

GERHARD PREYER

GOETHE UNIVERSITY FRANKFURT, GERMANY

E-MAIL: PREYER@EM.UNI-FRANKFURT.DE

ORCID: 0000-0002-1410-686

Cartesian Intuition A Cleansed Cartesianism

*Cartesianism is true, and pragmatism is false.*¹

1. Cartesian View

1. First-person thinking. There is a widespread agreement among philosophers that the thinker (speaker, agent) knows the content of his thought and has his own authority about knowing it. For *Cartesian internalists*, the content of mind is self-evident, and we have to begin with this knowledge to have a conception of the world we live in. Their view holds the self-ascriptions of “I know: I will go to the theatre”, “I know: I am in pain”, “I know: I like swimming”, etc. to be self-ascriptions of simple properties/dispositions/abili-

¹ On this philosophical enactment, see Jerry A. Fodor, *LOT 2. The Language of Thought Revisited* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 9–15, 40–47; idem, “Having Concepts: a Brief Refutation of the Twentieth Century,” *Mind & Language* 19.1 (Feb. 2004): 29–47.

ties which I have. The question is whether self-knowledge is propositional, as well as what is the relationship between the two *I*s? The Cartesian view is that mental states are ontologically independent of the physical, and that the *I* is universal—that is, not an *I* of an individual thinker only.

There is not only a “Cartesian revenge” with regard to mental causation (as Kim has called it), but also a “Cartesian long arm” which reaches, for instance, into the epistemological problem of “inner sense”, “ubiquity”, “the *de se* constraint (‘essential indexicals’)”, “self-awareness”, and “self-monitoring” in the philosophy of the mental. Since the 1950s, in the philosophy of mind, the main turn has been made that there is no non-spatial mind substance, and therefore Cartesianism is discarded. But ontological Cartesianism as a dualism of substances of *res cogitans* and *res extensa* is independent from the problem-area of *internalism* in the mind-body relationship.² Mental features, insofar as they are intrinsic, are not ontologically dependent upon a substance. Consciously mental states are conscious immediately, and we cannot assume any meaningfully informed epistemic attitude toward these states as (qua) conscious states: that is, we—each and every one of us—have an access to our own mental states in a way which cannot be accessible by any other person from a third-person perspective, obviously, as some higher-order iteration. For Cartesians, the nature of mental phenomena and thought in general is considered from the first-person point of view. First-person thinking means that the thinker (speaker, agent) has an unmediated access to the content of his own mental states, intentional or not; many philosophers, including *externalists*, accept this proposition. Cartesian first-person thinking means that the thinker knows first-order states which occur directly without conscious inference. Such states are certain and immune to error for Cartesians, unlike the knowledge of mental states from the third-person point of view; these are inferred from utterances and behaviour under observation.

² But we should mention that the meaning of the philosophical expression “substance” is different. Franz von Kutschera, *Ungegenständliches Erkennen* (Paderborn: Mentis Publisher, 2012), 44–45 makes the distinction between a substance in the philosophical literature as 1. a logical subject, that is, an object which has attributes but is itself no attribute. This concept is extended by further meanings: 2. substances are something which exists; 3. they are autarkic (saturated, Frege: *gesättigt*), that is, they are not dependent on other things; and 4. they are constant in the change of phenomena.

2. *The subject's point of view.* There is a conflict within Cartesian intuition about the nature of the mental and thought, just as there is within externalism. Mental features are determined by internal states. The thinker (speaker, agent) is conscious and knows the content of his own mental states, and is authoritative about the consciousness of the *content* of these states (mental content is a narrow content). If I ascribe to myself a mental state, then it makes no sense to doubt that I have such mental states in general: I am acquainted with myself immediately. Therefore, the distinction (borderline) between the internal and the external is drawn within the operation of our consciousness. The particular access to I-myself is a self-referential operation regarding which one cannot be aware from outside of I-myself. Call the *Cartesian intuition (The Solipsism Claim)* that the mental is determined by itself an *epistemological version of internalism* as the rebuilding of the Cartesian view.¹ The problem of rebuilding is the function of phenomenal consciousness. Consider these three situations:

1. "Pia sees a white car under normal conditions."
2. "Pia sees a white car which looks green under the given lighting conditions."
3. "Pia hallucinates a white car."

The problem is as follows: Does "Pia's" subjective experience (*Erlebnisse* = lived experience) have a phenomenal content as an internal feature of her mental states? Is the content intentional or not? Does this experience have a narrow content which we are aware of by inner awareness (introspection)?

3. *Question of introspection.* Since the 1990s, the concept of "introspection" (inner awareness) has entered once again into accounts of epistemology. It is often argued: if any subject has a consciously mental state, that subject can introspect having this mental state as self-awareness. Armstrong, for instance, argues: "Introspective consciousness ... is a perception-like awareness of current states and activity in our mind. The current activities will include sense-perception: which latter is the awareness of current states and activities of our

¹ Among contemporary German philosophers, the Cartesian intuition in epistemology is also emphasized by Richard Schantz, *Wahrheit, Referenz und Realismus. Eine Studie zur Sprachphilosophie und Metaphysik* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1996).

environment and our body.”² (Lycan: Internal attention mechanisms are directed upon lower-order psychological states and events; this reaches a little bit towards teleology.³) Goldman argues that attention is important for introspection, and that there is a parallel of introspection and external perception.⁴ Introspection is directed to conscious states only and is a self-objectifying awareness of conscious mental states. However, this leads to an infinite regress. Yet, we need no introspection as a medium to be conscious of ourselves because self-reference is infallible intuition which we have. (Shoemaker presents a critique on the epistemological concept of introspection—inner-sense/inward-glance model.⁵) Another case would be that of mental impairment. Frank makes the critique that the concept of introspection is, in principle, not possible insofar as I cannot assume the point of view of an external observer regarding myself (Tye: displaced perception/secondary seeing). Every observation is directed to an object.⁶ But consciousness is not an object of itself and has no grades (Brentano, Sartre).

The Cartesian intuition is not committed to an ontological solipsism, that is, that there is *one* subject as a respective observer only, the one which would also exist if the world were to be destroyed. This is in harmony with renewing a version of the monadological condition of subjectivity.⁷ The initial epistemological situation cannot be characterized as holding that an individual

² David M. Armstrong, “What is Consciousness?”, in: David M. Armstrong, *The Nature of Mind and Other Essays* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980), 65–66.

³ William G. Lycan, “Consciousness as Internal Monitoring”, in: *The Nature of Consciousness. Philosophical Debates*, eds. N. Block, O. Flanagan, and G. Güzeldere (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997), 755–773.

⁴ Alvin Goldman, *Simulating Minds. The Philosophy, Psychology, and Neuroscience of Mindreading* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 242. “‘Introspection’ can be replaced by ‘monitoring’, ‘inner sense’ or perhaps ‘apperception’”, 246.

⁵ Sydney Shoemaker, *The First-Person Perspective and Other Essays* (Cambridge: MIT Press 1996), 203–223; Manfred Frank, “5. Besteht Selbstbewusstsein in einem ‘inneren Wahrnehmen?’”, in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität* (Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher, 2012), 329–339.

⁶ S. Shoemaker, *The First-Person Perspective and Other Essays* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), to a critique on the object perception model of mental states, 205, *Cause, and Mind. Philosophical Essays* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984; Frank, “5. Besteht Selbstbewusstsein in einem ‘inneren Wahrnehmen?’”, 329–337 (on Shoemaker); 337–338 (on introspection), in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität* (Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher, 2012).

⁷ Gerhard Preyer, “Soziologie ohne Menschen”, *Rechtstheorie* 1 (2016), see about: 51–54.

subject is exclusively accompanied by an individual object. The subject point of view as a condition of objective knowledge is not itself an object. It is to mention that the turn to the subject's point of view is not ontology, which assumes that there is the *res cogitans* only, and the extern world is a mental representation. We always presuppose an objective world out of us. Call that the *fitting problem*.

The main question is, however: How strong is this intuition? Is self-reference immune to error as an apodictic certainty? The problem is that it is not disputed that there is self-deception. Therefore, apodictic certainty is too strong an epistemological position to take here.

Another problem is obvious: Do I have an access to my body directly or not? Or, more strongly: Does my access to any feature of my body come solely by mental states? Do I gain awareness of my body indirectly by proprioception, interoception, and kinaesthesia?

2. Dilemma of Cartesian Knowledge

1. Reflectivity and irreflectivity of the ego.

Let us consider: "What is the question of the *reditus in se ipsum* of Cartesian epistemology? Is there anything like a *dilemma* or *problem of Cartesian knowledge*?"

The overall question is: "Is subjectivity first-person only or not?"

Call that the question of the ubiquity of mental states and of the problem of their self-transparency.

With the Cartesian turn, the *subject (ego)* is introduced epistemologically, and subjectivity (self-reference, self-certainty) is a feature of the *cogitationes* (cogitatio, pensée, conscientia, *Denken*). The *reditus in se ipsum* is initiated by the method of doubt as a suspension of the *adequatio* of *intellectus* and *res* as an elementary epistemological procedure as a methodological doubt.⁸

⁸ The problem of scepticism here, which does not suffice to meet the issue, has entered into epistemological debates about global scepticism in last three decades; this problem does not reach the sceptic argument itself in epistemology (like, for instance, scepticism as a critique

Yet, there is a *dilemma of knowledge* in the relationship between the reflectivity and irreflectivity of the ego. That is the question of the role of self-certainty (*sum*) in epistemology, the ontology of self-consciousness (*sum res cogitans*), and the correspondence theory of truth because self-knowledge as *sum res cogitans* is true.⁹ This problem is identified by Sartre, firstly by the pre-reflective cogito and, in his early work before *L'être et le néant* by the *transcendence of the I*.¹⁰

1. Self-consciousness and self-knowledge are based on the *idea meipsius* within the domain of *conscientia*. But objectivity of the ideas of this domain is at the same time the subject of the methodological doubt. The reference to the external world is solely guaranteed by the ontological proof of God.

2. *Conscientia* is based as a result of the procedure of the Cartesian doubt on self-certainty (*sum*) and self-consciousness (*sum res cogitans*). Self-consciousness is possible only if the thinker is a being which exists.

3. *Cogitationes* are paired to a substance, that is, the *ideae* are given self-referentially. On this condition, the ideas can only be individuated by instances. Therefore, *conscientia* as the domain of the *idea mei ipsius* is based in self-consciousness. This is Kant's argument. The dilemma does not disappear because it is not possible to distinguish between self-certainty (*sum*) and self-knowledge (*sum res cogitans* is true). Descartes' view is that the step from

of knowledge as a method of epistemology or of the process of the dynamic of science) but the self-limitation of scepticism.

⁹ This problem is analyzed by Herbert Schnädelbach, *Reflexion and Diskurs. Fragen einer Logik der Philosophie* (Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher, 1977), 65–86, which relates it to the description of the Cartesian dilemma. In the end, this view leads towards the rebuilding of the Cartesian turn in epistemology. Tyler Burge, “Descartes on Anti-individualism (2003)”, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, slightly supplemented 2006), 420–39. His re-interpretation of the Cartesian demon *i*, is also instructive. This is a modification of his “Cartesian Error and the Objectivity of Perception (1986)”, in: *Foundations of Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 192–207, he concludes that Descartes should be re-interpreted as an anti-individualist. This position is informative because it shows that anti-individualist epistemology can conform with different versions of dualism. But it is a very problematic interpretation because self-reference cannot be externalized.

¹⁰ Jean-Paul Sartre, *L'être et le néant. Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1943), English translation: *Being and Nothingness. An Essay in Phenomenological Ontology*, transl. Hazel E. Barnes (London: Routledge Publisher, 1994).

the *ego cogito sum* to an objective knowledge requires the existence of the *res cogitans*.

4. Ego cogitans as a *res cogitans*. Most interpreters agree that *cogito ergo sum* is not an inference, because *sum res cogitans* claims the self-certainty of *I-myself* epistemically. Without that, the resolution of knowledge would be not possible.

- (a) The certainty of the *sum* can be ascribed to a self only when this entity is identified as a *res cogitans*. Were this not the case, this would not be an instance of certainty.
- (b) Descartes makes the distinction between *intuition* and *deduction* as a syllogism. *Intuition* “is the undoubting conception of an unclouded and attentive mind, and springs from the light of reason alone; it is more certain than deduction itself, ... Thus each individual can mentally have intuition of the fact that he exists.”¹¹ “Further deduction does not require immediately presented evidence such as intuition possesses; its certitude is rather conferred upon it some way by memory.”¹² It is to emphasize that Descartes’ view *ego cogito, ergo sum* (or exist) is not concluded by a syllogism whereby he deduces his existence. Something is self-evident as mental intuition. The *sum res cogitans* is an intuitive knowledge unmediated by inferences of syllogism or by empirical knowledge. The sentence *ego cogito, ergo sum* is valid as it stands.¹³ Katz argues the *ego cogito* sentence is not an inference, but an analytical entailment.¹⁴ On the contrary, conclusions are made

¹¹ Rene Descartes, *The Philosophical Work of Descartes Vol. I*, ed. and trans. by Elizabeth Haldane and George R. T. Ross (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1969), 7.

¹² *Ibidem*.

¹³ *Ibidem*, 7, 8.

¹⁴ Jerrold. J. Katz, *Cogitations: A Study of the Cogito in Relation to the Philosophy of Logic and Language and a Study of Them in Relation to the Cogito* (New York: The Harvester Press, 1986): on the dilemma of the Cartesian scholars, 11–22; on the source of the obscurity, 23–40; on the *cogito* as an analytic entailment, 131–43; on critiques regarding P. Geach and E. Anscombe, 119–125. The main true relation of semantics is entailment, for instance, the sentence *The train is yellow* entails the sentence *the train has a colour*, that is, if the first sentence is true then it guarantees the truth of the second sentence. Vice versa is valid: the falsity of the second sentence guarantees the falsity of the first sentence. Mark Platts, *Ways of Meaning. An Introduction to a Philosophy of Language* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul,

in the domain of the analysis of *ideas*. Thus we could conclude that the *sum res cogitans* is independent of the ontological proof of God.

Descartes' methodological analysis of ideas shows the certainty of the self-consciousness of the *ego cogitans* as a *res cogitans*, but not the complete adequacy of *intellectus* and *res*. This is the role of the Cartesian demon, because the *natura intellectualis* is not determined by itself only. There are other determinations in the domain of the *I* as the *natura intellectualis*. Therefore, the complete adequacy of the *I* as the *idea mei ipsius* is an *idea innata* as given by God. Therefore, the self-knowledge is dependent on God.¹⁵

We must conclude that the epistemic reflection of the self-consciousness, that is, the *intentio recta* of the *idea mei ipsius*, is an object among others like other objective ideas, the one which refers to itself. Therefore, self-consciousness is of the same type as the consciousness of something. There is a question between the reflectivity of the method of the first philosophy as self-referential reasoning of the philosophy and the non-reflectivity of the self-knowledge based on the *idea objective spectata innata*, which is reasoned ontologically by the *idea mei ipsius*: the *ego* is not grounded by itself but by God as the principle of self-knowledge. We should conclude from a reinterpretation of this reasoning that the consciousness of existence is not self-empowerment.

1979) argues that "all logical implications are entailments": for instance, (1) $2+2 = 4$ and $7 \times 9 = 63$ logically implies (2) $2+2 = 4$. This will also be an entailment since all logical implications are entailments, but not vice versa. However, (3) *They were married and they had children* does not logically imply (4) *They were married before they had children* since the structurally similar (1) produces no such implication, 72–73.

¹⁵ Dieter Henrich, *Denken und Selbstsein. Vorlesungen über Subjektivität* (Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher, 2007), 25–27, has reinterpreted this foundation and has emphasized that in particular the Hegelian interpretation of the Cartesian turn as an effect of the force of the self-power of the subject should be corrected on the level of a principle. Schnädelbach, "Descartes und das Projekt der Aufklärung", in *Analytische und postanalytische Philosophie* (Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher, 2004), 47–48, emphasized that this interpretation is not correct. On Henrich, see G. Preyer, "The Problem of Subjectivity: Dieter Henrich's Turn", in: *Consciousness and Subjectivity*, eds. Sofia Miguens, Gerhard Preyer (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2012), 189–211. Accessible at https://www.academia.edu/12447910/The_Problem_of_Subjectivity_Dieter_Henrich_s_Turn

2. *Intuitive knowledge.* From Descartes' point of view, I know myself by a *mentis intuitus* (intuitive knowledge). It is necessarily *not reflective*: it stands without the mediation of any other idea. But, on the other hand, it must be assumed to be *reflective* because the *mentis intuitus* is not empty since self-certainty of the *ego cogito* is an epistemological *first truth*. Descartes assumes that the *resolution* of knowledge has in the domain of the *purus intellectus* as theme the *cogito* and the *cogitare* as the content of *cogitationes*. Descartes' epistemological program would not work if the *cogito* were not reflective, that is, were it represented in an idea and thereby were a theme of the *resolution* of knowledge. But if the *cogito* is reflective then it is not certain and is at same time an intuitive knowledge because the evidence is given by an act of reflection only. Call this the *dilemma (problem) of Cartesian knowledge*.¹⁶ This dilemma is not solved in the theory of consciousness modern philosophy until present. It also comes back in Husserl's phenomenology after his turn to an egological epistemology because for him the pre-reflective consciousness is a concept of border (*Grenzbegriff*).

3. *Against the epistemic certainty of I.* From the *dilemma of Cartesian knowledge* we can move towards the rebuilding of the Cartesian view because the sentence *ego cogito* is not the foundation of knowledge and truth. The certainty of *I* cannot be demonstrated because the epistemic certainty of the ego-axiom is with no doubt. But we thus ascribe to consciousness the proposition that epistemic certainty as such is self-presenting. The adequate evidence is not knowledge about something. If we define consciousness as self-presenting, then conscious states are conscious by the subject himself. Thereby, there is no regress, because we have pre-reflective consciousness as adequate evidence. Knowledge implies truth, but the self-consciousness is beyond every truth and thus is immune to failure. Self-consciousness is an intuition of ourself: it is a self-referential/non-thetic/non-relational state which we have. It is not a presumptive evidence (Alexius Meinong: *Vermutungsevidenz*). This is to be distinguished from the epistemic concept of Cartesian certainty. The Romance philosophy characterized self-consciousness by a "feeling" of I-my-

¹⁶ On this problem, see Schnädelbach, *Reflexion and Diskurs*, 71–80; to the Cartesian dilemma between the reflectivity and irreflectivity of the ego, 76–77.

self, which is not a reflection. Therefore, the self-reference to I-myself is not established by a basic principle (*Grundsatz*).

3. Review of Cartesian reflection

The questions which emerged within Cartesian philosophy lead to a fundamental reinterpretation of the structure of the *reditus in se ipsum*, that is, the philosophy of reflection as basic epistemology. The main point is whether Cartesian philosophy has an adequate analysis of its own foundation, as Dieter Henrich argued. Schnädelbach reviewed the philosophy of reflection with respect to the following questions:

1. Is the Cartesian reflection an “individual” or “general” feature of cognition? Are we committed to a *methodological solipsism*, or is there anything like *consciousness in general* as human nature? In the latter case, is the individual consciousness solely an exemplification of the consciousness in general?

The epistemological foundation of the Cartesian certainty is the fact of the individual *I* of a particular thinker, and is not the eidōs “*I*”. Thus arises the problem of methodological solipsism. If, on the contrary, the beginning of the Cartesian reflection is an intersubjective egology, then, at the beginning of the *reditus in the ipsum* as an epistemological foundation of an individual thinker is not established. This is reasoned thereby because the general properties of subjectivity should be ascribed to consciousness in general or to empirical individuals as different ontological preferences. We have the two options.¹⁷ But the reference to the community of investigators as the final judge could bring this problem to any conceivable solution. Within this framework, the problem is reproduced from the inside of every community.¹⁸ Call that the *problem of intersubjectivity* which admits of no solution from an external point of view. Other people can be observed only in communication systems. We have no access to such systems from a Laplace demon point

¹⁷ Schnädelbach, *Reflexion and Diskurs*, 68.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, 86.

of view as someone who is an all-knower. The belief that we can take this point of view is a defect of modern epistemology. But we can, however, take a quasi-objective point of view regarding communication systems.

The answer for this problem comes out of the analysis of the *structure of consciousness*, the self-reference and the reference to others. Such an analysis of communication has to take into consideration the problem that consciousness of monads cannot be reached reciprocally in observation and communication.

2. Is the Cartesian reflection possible as self-knowledge of facts, or is the Cartesian reflection merely a knowledge of principles knowing facts from the subject point of view?

The *ego cogito* is an epistemic foundation of knowledge. From the first *adaequatio rei et intellectus* as the certainty of the *cogito* is a cross-reference to *intellectus* beyond all truth, which is at the same time the basis of the re-composition of all true knowledge. Therefore it is a *principle* of knowledge. But the Cartesian view is that this *intellectus* is a *res cogitans*. This is the origin of the distinction between the foundation of knowledge between a principle or a fact. The question is that what exists as a condition of true knowledge of a *res* (the *res cogitans*) is not at the same time already a *res*: if the *intellectus* is a *res*, then the *intellectus* cannot be a principle of knowledge.¹⁹ This question cannot be brought to any solution by the identification of a principle with a *factum*. This would be a category mistake (G. Ryle).²⁰

3. Is assumed experience for self-knowledge, or the analysis of the principles of the subjective point of view (that is, non-self-referential representation) sensory or intellectual experience? It is possible that the consciousness is not determined by external factors, and there is a pre-reflective consciousness?

This is the question of whether the *I* is given immediately or is mediately accessible by other representations, that is, by *a priori* conditions which must be assumed.

¹⁹ Ibidem, 70.

²⁰ Ibidem, 86.

4. Is the Cartesian reflection determined by empirical or by intellectual ideas? How do we distinguish the philosophical reflection from empirical observations?

This is the question of the philosophical status of philosophical reflection: Is reflection a methodical concept in philosophy, or is epistemology a domain of empirical science?²¹

Questions 1.–3. are the main problems for Cartesians; that is, the relationship between the reflectivity and irreflectivity of the *ego* leads to different answers regarding the relation between the epistemological role of the self-certainty (*sum*), the self-consciousness (*sum res cogitans*), and self-knowledge (“*sum res cogitans*” is true). Question 4. is to be answered with respect to the concept of philosophy. The problem is un-dramatized if we argue for a concept of philosophy as a reconstruction of presuppositions and assumptions of science, which are not themselves the object of science in its direct research. The analysis of *structure* could be a link between philosophy and empirical science of the mental and the mind-body problem.

4. Fichte’s original insight

1. *Fichte’s regress and circle argument.* Henrich identified an insight within Fichte’s philosophy, and Frank emphasized recalling “Fichte’s original insight” in the context of the contemporary philosophy of mind. We may say it is “Dieter Henrich’s original insight”.²² It is Fichte’s *regress* and *circle argument*--we find a comparative argument also from Brentano’s empirical psychology²³--which is emphasized by Henrich.

²¹ On these four issues, Schnädelbach, *Reflexion and Diskurs*, 66–84; for a summary, see 84–86.

²² This is not a claim regarding Henrich’s philosophical work as a whole. Some philosophical colleagues in Prague wonder whether Henrich indeed provided any truly novel contribution to philosophical thinking.

²³ Frank, *Präreflexives Selbstbewusstsein. Vier Vorlesungen* (Stuttgart: Reclam Publisher, 2015), 41–52.

Regress argument

You are conscious of yourself as [being] the conscious state, only to the extent that you yourself are conscious of yourself as the one who has a conscious state; but then “one having a conscious state” is yet another conscious state, and you must once again yourself become conscious of having the conscious state of this conscious state, and so on *ad infinitum*: and [only] thus you may see how you come to a primal consciousness. ...

But there is indeed consciousness; consequently that [regressive] assertion is false. That it is false means that its contrary is valid; thus the following statement obtains: there is a consciousness within which the subjective and objective cannot be distinguished, but are absolutely one and the same. It would therefore be such a consciousness which we would require in order to explain consciousness in general. ...

All possible consciousness as reality of the subject supposes an immediate (that is, unmediated) consciousness, within which the subject and the object is one and the same; otherwise, [there being] a consciousness is *per se* incomprehensible.²⁴

Circle argument

A circle can explain anything. For instance, my son does not hear something. I ask the doctor, “Why does my son not hear something?” The doctor answers, “Because he has lost his hearing ability.” I go further and ask the doctor, “Why has my son lost his hearing ability?” The doctor answers, “Your son has lost his hearing ability because he does not hear something.” This reasoning explains nothing.

²⁴ Fichte, “Versuch einer neuen Darstellung der Wissenschaftslehre”, (1897), in: *Fichtes Werke, Zur theoretischen Philosophie I*, ed. Immanuel Hermann (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 526, 527, 528. English translation of: “Du bist deiner, als des Bewusststen, bewusst, lediglich inwiefern du dir deiner als des Bewusstseyenden bewusst bist; aber dann ist das Bewusstseyende wieder das Bewusste, und du musst wieder des Bewusstseyenden dieses Bewusststen dir bewusst werden, und so ins unendliche fort: und so magst du sehen, wie du zu einem ersten Bewusstseyen kommst. ... Nun aber ist doch Bewusstsein; mithin muss jene Behauptung falsch seyn. Sie ist falsch, heisst: ihr Gegentheil gilt; sonach folgender Satz gilt: es giebt ein Bewusstseyen, in welchem das Subjective und Objective gar nicht zu trennen, sondern absolut Eins und ebendasselbe sind. Ein solches Bewusstseyen sonach wäre es, dessen wir bedürfen, um das Bewussteyn überhaupt zu erklären. ... Alles mögliche Bewusstseyen, als Objectives eines Subjects, setzt ein unmittelbares Bewusstseyen, in welchem Subjectives und Objectives schlechthin Eines seyen, voraus; ausserdem ist ein Bewusstseyen schlechthin unbegreiflich.” See, also, Frank, “3. Zeit und Selbst. Oder: Wie sich präreflexives Bewusstsein differenziert”, in: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 193–260.

The self-identical I requires complete knowledge for its-self-reflection, or there occurs an indefinite regress of reflective I-knowledge; that is, every conscious state is an object of another conscious state. The circle has entered into the I-reflection of modern philosophy; that is, an I-subject recognizes it-self and thereby it has a relationship to it-self, because if it acts as a subject (an actual I), then this I grasps itself by saying to itself “I”. The subject of reflection fulfils ‘I=I’, but the claim is that it is a result of reflection.²⁵

2. *Williford’s solution.* Williford distinguishes between the extensive and the intensive regress with reference to the Heidelberger School (Henrich, Frank). *Extensive regress:* 1. Every conscious state is an object of another conscious state (higher order reflection). 2. There is no circle within which a conscious state *x* is an object of another conscious state *b*. 3. Therefore we must conclude: there are infinitely many conscious states. A regress arises here because the explanation of a conscious state is given by another mental state, and so on. *Intensive regress:* 1. Conscious states represent them-selves. 2. If a conscious state represents something, then it represents itself as that object on the same level. 3. Conscious representations of something cannot be identical with their representations of “their representation” of that object. Therefore, these representations have an infinite object.²⁶

Williford’s solution of the regresses is a problematic one. One problem remains to be mentioned: the existence quantification over mental states as a version of Ramsey’s method (which goes back to the folk psychology of D. Lewis) does not work. Having such an access to the analysis of consciousness causes its necessary pre-reflective constitution to disappear. Another issue arises when we make the assumption that the intentional content of consciousness are propositions (consciousness – consciousness of ____). These propositions have a hierarchic structure. But there is no closed hierarchy of propositions. Take the statement: “The proposition ‘All propositions

²⁵ Henrich, *Fichtes ursprüngliche Einsicht* (1966) (Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann Publisher, 1967), 12.

²⁶ Kenneth Williford, “Zahavi versus Brentano: A Rejoinder,” *Psyche* 12(2), 1–8 (2006): 1–8. On Williford’s approach, also with reference to Kriegel, see Stefan Lang, *Phänomenales Bewusstsein und Selbstbewusstsein Idealistische und selbstrepräsentationalistische Interpretationen*. (Hamburg: Mainer Publisher 2019), 37–41. On a critique of self-representationalism (U. Kriegel, Williford), see, Frank, *Präreflexives Bewusstsein*, 138–172.

of P_1 are not impredicative' is not entailed in P_1 , but on the next level".²⁷ The levels are not finished, but they are open. Once we enter into the first level we have to take into consideration the fact that this introduces an external reality levelling. To make this turn does not result in a universal quantification of mental states. This is the challenge presented by Williford's solution.

If we take Fichte's insight seriously, then we must conclude: there is no introspective awareness as an awareness *that*, or a secondary consciousness, which refers to the thetic consciousness as to itself, that is, as the own lived experience (*E*) of the thinker (speaker, agent) (Brentano). The transparency of consciousness is the unit of consciousness in every moment. But one must bear in mind that the hard core of Fichte's philosophy (transcendental idealism) is that he analyzes what he calls "*unmittelbares Bewusstseyn*" (immediate consciousness) from the *I*-the point of view as an "*Anschauung des Ich*" ("*intellektuelle Anschauung*"; perception of the *I*, intellectual perception), that is, as an activity of "self-thinking" (*Selbstdenken*). There is, from Fichte's point of view, no "*intellektuelle Anschauung*" in the domain of folk psychology, but only concepts. Therefore, he connects theoretical with practical philosophy by an elementary orientation upon "freedom". The *I*-thought is therefore for him an attention and thereby reflective.

3. *Frank's correction.* But we should mention a particular problem in Fichte's philosophy which recurs in Castañeda's analysis of self-reference (*de se* constraint). Frank focuses on the concept word "as" in Fichte's "[*The*] *I* posits itself as positing myself" ("*Ich setzt sich als mich setzend*") His arguments are:

1. The "as" renders the perceptual feature of the *self-positing* (*Selbstsetzung*) of the non-conceptual conscious incomprehensible.

2. There is a contradiction between the jointless, non-conceptual features of the relata of *self-positing* within Fichte's "law of reflection"; that is, we recognize something by thinking what it is not. The problem-reference is the differentiation of the jointless unity of consciousness.

3. There is an intensive regress in "*as it-self*" ("*als sich selbst*") because the *I* is nothing more than its *positing itself* (*selbst setzen*) and the reflective pro-

²⁷ F. von Kutschera, *Philosophie des Geistes* (Paderborn: Mentis Publisher, 2009), 29–30.

noun refers with an infinite regress to the one *I* as *self-positing* (*Selbstsetzung*). This is recognized by Herbart, who is a critical successor of Fichte.²⁸ We thus are forced to provide a further interpretation to make sense of the “as”-self reference. The regress is cut by Sartre in one step; this is worthwhile to mention here. Sartre prevents the regress by taking the “consciousness of consciousness” to be a non-positional consciousness:

Either we stop at any one term of the series—the known, the knower known, the knower known by the knower, etc. In this case the totality of the phenomenon falls into the unknown; that is, we always bump up against a non-conscious reflection and a final term. Or else we affirm the necessity of an infinite regress (*idea ideae ideae*, etc.), which is absurd. ... Are we obliged, after all, to introduce the law of this [knower—known] dyad into consciousness? Consciousness of self is not dual. If we wish to avoid an infinite regress, there must be an immediate, non-cognitive relation of the self to itself.²⁹

To orient ourselves, we shall conclude: A subject-object dualism is not ontological dualism; rather, it establishes different conditions of fulfilment. Self-present/evident conditions of self-conscious mental states and conditions depend upon reference to an external state of affairs. When we make this turn, self-representationalism (Kriegel and others) is wrong.

5. The Kantian-I and Castañeda’s reinterpretation

1. *The being of Kantian-I.* The Cartesian *ego cogito axiom* has taken effect in philosophy even to the present day. But it is far from clear why, on the level of principle, it is a foundation of our worldview and world-knowledge. Critiques regarding Descartes are *de rigueur* in the tradition of naturalistic and materialistic philosophy, holding him to be in error as a matter of principle. Heideggerians also find themselves in the same boat. The main question is whether the Cartesian axiom is a foundational reasoning for theories of self-consciousness which do not abandon conscious self-reference and the

²⁸ Frank, *Präreflexives Bewusstsein*, 140–143.

²⁹ Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 12.

relationship to others as the link between mental/language/social reality and the rest of the world. The subject's point of view of the participants in communication and social intercourse is the problem of the existence of members of social systems in their system-environment relation, an existence which cannot be negated by any member without giving up his/her/their own position as a conscious subject in the world among others.

Kant's view is following: to say that a mental self-representation is mine means that the timeless "I think" leads to the proposition that "all belong to one self-consciousness".³⁰ Empirical consciousness cannot explain the unity of self-consciousness. Therefore, Kant posited a "*transcendental* unit of self-consciousness".³¹ The link between the transcendental and the empirical consciousness is that *I* myself can appear to myself only through how *I* effect *I* myself by the "inner sense" (*Selbstaffektion*).³²

What is the being of the *Kantian I think*?

Kant argued that "I think" accompanies all representations, and that thinking thereby accompanies all my representations. This is a wrong assertion in actuality. The "I think" should be read as holding that all representations are conscious by the "I think ...". But Kant makes a distinction between the being of the self-consciousness and its appearing in time. This latter is an empirical fact only as the subject of recognition. The being of the self-consciousness is pre-categorical and pre-propositional. The thought *I* is not a concept, but rather an object of inner awareness. Thereby, Kant gives the Cartesian *ego-cogito* a phenomenological turn. The "inner sense" is the guarantee of the transparency of the mental by virtue of itself. But this cannot be any appeal to the reality of *I* myself, or to any reality. The epistemological background here is that "being is not a predicate" (not only logically and semantically; it is no predicate at all). This was rediscovered by Frege and

³⁰ Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, transl. Werner S. Pluhar (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1996), B 132.

³¹ Kant, *Critique*, B 132.

³² Frank, "7. Kant über Selbstbewusstsein," in *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus* (Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher, 2007), 188–193, Henrich, "Die Identität des Subjekts in der transzendentalen Deduktion", in: *Kant. Analysen – Probleme – Kritik*, eds. Hariolf Oberer und G. Seel (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann Publisher, 1988), 39–70.

Russell. The pre-categorical being of apperception cannot be recognized, but must be a presupposition.

We thus come to the question: must we pair the cogito—notwithstanding its spontaneity—with a perception?! This would be an intellectual view which contradicts the architectonic structure underlying the *Critique of Pure Reason*.

2. *Castañeda's reinterpretation*. Among the analytic philosophers of self-consciousness, Castañeda made a turn to a reinterpretation of the subject's point of view as a self-referential perspective of the *I* recalling the Kantian *I* in the world of monads and their reciprocal observation. But Castañeda does not accept the Kantian *I* as an *a priori* constitution for the object of experience and metaphysical as well as transcendental deduction. His view is: "The essence of an *I* is just to conceive itself as a subject qua subject".³³ The "qua" indicates that the speaker of an *I*-utterance has consciousness of itself. The "subject" is not "pure *I*" or a "transcendental subject". Neither is it some unworldly subject of mental states. Castañeda distinguishes between the *I* as a self-reference to one-self as oneself and the *I*-world-strands, which are characterized by their manifold contrasts and negations.

Castañeda reinterprets the Kantian *I*. In contrary to Kant, Castañeda' argues: the transcendental *I*-Guise "I Think" is not the Kantian transcendental *I*, but "I think here now", "I think that ...": "An *I*-guise is the *I* of an experience. An *I*, a Here, and a Now, constitute the inner framework of an experience."³⁴ The sameness of *I*-Guises is a phenomenal and contingent "sameness" and not a noumenal one. Castañeda calls his account "minimal transcendental realism". If we assume that the "I" exists as an object of first-person awareness, then the self-reference within first-person consciousness is constituted by an empirical self, that is, by *I*-Guises. But Castañeda accepts the Kantian

³³ Hector-Neri Castañeda, "The Self and the *I*-Guises, Empirical and Transcendental", in: *The Phenomeno-Logic of the I*, eds. J. G. Hart, T. Kapitan, (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1999), 187. To Castañeda: Frank, *Ansichten der Subjektivität*, 87–124, *Präreflexives Selbstbewusstsein*, 109–137 (with reference to D. Rosenthal's Higher Order Self-Monitoring Account).

³⁴ Castañeda, "The Self and the *I*-Guises, Empirical and Transcendental", in: *The Phenomeno-Logic of the I*, 187–88, 189–90.

view that “I think as a transcendental subject”. The prefix in the “I-guise” means “I think here and now” as an ephemeral subject. This “I” as such prefix refers to “transcendental *I*-guise” and does not have a psychological indexical role (Perry). It remains the “same” amidst the variation of empirical predicates which I ascribe to I-myself as transcendental *I*-Guises. Otherwise, there would be no sameness relation among one’s conscious states.

Castañeda argues that the priority of “I” is a referential, ontological, and epistemological one. *Referential priority*: correct use of “I” cannot fail in its reference to the category of entity to which it is meant to refer. This is in contradistinction to demonstratives, definite descriptions which can fail; moreover, many entities can have the same name. *Ontological priority*: the self-reference constituted by the word “I” is protected by the existence-guarantee of the reference instance. *Epistemological priority*: the I-use is prior to the use of names, demonstratives, and definite descriptions because building any access to the external world presupposes a self-conscious subject.

The result of Castañeda’s analysis is that self-reference as a reference to *ONEself qua oneSELF* is a specific instance of the general reference “X refers to Y as Z” only. (Y is a *de re* belief, Z is a *de dicto* belief.) Thus, the referential consciousness referring to myself (external reflectivity) is transferred to an internal reflectivity, that is, to consciousness *qua oneSELF*. In this, he differs from Chisholm, Perry, and Lewis, for whom internal reflectivity is no special case of a propositional *de dicto* belief. But it is difficult to understand that for Castañeda self-consciousness is also an objective (external) reference. This issue invites a correction or reinterpretation of Castañeda’s Guises account of the mental.

6. Early Romance “Constellation”

1. *Elementary philosophy*. The analysis of the relationship between the reflectivity or irreflectivity of the ego and the self-knowledge of facts or principles is one of the main subjects of the *Early Romance Constellation*, which is the initial problem situation of the different philosophies of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, and their development. But their philosophies obscured

the primary question, and it has not taken effect in the following philosophical reflection. It was the particular merit of Henrich and his follower, Frank, to rediscover the primary question.³⁵ This leads to “Fichte’s original insight.”

The background question of Early Idealism was Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi’s concept of the “trans-reflectivity of being”, and the critique on Reinhold’s “Elementary Philosophy” (*Elementarphilosophie*) by his followers, for instance, Carl Christian Erhard Schmid, Johann Benjamin Erhard, and Friedrich Carl Forberg.³⁶ Jacobi recognized complete dualism between the immediate certainty of being and the endless relativity of rational reasoning (nihilism of reasoning). Jacobi claims to have found a solution to the question by reference to higher cognitive faculty which he calls “feeling” (*Gefühl*). This is the *cantus firmus* for Early Idealism: the “absolute” (*Unbedingte*) is not to be reached by a chain of “conditions”. The Early Romance view is that the “self-being” (*Selbstsein*) of the subject is not found by it-self and is not grounded by the internal subject point of view.³⁷ Self-consciousness is grounded in a jointless (non-reflective) identity, which was called “*Seyn*” by Jacobi. This was the conclusion of the Early Romance (Novalis, Hölderlin).

2. *Sentence of consciousness, self-consciousness, identity of subject and object.* Reinhold characterizes the foundation of consciousness as a “form

³⁵ Henrich, *Grundlegung aus dem Ich. Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte des Idealismus Tübingen – Jena 1789–1795* (2 vols.), (Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher, 2004 and Frank, „1. Die Philosophie des sogenannten magischen Idealismus,“ 27–66, „2. Philosophie als ‚unendliche Annäherung‘. Überlegungen im Ausgang von der frühromantischen ‚Konstellation,“ 67–87, „3. Wechselgrundsatz“. Friedrich Schlegels philosophischer Ausgangspunkt“, 88–116, „4. Allegorie, Witz, Fragment, Ironie Friedrich Schlegel und die Idee des zerrissenen Selbst“, 117–13, in: *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*. The new insight of Early German Idealism is recognized in particular by Henrich’s “Constellation-Research” and his followers, see about, M. Maurhard, and M. Stamm eds., *Konstellationsforschung*, (Frankfurt a. M./Berlin, Suhrkamp Publisher, 2005).

³⁶ Frank, „4. Allegorie, Witz, Fragment, Ironie“, 118–119. On the two meanings of being (*Sein*) of the “Early Idealism”: 1. as existence (reality) – Kant, Crusius, Jacobi – and 2. as absolute within thinking (*cogito*) and being (*sum*) fall together – the tradition of Spinoza and Leibniz – which are not often carefully distinguished, Frank, “Einleitung”, in: *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*, 12–14.

³⁷ It is to mention that the “riddle” of this relationship has motivated in the context of the “Early German Idealism” the turn to the philosophy of art as a perfection of philosophy.

of consciousness". "Elementary Philosophy" as a philosophy of one principle is the deduction of all original forms of representations (*Vorstellungen*) from the consciousness of humans.

Sentence of consciousness:

In consciousness the representation is distinguished by the subject from subject and object, and is related to both.

Self-consciousness:

The consciousness of the representer as such, the self-consciousness, has the representer itself as its object which therefore is represented, i.e. becomes an object of a representation which has to be distinguished from itself (the representer) as the subject and the object which is distinguished from the mere representation which through its being related constitutes the self-consciousness, whose object is designated by the word I.

Identity of subject of object:

But the self-consciousness contains not only the representation of the representer but of the representer which represents in itself, i.e. in the case of self-consciousness the object of consciousness is represented as identical with the subject.³⁸

³⁸ Karl L. Reinhold, *Neue Darstellung der Hauptmomente der Elementarphilosophie* (Prague and Jena: Mauke Publisher, 1790) English translation of: "Im Bewusstsein wird die Vorstellung durch das Subjekt von Subjekt und Objekt unterschieden und auf beides bezogen." *Versuch einer neuen Theorie des menschlichen Vorstellungsvermögens*(1789) (Prague and Jena: Mauke Publisher, 1795 second edition). English translation of: „Das Bewusstsein des Vorstellenden als seines solchen, das Selbstbewusstsein, hat das Vorstellende selbst zum Gegenstande, das also dabei vorgestellt, das heißt Objekt einer von ihm als Subjekt und als Objekt verschiedenen bloßen Vorstellung werden muß, die durch ihr Bezogenwerden das Selbstbewusstsein, dessen Gegenstand durch das Wort Ich bezeichnet wird, ausmacht.“; "Allein das Selbstbewusstsein enthält nicht bloß die Vorstellung des Vorstellenden, sondern des Vorstellenden, welches in demselben vorgestellt, d.h. beim Selbstbewusstsein wird das Objekt des Bewußtseins als Identisch mit dem Subjekte vorgestellt." On the "form of consciousness", 322. On Reinhold and Fichte: J. Stolzenberg, „Fichte's concept of Practical Self-Consciousness—or: Fichte's claim for the relation between Pre-Reflectivity, Self-representationalism, and Reflectivity in understanding Self-Consciousness", Workshop *Self-Representationalism, Pre-Reflectivity, and Mental Impairment*, Centre of Interdisciplinary Research, University Bielefeld, 2013, September 4–6; to the concept of philosophical deduction referring to Reinhold and Fichte:

Reinhold claims to have solved the regress which happens if knowledge is defined as a justified (true) belief. The regress happens because knowledge is specified by sentences which represent knowledge as reasoned from other sentences, that is, the set of sentences represents knowledge under the condition of other sentences *ad infinitum*. Therefore, the regress can come to the end only by an *unconditioned* sentence as a basic principle. This sentence is the foundation of all other true sentences, and the sentence as the basic principle is evident by it-self.³⁹

The main question is: “How do we conclude logically and content-relatedly from the basic-principle to consequences?” The *philosophy of one principle* claims to synthesize and produce a whole of knowledge synthetically and analytically:

1. if it methodically (deductally) makes clear the negation of this principle (Fichte: law of reflection) and
2. it sets in motion a process of deduction leading to totality,
3. then the concept of negativity justified the concept of totality.

Four questions were emphasised against such a philosophy from the basic principle among the followers of Reinhold:

1. A system of beliefs is not based by evidence because evidence is private experience. The basic principle is not given. If we make this assumption, then the problem of interpersonal verification emerges.
2. Belief-sentences have an axiomatic status. If these sentences are proofed then they are not basic principles.
3. Reinhold’s basic principle is not reasoned by itself. In particular, Schmid argued that Reinhold is wrong to unify Kant’s cognitive faculties to one basic principle only. Self-consciousness cannot be the basic sentence of philosophy, as well as a representation (*Vorstellung*). It is not a philosophical principle of deduction.

S. Lang, “Karl Leonhard Reinholds Begriff der Deduktion.” Manuscript (2019), “Fichtes Deduktion praktischer Spontaneität”, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 95/1, (2013): 65–86.

³⁹ Frank, “2. Philosophie als ‚Unendliche Annäherung‘”, in: *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*, 71.

4. The “sentence of consciousness” is a singular, rather than some general fact. Therefore, Reinhold’s procedure is hypothetic-deductive only, and we are free to take into play another hypothesis.⁴⁰
5. The conclusion is that a methodological monism, that is a philosophy from a unique principle, is a failed program.

Reinhold did not give a reasoned response to the objections of his pupils and friend regarding to the regress of justification and the “nihilism of reasoning”. The critique on Reinhold from Schmid, and Immanuel Carl Diez can also be applied to Fichte’s *Wissenschaftslehre* (1794) because the sentence as a basic principle “The I posits itself per se/its own being” (*Das Ich setzt schlechthin sich selbst/sein eigenes Sein*) as a theoretical foundation is not self-supporting, and makes a cross reference to the practical philosophy. The theoretical absolute of the sentence “*ego sum*” requires a practical sentence: “I ought to be” (*Ich soll sein*). Hence Fichte assumes the principle of counteraction, that is, the external impetus of the non-I (*der äußere Anstoß des Nicht-Ich*), which cannot ascribe the I to it-self.⁴¹

3. Philosophical deduction and logical deduction.

What is the difference between the philosophical and the logical deduction?

⁴⁰ On the critique among the followers of Reinhold in particular I. C. Diez, F. I. Niethammer, J. B. Erhard: Henrich, *Grundlegung aus dem Ich*, Frank, “2. Philosophie als ‘unendliche Annäherung,’” on an overview, 71–74, on Novalis who goes along with the critique on Reinhold, 74–76; for him the basic principle is a free produced/fabled thing (an invention), 83, “Unendliche Annäherung. Die Anfänge der philosophischen Frühromantik,” in *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*, to Reinhold’s philosophy M. Bondeli, *Das Anfangsproblem bei Karl Leonhard Reinhold. Eine systematische und entwicklungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Philosophie Reinholds in der Zeit von 1789 bis 1803* (Frankfurt a. M., Kostermann Publisher, 1995).

⁴¹ Frank, „3. „Wechselgrundsatz.“ In *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*, with respect to Hölderlin und F. Schlegel, 95–98; Schlegel argues in particular that the I is not an absolute because it is determined, that is, it excludes something from it-self, 98; Hölderlin’s view is that the „absolute I“ cannot be recognized, 96–97.

Philosophical deduction:

1. The premises are to be recognized as true based on their content.
2. The content determines the shift to new contents in the conclusions.
3. There are new conclusions because they are not concluded by logical deduction.
4. The connection of the premises and the conclusion are implications of synthetic *a priori* statements.

Logical deduction:

1. The truth of the premises and the content of the descriptive terms are not relevant.
2. Constraint: if the premises are true then the conclusion is true (truth-preserved inferences).
3. Formal inferences are based only on
 - (a) the meaning of the logical signs;
 - (b) their expression with logical true implications; and
 - (c) up to the first-order logic of quantification, the formal inferences are expressed completely in a calculus.

The *consequential problem* of the philosophical deduction is as follows: do we also determinate the implication of the synthetic *a priori* statement of the philosophical deduction positively? The answer to the question is the reflection to the “conditions on the possibility” of the philosophical deduction.

Conditions on the possibility: necessary conditions of the premises of the philosophical deduction (*b*) expressed in the starting position (*a*). We have two interpretations:

1. if *a* then *b*.
b = component of a material conditional.
“If *a* then *b*” is read either as logically true or as a synthetic statement of the philosophical deduction. In the case of a logical statement, *b* is a consequence of *a*. This case is excluded, and it would be a negative characterization of the philosophical deduction only.
2. In the case of a synthetic statement, *b* is a consequence from *a* and “if *a* then *b*”. If the premises are true, then *b* can be any statement. But this is not enough to express a necessary condition of the premises of a philosophical deduction. Yet, this interpretation of “if *a* then *b*” is not placed at the disposal of the philosophical deduction.

The overall *consequential problem* of the philosophical deduction is that this deduction has no general positive and logical description because the deduction is a connection of contents based on evidence. Therefore, its validity is not justified by a formal reasoning. The vanishing point of the philosophical deduction can only be the reference to evidence. But when we start from the concept of logical consequence (Bolzano, Tarski):

* From a follows b iff b is true if a is true

then the question of philosophical deduction need not be reinterpreted. The philosophical deduction works with a more narrow concept of logical consequence which does not allow the conclusion from “ a ” to “ a or b ”⁴²

No representative of the German idealism has a *well-formed formula* of their used logic and they have no logical calculus inferring something. This is the unspoken truth of the critiques of Reinhold’s *Elementary Philosophy* as a philosophy from the basic principle.

7. Correction and outlook

1. *Rebuilding Cartesian view.* Consciousness is an anonymous field, and no I is its inhabitant. This goes along with the problem that I stand with regard to myself in a primary and solitary self-reference which is conscious immediately. Therefore, I myself as subject is constituted by pre-reflectivity. It is something which is intelligible by itself *independently* of any real communication with other people. But in respect to my conscious I-knowledge, I myself understand myself always as one among an indefinite plurality of others. In my *pour-soi* I myself am also solitary if this knowledge is only gained by

⁴² That is also emphasized by Erwin Rogler, “*Subjektivität und Transzendentalität*”, in: Hans Radamacher, Peter Reisinger, *Rationale Metaphysik. Die Philosophie von Wolfgang Cramer* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987), 160–162. We discussed about the problem of philosophical deduction also regarding to Fichte’s obscure deductive procedures in the 1980s among philosophical friends in Frankfurt a. M.

a symbiosis with others. I am conscious by the state of my *unmediated consciousness* about myself that I am one among others. As such, I myself must distinguish myself not only by myself with respect to others, but also by properties.⁴³

The rebuilt Cartesian view is that we have an evident access to our mental states, which are conscious immediately as pre-reflective consciousness, while at the same time., the propositional content of the reinterpreted flow of information can be empirical, or conceptually false, and that the ontological assumption may also not be ultimately valid. The rebuilt Cartesian view proceeds to abandon the first principle of the *ego cogito* as an epistemological *first truth*. The Cartesian intuition of the self-determination of the mental is Cartesian in structure only. Within this structure we must find an answer for the question of the relationship between self-conscious mental states and language, since such states stand in a reflective relation to their expressions in a mental language as a private language. Call that the *semantics of mental language*. The phenomenal consciousness is not a part of any linguistic competence.

2. *Problem of perception*. It is also to mention that an epistemology which argues that our ideas resemble the things outside of us and that we see these ideas is coming to be seen as mistaken. In the contemporary philosophy, this leads to the problem of *perceptions* which are happenings of something we are aware of at the same time as perceptual (mental) sensory states. There is an epistemic conflict in the rationalist and empiricist mentalist epistemology in general about the self-referential foundation of consciousness between the epistemological direct evidence of mental states (self-adequate evidence/fulfilment) and their reflective objectification, that is, the conscious reference to such states, for instance, by self-awareness, self-presence, self-knowledge, self-monitoring, and self-objectification. This problem is not adequately addressed in Husserl's phenomenology because his philosophy is dominated by the problem of intentionality. This question in epistemology takes effect up to contemporary philosophy and looks ahead to what is coming next. This very

⁴³ Henrich, *Denken und Selbstsein*, 31–33.

question also applies to time consciousness, which we cannot ignore. Such consciousness has particular fulfillment conditions.

What is the connection to neurophysiology, psychology, and sociology—more world domains? It is not disputed that the mental life presupposes a body, a physical world, or a membership domain (social). But our access to one's own body, is a mental one. We have a lived experience (*Erlebnis*) with regard to our body via “pain”, but the body process is not accessed directly. Just this is the overall problem of sense data (phenomenal consciousness, qualia-concept).

3. *Limit of self-consciousness.* Consciousness and mental states do not have a foundation in themselves; that is, there is no total transparency of mental states and self-power. The self-certainty which is connected with the self is at the same time taken away from the self-certainty and the whole is only present under this condition. For Descartes the *idea mei ipsius* and also the *ingenium* are caused by God: the *idea objective spectate innata* shows us that we are a *res cogitans*. Self-consciousness is, against his primary intention, no primary knowledge by reflection. Self-consciousness is valid self-knowledge given by God only. But, if subjectivity does not imply its self-power and its absolute self-transparency (making my-self being accessible, *Sich-selbst-Erschlossensein*) then the traditional critiques of Cartesianism are not convincing at all, since these critiques make such assumption. This point is of particular relevance in the tradition of Hegel, Nietzsche, and Heidegger because they interpret subjectivity as self-power and absolute self-authorization. This goes along in many cases with a misinterpretation of Descartes' expression of the “*maître et possesseur de la nature*”.⁴⁴

4. *Cooperations.* This short study is a part the ProtoSociology project “Consciousness, Mind”.⁴⁵ This problem-reference in cooperation with So-

⁴⁴ See about, footnote 17.

⁴⁵ Consciousness, Mind <https://uni-frankfurt.academia.edu/GerhardPreyer/Consciousness,-Mind> New publications: Miguens, Preyer eds., *Consciousness and Subjectivity, Pre-reflectivity. Sartre and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*, eds., Miguens, Preyer, C. Bravo Morando (London: Routledge Publisher, 2016), Preyer, “Zur gegenwärtigen Philosophie des

phia Miguens is a connection between analytic philosophers of the theory of mind and more and less European traditional-oriented philosophers.⁴⁶ We claim to recognize some problem looking back to the Cartesian Intuition as a cleansed Cartesianism in principle, and why it is worth recalling the intuition of self-determination of the mental which is not transparent from an external point of view. From the third-person stance, the constraint of the ascription of mental states is the use of quasi-indication (Castañeda). Another point is that epistemology does not begin in the meantime with something like a Cartesian doubt, but from the “order of noise” (von Foerster). The problem of the immediated/prereflective as an unmediated consciousness is also central in the theorizing of Eshman, Horgan and Nichols, Kapitan, Kriegel, and Williford as well as others. In particular, Kapitan brings into play the ubiquity of all states of consciousness. Horgan and Nichols, for instance, call the “phenomenal subjectivity as non-representational self-presence” an immediate, that is, unmediated, consciousness which is to contrast with mental acts of reflection.⁴⁷ Castañeda’s merit requires a more detailed critique and are not analyzed in detail in this text. The project participates in, as the Early Romance calls it, a “symphilosophy” (F. Schlegel) via exchange between Ger-

Mentalen”, in: *Die Philosophie der neuesten Zeit*, Hrsg. W. Röd, W. K. Essler, unter Mitarbeit von C. Bratu, G. Preyer und J. Nida-Rümelin. Analytische Philosophie und Wissenschaftstheorie, Frankfurter Schule, Hermeneutik, Strukturalismus und Poststrukturalismus, Philosophie des Geistes, Praktische Philosophie (München: Beck, 2019) to Frank:

Preyer, „Subjektivität als präreflexives Bewusstsein. Jean-Paul Sartres bleibende Einsicht“, access 27.09.2019, www.academia.edu/10435162/Gerhard_Preyer_Subjektivität_als_präreflexives_Bewusstsein_Jean-Paul_Sartres_bleibende_Einsicht_.Zu_Manfred_Frank_Präreflexives_Selbstbewusstsein._Vier_Vorlesungen_Stuttgart_Reclam_2015

Preyer, „Selbstbewusstsein. Kritik am apriorischen Intersubjektivismus“, access 27.09.2019, www.academia.edu/31417062/Gerhard_Preyer_Selbstbewusstsein_Kritik_am_apriorischen_Intersubjektivismus Preyer, “On Contemporary Philosophy of Mind From the 1950s Years to the Present”. *Ruch Filozoficzny*, 71(4) 2015 <<http://apcz.pl/czasopisma/index.php/RF/article/view/RF.2015.001>> Rogler, “On David Lewis Philosophy of Mind”, in: G. Preyer, *Philosophie des Mentalen. Supervenienz, Physikalismus, nicht-reduktiver Physikalismus und mentale Kausalität* (Frankfurt a. M.: Humanities Online, 2020 second edition, forthcoming).

⁴⁶ Horgan, Nichols, “The zero point and I”, in: *Pre-Reflective Consciousness*, ed. Sofia Miguens, Gerhard Preyer and Clara Bravo Morando (London: Routledge Publisher, 2016), 143–144.

⁴⁷ Horgan, Nichols, “The zero point and I”, in Miguens, Bravo Morando, Preyer eds., *Pre-Reflective Consciousness*, 146, 147.

man, American, French, Italian, Polish, and Portuguese colleagues. In particular, I mention the Institutes of Philosophy Genoa (Italy), Porto (Portugal), Toruń (Poland), Malta, and Cognitive Science Toruń (Poland). There was a fruitful, continuing communication with the participants of the lectures, seminars, workshops, and congresses, as well as other colleagues. I want to thank everyone for their interest and motivation in working on the dynamic and shifting situation within the philosophy of the mental.⁴⁸

Bibliography

- Armstrong David M. 1980. "What is Consciousness?", in: *The Nature of Mind and Other Essays*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Castañeda Hector-Neri. 1999. "The Self and the I-Guises, Empirical and Transcendental". In: *The Phenomeno-Logic of the I*, eds. James G. Hart, Tomis Kapitan. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Descartes Rene. 1969. *The Philosophical Work of Descartes Vol. I*, ed. and trans. by Elizabeth Haldane and George R. T. Ross. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bondeli Martin. 1995. *Das Anfangsproblem bei Karl Leonhard Reinhold. Eine systematische und entwicklungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Philosophie Reinholds in der Zeit von 1789 bis 1803*. Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann Publisher.
- Burge Tyler. 2007. "Descartes on Anti-individualism (2003)". In: *Foundations of Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burge Tyler. 2007. "Cartesian Error and the Objectivity of Perception (1986)". In: *Foundations of Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁴⁸ I want to thank Henryk Jaronowski for helping to give the text its final English shape, as well as for substantial arguments about renewing a cleansed Cartesianism. Finally, I would also like to express my gratitude to Herbert Schnädelbach because the analysis of the dilemma of Cartesian knowledge goes back to his philosophical research project on the "modern philosophy of reflection" and the basic theories of so-called "positivism", about which he lectured and published during the first half of the 1970s. The „dilemma of Cartesian knowledge" is in harmony with Dieter Henrich's critiques on the philosophy of reflection accompanying his writings on „Fichte's original insight" (1966/68) and his philosophical renewing of the „problem of self-consciousness". The problem was well-known among contemporary students of philosophy but has since faded from view; however, this generational lacuna provides us with a fresh opportunity to rediscover it.

- Fichte Johann Gottlieb. 1971. "Versuch einer neuen Darstellung der Wissenschaftslehre (1897)". In: *Fichtes Werke, Zur theoretischen Philosophie I*, ed. Immanuel Hermann. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Fodor Jerry A. 2008. *LOT 2. The Language of Thought Revisited*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fodor Jerry A. 2004. "Having Concepts: a Brief Refutation of the Twentieth Century". *Mind & Language* 19.1.
- Frank Manfred. 2007. "Einleitung". In: *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Frank Manfred. 2007. "1. Die Philosophie des sogenannten magischen Idealismus". In: *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Frank Manfred. 2007. "2. Philosophie als ‚unendliche Annäherung‘. Überlegungen im Ausgang von der frühromantischen ‚Konstellation‘". In: *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Frank Manfred. 2007. "3. Wechselgrundsatz". Friedrich Schlegels philosophischer Ausgangspunkt". In: *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Frank Manfred. 2007. "4. Allegorie, Witz, Fragment, Ironie Friedrich Schlegel und die Idee des zerrissenen Selbst". In: *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Frank Manfred. 2007. "7. Kant über Selbstbewusstsein". In: *Auswege aus dem Deutschen Idealismus*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Frank Manfred. 2012. "5. Besteht Selbstbewusstsein in einem 'inneren Wahrnehmen'?" In: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Frank Manfred. 2012. "3. Zeit und Selbst. Oder: Wie sich präreflexives Bewusstsein differenziert". In: *Ansichten der Subjektivität*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Frank Manfred. 2015. *Präreflexives Selbstbewusstsein. Vier Vorlesungen*. Stuttgart: Reclam Publisher.
- Goldman Alvin. 2006. *Simulating Minds. The Philosophy, Psychology, and Neuroscience of Mindreading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henrich Dieter. 1967. *Fichtes ursprüngliche Einsicht* (1966). Frankfurt a. M., Klostermann Publisher
- Henrich Dieter. 1988. "Die Identität des Subjekts in der transzendentalen Deduktion". In: *Kant. Analysen – Probleme – Kritik*, ed. Hariolf Oberer, Gerhard Seel. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann Publisher.
- Henrich Dieter. 2004. *Grundlegung aus dem Ich. Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte des Idealismus Tübingen – Jena 1789-1795* (2 vols.). Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.

- Henrich Dieter. 2007. *Denken und Selbstsein. Vorlesungen über Subjektivität*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Horgan Nichols. 2016. "The zero point and I". In: *Pre-Reflective Consciousness, Sartre and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Sofia Miguens, Gerhard Preyer and Clara Bravo Morando. London: Routledge Publisher.
- Kant Immanuel. 1996. *Critique of Pure Reason*, transl. W. S. Plurhar. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1996.
- Katz Jerrold J. 1986. *Cogitations: A Study of the Cogito in Relation to the Philosophy of Logic and Language and a Study of Them in Relation to the Cogito*. New York: The Harvester Press.
- Lang Stefan. 2019. "Karl Leonhard Reinholds Begriff der Deduktion". *Manuscript*.
- Lang Stefan. 2019. *Phänomenales Bewusstsein und Selbstbewusstsein Idealistische und selbstrepräsentationalistische Interpretationen*. Hamburg: Mainer Publisher.
- Lang Stefan. 2013. „Fichtes Deduktion praktischer Spontaneität". *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 95(1): 65-86.
- Lycan William G. 1997. "Consciousness as Internal Monitoring". In: *The Nature of Consciousness. Philosophical Debates*, ed. Ned Block, Owen Flanagan, and Güven Güzeldere. Cambridge: MA, MIT Press.
- Maurhard Martin and Marsello Stamm ed. 2005. *Konstellationsforschung*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Miguens Sofia and Gerhard Preyer eds. 2012. *Consciousness and Subjectivity*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Miguens Sofia and Gerhard Preyer, Clara Bravo Morando eds. 2015. *Pre-Reflective Consciousness: Sartre and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*. London: Routledge.
- Platts Mark. 1979. *Ways of Meaning. An Introduction to a Philosophy of Language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Preyer Gerhard. 2012. "The Problem of Subjectivity: Dieter Henrich's Turn". In: *Consciousness and Subjectivity*, Red. Sofia Miguens and Gerhard Preyer eds., Berlin: Duncker & Humblot. Accessible at https://www.academia.edu/12447910/The_Problem_of_Subjectivity_Dieter_Henrich_s_Turn
- Preyer Gerhard. 2016. "Soziologie ohne Menschen". *Rechtstheorie* 1.
- Preyer Gerhard. „Subjektivität als präreflexives Bewusstsein. Jean-Paul Sartres bleibende Einsicht" 2017. Access 27.09.2019 www.academia.edu/10435162/Gerhard_Preyer_Subjektivität_als_präreflexives_Bewusstsein_Jean-Paul_Sartres_bleibende_Einsicht_.Zu_Manfred_Frank_Präreflexives_Selbstbewusstsein._Vier_Vorlesungen_Stuttgart_Reclam_2015
- Preyer Gerhard. 2015. "On Contemporary Philosophy of Mind From the 1950s Years to the Present". *Ruch Filozoficzny* 71(4).

- Preyer Gerhard. 2018. „Selbstbewusstsein. Kritik am apriorischen Intersubjektivismus“. Access 27.09.2019. www.academia.edu/31417062/Gerhard_Preyer_Selbstbewusstsein_Kritik_am_apriorischen_Intersubjektivismus
- Preyer Gerhard. 2019. “Zur gegenwärtigen Philosophie des Mentalen”. In: *Die Philosophie der neuesten Zeit. Analytische Philosophie und Wissenschaftstheorie, Frankfurter Schule, Hermeneutik, Strukturalismus und Poststrukturalismus, Philosophie des Geistes, Praktische Philosophie*, ed. Wolfgang Röd, Wilhelm K. Essler Unter Mitarbeit von Christine Bratu, Gerhard Preyer und Julian Nida-Rümelin. München: Beck.
- ProtoSociology: Consciousness, Mind <https://uni-frankfurt.academia.edu/GerhardPreyer/Consciousness,-Mind>
- Reinhold Karl Leonard. 1790. *Neue Darstellung der Hauptmomente der Elementarphilosophie*. Prague and Jena: Mauke Publisher.
- Reinhold Karl Leonard. 1795 (second edition). *Versuch einer neuen Theorie des menschlichen Vorstellungsvermögens*(1789). Prague and Jena, Mauke Publisher, 1795 second edition).
- Rogler Erwin. 1987. “Subjektivität und Transzendentalität”. In: Hans Radamacher and Peter Reisinger *Rationale Metaphysik. Die Philosophie von Wolfgang Cramer*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Rogler Erwin. “On David Lewis Philosophy of Mind”. In: Gerhard Preyer, *Philosophie des Mentalen. Supervenienz, Physikalismus, nicht-reduktiver Physikalismus und mentale Kausalität* (Frankfurt a. M.: Humanities Online, 2020 second edition, forthcoming).
- Sartre Jan-Paul. 1943. *L'être et le néant. Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique*. Paris: Gallimard. English translation: *Being and Nothingness. An Essay in Phenomenological Ontology*. Translated by H. E. Barnes. Edited by A. E. Sartre (London: Routledge Publisher, 1994).
- Schantz Richard. 1996. *Wahrheit, Referenz und Realismus. Eine Studie zur Sprachphilosophie und Metaphysik*. Berlin: De Gruyter Publisher.
- Schnädelbach Herbert. 1977. *Reflexion and Diskurs. Fragen einer Logik der Philosophie*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Schnädelbach Herbert. 2004. “Descartes und das Projekt der Aufklärung”. In: *Analytische und postanalytische Philosophie*. Frankfurt a. M./Berlin: Suhrkamp Publisher.
- Shoemaker Sydney. 1984. *Cause, and Mind. Philosophical Essays*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Shoemaker Sydney. 1996. *The First-Person Perspective and Other Essays*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Stolzenberg Jürgen. 2013. „Fichte’s concept of Practical Self-Consciousness—or: Fichte’s claim for the relation between Pre-Reflectivity, Self-representation-

- alism, and Reflectivity in understanding Self-Consciousness”, Workshop *Self-Representationalism, Pre-Reflectivity, and Mental Impairment*, Centre of Interdisciplinary Research, University Bielefeld, September 4-6.
- von Kutschera Franz. 2009. *Philosophie des Geistes*. Paderborn: Mentis Publisher.
- von Kutschera Franz. 2012. *Ungegenständliches Erkennen*. Paderborn: Mentis Publisher.
- Williford Kenneth. 2006. “Zahavi versus Brentano: A Rejoinder”. *Psyche* 12(2).

Abstract

For the contemporary philosophy of the mental, it is fruitful for us to return to Cartesian intuition and to attempt to present a “cleansed Cartesianism”, because the intuition takes effect in the fields of epistemology, semantic and linguistic internalism, externalism, and linguistics (Chomsky, Fodor). In this article, we present a series of six following sketches (1.-5.), leading towards a new correction of Cartesian internalism which we hope will cleanse and unleash a fresh outlook on Cartesianism because if we are to finally put aside pragmatism, we must realize that Cartesianism is in the offing when it comes to the lively scholarly discourse around the philosophy of the mind and related subjects: the feature of the subject’s point of view (1.); the dilemma of Cartesian knowledge (2.); a review of Cartesian reflection (3.); the ‘Kantian I’ (as well as Castañeda’s reinterpretation of it) (5.); the monadological foundation of subjectivity (7.); we conclude with a correction and outlook (7.). We find it of particular interest to connect what we call the ‘dilemma of Cartesian knowledge’ (2.) with “Fichte’s original insight” (4.), Reinhold’s “Elementary Philosophy”, and the “Early Romance ‘Constellation’ (6.) as rediscovered by Dieter Henrich and continued by Manfred Frank. The foundational subject here is the regress and circle as well as the problem of “philosophical deduction” in the philosophy of reflection, Elementary Philosophy, and German Idealism in general. Manfred Frank long connected this problem to contemporary philosophy of the mental (mind), as we describe in “The Early Romance Constellation” and “Fichte’s Original Insight” (6., 4.) The rebuilding of a Cartesian view hints that we might well promote the theme of pre-reflective consciousness—going back to Jean-Paul Sartre—within the new architecture of philosophy of the mental as a fundamental question. Neither in the rationalistic or the empiricist accounts of “modern philosophy” nor within the discourse around German Idealism has pre-reflective consciousness been recognized adequately. Looking back, the important matter is following: Within modern egology, the function of pre-reflective consciousness is covered by the I-axiom as the foundation of knowledge. We conclude with a correction of the Cartesian view, the limit of self-

consciousness, and a brief treatment of current cooperations of the European and American philosophers exchange (7.)

Keywords: Cartesian View (- Reflection, First Person Thinking); Philosophy of the Mental (Mind); Epistemology; German Idealism (Kant, Castañeda's Kant-Interpretation, Reinhold, Fichte); Self-Consciousness; Dilemma of Cartesian Knowledge; Early Romance "Constellation" and Fichte's Original Insight/Circle and Regress Argument (D. Henrich, M. Frank, J.-P. Sartre).