <chapmaning@gmail.com>

**Lectures:** 1:00–1:50 pm Mon, Wed, & Fri, HLMS 245

**Course Description:**

Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* (CPR) is arguably the single most brilliant, difficult, and important book in modern philosophy. Its main topic is the nature, scope, and limits of human cognition and reason; and its main conclusion is that necessary truth, a priori knowledge, and freedom of the will are possible if and only if Transcendental Idealism is true. The purpose of this course is to give a close, critical reading of the central line of argument in the CPR all the way from the Preface to the Ideal of Pure Reason. Topics to be covered include: the Critical Project & the Transcendental Project; the Introduction & beyond: basic terms, notions, and distinctions; Space, time, and mathematics: the Transcendental Aesthetic; Transcendental Idealism; the Refutation of Idealism; concepts, logic & judgments: the Metaphysical Deduction of the Categories; the Transcendental Deduction of the Categories; the System of Principles: Schematism, Axioms of Intuition, Anticipations of Perception, & Analogies of Experience; the Transcendental Dialectic & transcendental ideas; the Third Antimony, freedom, and determinism; and The Ideal of Pure Reason & the impossibility of ontological arguments.

**Required Texts:**

Other Recommended Secondary Sources:


Extremely Silly Online Kant Stuff:

(1) *The Kant Song*, available online at URL = [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rzpL_5CI0WQ](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rzpL_5CI0WQ)
(2) *The Kant Attack Ad*, available online at URL = [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7M-cmNdiFul](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7M-cmNdiFul)

**The.Best.Kant.T-shirt.Evar:**


Course Requirements:

(1) **For Undergraduates**, two 8-10 pp. papers, and **For Graduate Students**, two 10-12 pp. papers, each worth 25% of the final grade (= 50% in total), due on **Mon 12 Mar** and **Mon 7 May**.

(2) **Thirteen short** (= 4 question, multiple choice, 10 minute maximum) **quizzes** on the required readings FOR THAT VERY week (i.e., NOT the readings for the PRECEDING week), worth 40% of the final grade, calculated on the basis of your ten best scores. Each quiz will contain TWO questions on the CPR reading for that week, and TWO questions on the Altman, Hall, and/or Hanna readings for that week. **The first quiz will be at the beginning of class on each Monday, starting on Mon 23 Jan**—except for the weeks of **Mon 12 Mar** and **Mon 26 Mar**, which are no-quiz weeks.

(3) **Attendance at five out of six class discussions**, worth 10% of the final grade.

NB. Please note that there will be no make-up quizzes or excused absences from class discussions. If you miss more than three quizzes or more than one of the class discussions, your grade for the quizzes will be calculated on the basis of the total number of quizzes you have completed & your grade for discussions will be calculated on the basis of the total number of class discussions that you have attended, assuming that ten completed quizzes are the minimum for receiving a perfect 40 points for the quizzes & also that five attended discussions are the minimum for receiving a perfect 10 points for the discussions—e.g., if you’ve completed only nine quizzes, the maximum you can get is 36 points, etc., & if you’ve attended only four class discussions, the maximum you can get is 8 points, etc.
The Awesomely Awesome Revise-&-Resubmit Option:

You may revise & resubmit your first essay, making changes to it in response to my comments. If (and only if) the revised paper is significantly different from and significantly better than the original paper, then you’ll receive a higher grade that will be substituted for the original grade; otherwise your original grade will remain the same. **In order to qualify for this option, you must also submit a one-page description of precisely how you have responded to my comments, along with the revised paper. Please note that papers turned in without the accompanying description will not be considered.** The revised--&-resubmitted paper is due on **Fri 11 May**.

The Amazingly Amazing Third Essay Option for Extra Credit:

You may also write a third 8-10 page (for undergraduates) or 10-12 page (for graduate students) essay on any of the assigned essay topics you have not already written on, and receive extra credit according to the following scheme: A=10%, A-=9%, B+=8%, B=7%, B-=6%, C+=5%, C=4%, C-=3%, D+=2%, D or Below=1%. The optional third essay is due on **Fri 11 May**.

Paper Policies:

Paper topics will be handed out at least two weeks in advance of the due date. If you want to write on a different topic, that is perfectly acceptable, **but the topic must be officially OK’d by me at least a week before the due date**.

Papers turned in on time will be graded & returned two weeks later, other things being equal. Late papers will be accepted but penalized and returned at my discretion. **Please note that I will not accept papers submitted by e-mail: so all papers must be submitted in typed hard-copy.**

Schedule of Class-Meetings, Lecture Topics, Readings, Quizzes, and Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 1</th>
<th>18 Jan, 20 Jan</th>
<th>No reading quiz.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>The Critical project and the Transcendental Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings:</td>
<td>CPR: 95-124 (Preface, both editions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altman: 5-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall: 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanna: 2-9 (Lecture 1 + Table 1 + Table 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st class discussion on Fri 27 Jan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>The Introduction &amp; Beyond: Basic Terms, Notions, &amp; Distinctions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings:</td>
<td>CPR: 125-152 (Introduction, both editions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanna: 10-20 (Lecture 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK 3</td>
<td>30 Jan, 1 Feb, 3 Feb</td>
<td>2nd reading quiz on Mon 30 Jan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Same as WEEK 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings:</td>
<td>CPR: 279-283 (Supreme Principles of Analytic and Synthetic Judgments), and 684-689 (Opining, Knowing, &amp; Believing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altman: 27-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall: 4-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanna: Same as WEEK 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 4</th>
<th>6 Feb, 8 Feb, 10 Feb</th>
<th>3rd reading quiz on Mon 6 Feb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd class discussion on Fri 10 Feb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Space, Time, &amp; Mathematics: The Transcendental Aesthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings:</td>
<td>CPR: 155-192 (Transcendental Aesthetic, both editions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanna: 21-30 (Lecture 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 5</th>
<th>13 Feb, 15 Feb, 17 Feb</th>
<th>4th reading quiz on Mon 13 Feb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd class discussion on Fri 17 Feb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Same as WEEK 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings:</td>
<td>CPR: 630-643 (The Discipline of Pure Reason in Dogmatic Use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altman: 57-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall: 17-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanna: Same as WEEK 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 6</th>
<th>20 Feb, 22 Feb, 24 Feb</th>
<th>5th reading quiz on Mon 20 Feb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>Transcendental Idealism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings:</td>
<td>CPR: 185-192 again (General Remark, B edition), 338-365 (Phenomena and Noumena),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altman: 75-84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall: 49-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanna: 31-36 (Lecture 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK 7</th>
<th>27 Feb, 29 Feb, 2 Mar</th>
<th>6th reading quiz on Mon 27 Feb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st paper topics handed out on Mon 27 Feb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic:</td>
<td>The Refutation of Idealism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings:</td>
<td>CPR: 425-431 (Fourth Paralogism), 326-329 [+121-122 n.] (Refutation of Idealism),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altman: 155-159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall: 129-132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanna: 37-51 (Lecture 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WEEK 8  5 Mar, 7 Mar, 9 Mar  7th reading quiz on Mon 5 Mar.

Readings:  
CPR: 193-218  
Altman: 85-109  
Hall: 57-73  
Hanna: 52-55 (Lecture 6)

WEEK 9  12 Mar, 14 Mar, 16 Mar  No reading quiz.

1st paper due on Mon 12 Mar.

4th class discussion on Fri 16 Mar.

Topic: The Transcendental Deduction of the Categories in the A Edition
Readings:  
CPR: 219-244  
Altman: 110-121  
Hall: 75-82  
Hanna: 56-61 (Lecture 7)

WEEK 10  19 Mar, 21 Mar, 23 Mar  8th reading quiz on Mon 19 Mar.

Topic: The Transcendental Deduction of the Categories in the B Edition
Readings:  
CPR: 245-266  
Altman: 121-143  
Hall: 83-90  
Hanna: 62-68 (Lecture 8)

WEEK 11  26 Mar, 28 Mar, 30 Mar  No classes: Spring Break.

WEEK 12  2 Apr, 4 Apr, 6 Apr  9th reading quiz on Mon 2 Apr.

Topic: The System of Principles I: Schematism, Axioms of Intuition, and Anticipations of Perception
Readings:  
CPR: 267-295  
Altman: 143-147  
Hall: 91-106  
Hanna: 69-77 (Lecture 9)

WEEK 13  9 Apr, 11 Apr, 13 Apr  10th reading quiz on Mon 9 Apr.

5th class discussion on Fri 13 Apr.

Topic: The System of Principles II: Analogies of Experience
Readings:  
CPR: 295-321  
Altman: 147-155  
Hall: 107-126  
Hanna: 78-84 (Lecture 10)
WEEK 14  
16 Apr, 18 Apr, 20 Apr  
11th reading quiz on Mon 11 Apr.  
2nd paper topics handed out on Mon 16 Apr.  
6th class discussion on Fri 20 Apr.  

Topic: Transcendental Dialectic & Transcendental Ideas  
Readings:  
CPR: 384-408 and 590-604  
Altman: 165-172  
Hall: 145-152  
Hanna: 85-88 (Lecture 11)  

WEEK 15  
23 Apr, 25 Apr, 27 Apr  
12th reading quiz on Mon 23 Apr.  

Topic: The Third Antinomy, Freedom, & Determinism  
Readings:  
CPR: 459-469, 484-489, 532-546, 549-550  
Altman: 172-177  
Hall: 176-183  
Hanna: 89-97 (Lecture 12)  

WEEK 16  
30 Apr, 2 May, 4 May  
13th reading quiz on Mon 30 Apr.  

Topic: The Ideal of Pure Reason, the Impossibility of Ontological Arguments, & How to Deal with the Unprovability of God's Existence  
Readings:  
CPR: 551-569  
Altman: 177-187  
Hall: 193-196  
Hanna: 98-108 (Lecture 13)  

2nd paper due on Mon 7 May.  
Awesomely Awesome Optional revised-&-resubmitted paper (+ 1 page cover letter) due on Fri 11 May.  
Amazingly Amazing Optional Third Paper due on Fri 11 May  

Abbreviations Used in Grading Papers  
AGR Lack of agreement in number, gender, or tense  
AWK Awkward: an ill-sounding or ungrammatical construction  
CIT No citation or improper citation: footnote or page reference required, in correct format  
CN Inappropriate contraction: please write out the entire word or phrase  
DEL This symbol or word should be deleted  
EX This term or phrase is not self-explanatory: please define it  
INF Split infinitive: never split an infinitive unless not splitting it will produce a barbarism (OK, I'm a grammatical fanatic. But it's better than the Grammatical End of the World as We Know It.)  
ME Be more explicit: please give more details or further elaboration  
MS More support needed: this claim requires more defense than you give it  
NP! Nice point!: an interesting remark or persuasive argument  
NS Non sequitur: this claim does not follow from the premises you've supplied
On Philosophy Papers

(1) What a Philosophy Paper Is.

A philosophy paper—as opposed to original philosophy in written form, which is a different kettle of fish and not discussed here—is an explicative and critical essay on some well-focused philosophical topic. No matter how long the paper is, it always consists of four parts: (i) an introduction (usually one paragraph); (ii) an explication of some philosophical argument, doctrine, or problem; (iii) some critical remarks; and (iv) a conclusion (also usually one paragraph).

The explicative and critical parts together make up the body of the paper, and within that body the proportion of explication to criticism is usually either (a) one-half explication to one-half criticism, or (b) two-thirds explication to one-third criticism. The critical remarks can be either negative or positive: that is, they may either attack or attempt to undermine the argument, doctrine, or problem, or else they may defend or extend it.

(2) What Makes for a First-Rate Paper.

A first-rate philosophy paper is, above all, clear. There is no need to strive for profundity—the doctrines, arguments, or problems being studied will provide a more-than-sufficient supply of that. The best way to attain clarity is by trying hard to avoid unclarity in your explicative and critical remarks. Unclarity, in turn, typically is of two sorts: superficiality, and sloppiness.

Explicative superficiality consists either in the failure to give sufficient detail and supporting references, or else in failing to explain things carefully in your own words. Critical superficiality consists either in being uncharitably negatively critical, or else in merely accepting arguments, doctrines, or problems without scrutiny. Both explicative and critical sloppiness result from poor organization of the points you want to make.

Indeed the logically coherent ordering of points is fundamental and will determine the cogency of your overall argument or account. Usually you are trying to prove a single thesis, and the several points you make are either premises in support of that thesis, or else argument-steps towards proving the thesis. It is
therefore crucial to jot down an outline consisting of a thesis statement and a list of main points, before you start writing drafts.

(3) How to Explicate.

Explicating an argument, doctrine, or problem has three stages. First, you analyze it by decomposing it into its basic elements; second, you unpack it by describing each basic element, and then third, you develop it by explaining basic relationships between the elements.

(4) How to Criticize.

Criticism is either (i) negative or (ii) positive.

**Negative criticism** of an argument, doctrine, or problem has two forms: (i) challenging the truth of one or more of its premises, assertions, or assumptions; (ii) attacking the validity of inferences based on those premises, assertions, or assumptions. Either is sufficient to show that the relevant argument, doctrine, or problem is unsound or ill-founded. But charity should always be exercised in negative criticism. The rule here is to assume that what is being criticized has been put forward by an extremely clever philosopher who will always reason well even if not perfectly. Then try to imagine what that philosopher would say in response to your criticism. Does your original criticism stand up to the imagined response? If not, then you had better strengthen your criticism accordingly. Repeat this process until it seems to you that the matter has been decisively settled, or at least that the most relevant points have been exposed.

**Positive criticism** of an argument, doctrine, or problem also has two forms: (i) defending it; (ii) extending it. To defend is to marshal reasons in favor of it; this is best done by responding to an imaginary negative critic. To extend is to apply it to a new instance or in a new domain; this is best done by imagining how the original author would have gone on consistently with her own view had she been presented with the new instance or domain.

(5) How to Produce a Good Philosophy Paper.

First, follow the guidelines above.

Second, write many rough drafts.

**Official Statements**

*Classroom Behavior Statement*: Students and faculty each have responsibility for maintaining an appropriate learning environment. Students who fail to adhere to such behavioral standards may be subject to discipline. Faculty have the professional responsibility to treat all students with understanding, dignity and respect, to guide classroom discussion and to set reasonable limits on the manner in which they and their students express opinions. Professional courtesy and sensitivity are especially important with respect to individuals and topics dealing with differences of race, culture, religion, politics, sexual orientation, gender, gender variance, and nationalities. Class rosters are provided to the instructor with the student's legal name. I will gladly honor your request to address you by an alternate name or gender pronoun. Please advise me of this preference early in the semester so that I may make appropriate changes to my records.
**Disabilities Statement:** If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit to me a letter from Disability Services in a timely manner so that your needs may be addressed. Disability Services determines accommodations based on documented disabilities. Contact: 303-492-8671, Willard 322, and at http://www.Colorado.EDU/disabilityservices

**Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Statement:** The University of Colorado at Boulder policy on Discrimination and Harassment at [http://www.colorado.edu/policies/discrimination.html](http://www.colorado.edu/policies/discrimination.html), the University of Colorado policy on Sexual Harassment and the University of Colorado policy on Amorous Relationships applies to all students, staff and faculty. Any student, staff or faculty member who believes s/he has been the subject of discrimination or harassment based upon race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status should contact the Office of Discrimination and Harassment (ODH) at 303-492-2127 or the Office of Judicial Affairs at 303-492-5550. Information about the ODH and the campus resources available to assist individuals regarding discrimination or harassment can be obtained at [http://www.colorado.edu/odh](http://www.colorado.edu/odh)

**Honor Code Statement:** All students of the University of Colorado at Boulder are responsible for knowing and adhering to the academic integrity policy of this institution. Violations of this policy may include: cheating, plagiarism, aid of academic dishonesty, fabrication, lying, bribery, and threatening behavior. All incidents of academic misconduct shall be reported to the Honor Code Council (honor@colorado.edu; 303-725-2273). Students who are found to be in violation of the academic integrity policy will be subject to both academic sanctions from the faculty member and non-academic sanctions (including but not limited to university probation, suspension, or expulsion). Other information on the Honor Code can be found at [http://www.colorado.edu/policies/honor.html](http://www.colorado.edu/policies/honor.html) and at [http://www.colorado.edu/academics/honorcode/](http://www.colorado.edu/academics/honorcode/)

**Plagiarism Statement:** Plagiarism is copying someone else’s work and turning it in under your own name without adequate citation of the source(s). Plagiarism is morally wrong because (1) the plagiarist is lying about whose work is being turned in, and (2) it gives the plagiarist an unfair academic advantage over those who play by the rules and don’t plagiarize. **So just don’t do it.** Anyone suspected of plagiarism will be referred to the Honor Code Office.

**Religious Observances Statement:** Campus policy regarding religious observances requires that faculty make every effort to deal reasonably and fairly with all students who, because of religious obligations, have conflicts with scheduled exams, assignments or required attendance. In this class, Any student needing academic adjustments or accommodations because of a religious holiday or other religious obligation is requested to speak to me as early as possible in the semester. See full details at [http://www.colorado.edu/policies/fac_relig.html](http://www.colorado.edu/policies/fac_relig.html)