

14.06.2019

## Literatur zu Kants Ethik

## Bibliography on Kant's ethics

Alphabetische Ordnung / alphabetical order:

<http://www.ethikseite.de/bib/bkant.pdf>

Chronologische Ordnung / reverse chronological order:

<http://www.ethikseite.de/bib/ckant.pdf>

- 2015 [1] Abela, Paul (2015): Kant, Naturalism, and the Reach of Practical Reason, in *The Transcendental Turn*, hrsg. von Sebastian Gardner und Matthew Grist, Oxford, S. 56–73.
- 2018 [2] Ackeren, Marcel van/Sticker, Martin (2018): Moral Rationalism and Demandingness in Kant, *Kantian Review* 23, S. 407–28.<sup>1</sup> – Dazu: [236].
- 1970 [3] Acton, H. B. (1970): *Kant's Moral Philosophy*, London.
- 1994 [4] Albrecht, Michael (1994): Kants Maximenethik und ihre Begründung, *Kant-Studien* 85, S. 129–46. – Kant's Justification of the Role of Maxims in Ethics, in *Kant's Moral and Legal Philosophy*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Otfried Höffe, Cambridge 2009, S. 134–57.
- 2019 [5] Allais, Lucy (2019): The Given in Theoretical and Practical Cognition. Intuition and the Moral Law, in *Kant on Intuition. Western and Asian Perspectives on Transcendental Idealism*, hrsg. von Stephen R. Palmquist, New York, S. 69–85.
- 1986 [6] Allison, Henry E. (1986): Morality and Freedom: Kant's Reciprocity Thesis, *Philosophical Review* 95, S. 393–425.
- 1986 [7] Allison, Henry E. (1986): The Concept of Freedom in Kant's 'Semi-Critical' Ethics, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 68, S. 96–115.

---

<sup>1</sup> "We discuss Kant's conception of moral rationalism from the viewpoint of recent debates, which have distinguished different forms of moral rationalism. We argue that Kant's version, 'silencing', is different and stronger than currently held versions of moral rationalism and that it also differs from versions of silencing that contemporary thinkers advocate. We then discuss Kant's version of silencing in the context of the moral demandingness debate and argue that silencing can make a perfect duty very demanding. However, it is important that whilst in cases of conflict between duty and personal happiness the normative standing of the latter is silenced, silencing does not require that agents do all they can in the case of imperfect duties. We finally indicate the kind of latitude imperfect duties allow for, according to Kant's strong form of moral rationalism."

- 1989 [8] Allison, Henry E. (1989): Kant's Preparatory Argument in *Grundlegung III*, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 314–24.
- 1990 [9] Allison, Henry E. (1990): *Kant's Theory of Freedom*, Cambridge.
- 1991 [10] Allison, Henry E. (1991): On a Presumed Gap in the Derivation of the Categorical Imperative, *Philosophical Topics* 19, S. 1ff. Wiederabgedruckt in Allison, *Idealism and Freedom. Essays on Kant's Theoretical and Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge 1996, S. 143–54.
- 1993 [11] Allison, Henry E. (1993): Kant's Doctrine of Obligatory Ends, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 1. Wiederabgedruckt in Allison, *Idealism and Freedom. Essays on Kant's Theoretical and Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge 1996, S. 155–68.<sup>2</sup> – Vgl. dazu [1090].
- 2001 [12] Allison, Henry E. (2001): Ethics, Evil, and Anthropology in Kant: Remarks on Allen Wood's *Kant's Ethical Thought*, *Ethics* 111, S. 594–613.
- 2002 [13] Allison, Henry E. (2002): On the Very Idea of a Propensity to Evil, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 337–48. Wiederabgedruckt in Allison, *Essays on Kant*, Oxford 2012, S. 99–109.
- 2007 [14] Allison, Henry E. (2007): Comments on Guyer, *Inquiry* 50, S. 480–88.<sup>3</sup> – Zu [498].
- 2011 [15] Allison, Henry E. (2011): *Kant's Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals: A Commentary*,

---

<sup>2</sup> “This paper analyzes Kant's thesis in the *Tugendlehre* that there are certain ends (one's own perfection and the happiness of others) that we are obligated to adopt. It contends that none of the three arguments which Kant advances in support of this thesis succeeds and that the attempted reconstruction by Nelson Potter likewise fails. It then maintains that the argument does work, if one brings in, as an implicit premise, transcendental freedom. Finally, it is argued that this late doctrine of obligatory ends marks a significant advance over the treatment of broad duties in the *Grundlegung* and can serve as a basis for defending Kant's ethics against the familiar emptiness charge.”

<sup>3</sup> “Guyer argues for four major theses. First, in his early, pre-critical discussions of morality, Kant advocated a version of rational egoism, in which freedom, understood naturalistically as a freedom from domination by both one's own inclinations and from other people, rather than happiness, is the fundamental value. From this point of view, the function of the moral law is to prescribe rules best suited to the preservation and maximization of such freedom, just as on the traditional eudaemonistic account it is to prescribe rules for the maximization of happiness. Second, in the *Groundwork*, Kant abandoned this naturalistic approach and while retaining the same substantive thesis as his early moral philosophy, “namely that freedom is the value that is realized by adherence to the moral law” (Guyer 455), attempted to provide a non-naturalistic (transcendental) grounding for this valuation of freedom. Third, this took the form of a transcendental deduction, closely modeled on that of the first Critique, which was intended to demonstrate that we are in fact (noumenally) free and the moral law is the “causal law” of this freedom. Fourth, this deduction is a disaster, indeed, one of Western philosophy's “most spectacular train wrecks” (Guyer 445). I shall discuss each in turn, devoting the bulk of my attention to the last.”

Oxford.<sup>4</sup>

- 2012 [16] Allison, Henry E. (2012): The Singleness of the Categorical Imperative, in Allison, *Essays on Kant*, Oxford 2012, S. 124–36. Auch in *Kant und die Philosophie in weltbürgerlicher Absicht. Akten des XI. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Stefano Bacin, Alfredo Ferrarin, Claudio La Rocca und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, New York 2013, Band 1, S. 37–53.
- 2013 [17] Allison, Henry E. (2013): Kant’s Practical Justification of Freedom, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 284–99. Wiederabgedruckt in Allison, *Essays on Kant*, Oxford 2012, S. 110–23.
- 2010 [18] Altman, Matthew C. (2010): Kant on Sex and Marriage: The Implications for the Same-Sex Marriage Debate, *Kant-Studien* 101, S. 309–30.<sup>5</sup>
- 2011 [19] Altman, Matthew C. (2011): *Kant and Applied Ethics. The Uses and Limits of Kant’s Practical Philosophy*, Malden, MA.<sup>6</sup>
- 2017 [20] Altman, Matthew C. (2017): A Practical Account of Kantian Freedom, in *The Palgrave Kant Handbook*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, London, S. 211–42.
- 2019 [21] Altman, Matthew C. (2019): Animal Suffering and Moral Salience. A Defense of Kant’s Indirect View, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 53, S. 275–88.

---

<sup>4</sup> Contents: Acknowledgments. Note on sources and key to abbreviations and translations. Preface. Part **One: Preliminaries**. 1. The Nature of and Need for a Metaphysic of Morals: An Analysis of the Preface of GMS. 2. Universal Practical Philosophy and Popular Moral Philosophy. **Part Two: GMS 1**. 3. The Good Will. 4. Maxims and Moral Worth Redux. 5. Kant’s Three Propositions, the Supreme Principle of Morality, and the Need for Moral Philosophy. **Part Three: GMS 2**. 6. Rational Agency and Imperatives. 7. The Universal Law (FUL) and the Law of Nature (FLN). 8. The Formula of Humanity (FH). 9. Autonomy, Heteronomy, and Constructing the Categorical Imperative. **Part Four: GMS 3**. 10. The Moral Law, the Categorical Imperative, and the Reciprocity Thesis. 11. The Presupposition of Freedom, The Circle, and the two Standpoints. 12. The Deduction of the Categorical Imperative and the Outermost Boundary of Practical Philosophy.

<sup>5</sup> “When examined critically, Kant’s views on sex and marriage give us the tools to defend same-sex marriage on moral grounds. The sexual objectification of one’s partner can only be overcome when two people take responsibility for one another’s overall well-being, and this commitment is enforced through legal coercion. Kant’s views on the unnaturalness of homosexuality do not stand up to scrutiny, and he cannot (as he often tries to) restrict the purpose of sex to procreation. Kant himself rules out marriage only when the partners cannot give themselves to one another equally – that is, if there is inequality of exchange. Because same-sex marriage would be between equals and would allow homosexuals to express their desire in a morally appropriate way, it ought to be legalized.”

<sup>6</sup> Preface vi. Note on Sources and Key to Abbreviations viii. Introduction: Why Kant Now 1. Part I. Applying Kant’s Ethics 11. 1. Animal Suffering and Moral Character 13. 2. Kant’s Strategic Importance for Environmental Ethics 45. 3. Moral and Legal Arguments for Universal Health Care 71. 4. The Scope of Patient Autonomy 90. Part II. Kantian Arguments against Kant’s Conclusions 115. 5. Subjecting Ourselves to Capital Punishment 117. 6. Same-Sex Marriage as a Means to Mutual Respect 139. Part III. Limitations of Kant’s Theory 165. 7. Consent, Mail-Order Brides, and the Marriage Contract 167. 8. Individual Maxims and Social Justice 194. 9. The Decomposition of the Corporate Body 217. 10. Becoming a Person 241. Conclusion: Emerging from Kant’s Long Shadow 283. Bibliography 289. Index 311.

- 2013 [22] Altmann, Silvia (2013): Geometrie und objektive Realität der Idee der Sittlichkeit in der *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, in *Das Leben der Vernunft. Beiträge zur Philosophie Kants*, hrsg. von Dieter Hüning, Stefan Klingner und Carsten Olk, Berlin, S. 354–63.
- 2010 [23] Alves, Julius (2010): Vollkommene Tugendpflichten: Zur Systematik der Pflichten in Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten*, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 64, S. 520–45.<sup>7</sup>
- 1981 [24] Ameriks, Karl (1981): Kant's Deduction of Freedom and Morality, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 19, S. 53–79.
- 1989 [25] Ameriks, Karl (1989): Kant on the Good Will, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 45–65. Wiederabgedruckt in Ameriks, *Interpreting Kant's Critiques*, Oxford 2003, S. 193–210.
- 2001 [26] Ameriks, Karl (2001): Zu Kants Argumentation am Anfang des Dritten Abschnitts der *Grundlegung*, in *Systematische Ethik mit Kant*, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 24–54.
- 2002 [27] Ameriks, Karl (2002): "Pure Reason of Itself Alone Suffices to Determine the Will" (42–57), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 99–114. Wiederabgedruckt in Ameriks, *Interpreting Kant's Critiques*, Oxford 2003, S. 249–61.

---

<sup>7</sup> „Diese Arbeit widmet sich einem Hauptproblem der kantischen Pflichtensystematik in der Tugendlehre: Der Unterscheidung von vollkommenen und unvollkommenen Pflichten und der resultierenden Spannung zwischen Einleitung und Elementarlehre. Während in der Einleitung in die Tugendlehre Tugendpflichten begrifflich nur als unvollkommene Pflichten eingeführt und abgeleitet werden, beginnt die Elementarlehre mit einem extensiven Abschnitt über vollkommene Pflichten, die dennoch Tugendpflichten sein sollen. Nach einer kurzen Betrachtung einschlägiger Vorschläge der Literatur zu diesem Problem, versucht die vorliegende Arbeit aus dem Konzept der Weite von Pflichten Kriterien für die Zuordnung der verschiedenen Tugendpflichten zu gewinnen. Im Lichte dieser Kriterien erscheint Kants Beurteilung mancher verhandelter Pflichten als ‚vollkommen‘ gerechtfertigt. Abschließend wird gezeigt, inwiefern sie dennoch zu den Tugendpflichten gehören können (und deshalb in der Elementarlehre ihren Platz haben), indem Kants eher beiläufige Unterscheidung von Strebens- und Erhaltungspflichten in den Mittelpunkt gerückt wird. Unvollkommenheit einer Pflicht folgt nur aus ethischen Strebenspflichten, nicht aus gebotenen Maximen überhaupt. Das Ziel der Exposition aller relevanten Merkmale, die zu einer Tugendpflicht gehören können, lässt verstehen, warum die Einleitung nur auf Strebenspflichten zentriert ist.“

“This essay is concerned with one of the main problems in Kant's system of duties in the Tugendlehre: the difference between perfect and imperfect duties and the resulting inconsistency between introduction and Elementarlehre. Even though the introduction establishes and derives duties of virtue as imperfect duties only, the Elementarlehre begins with a long section concerning perfect duties, which nevertheless are supposed to be duties of virtue. After a brief consideration of other interpreter's views on this topic, this essay tries to develop criteria for the categorisation of the different duties of virtue from the concept of a duty's latitude. In light of these criteria, Kant's categorizing some of the discussed duties as perfect seems justifiable. Finally I will show, why they can nevertheless be 'duties of virtue', by emphasizing Kant's distinction between duties to strive and those to conserve. Imperfection of a duty follows from duties to strive only, not from obligatory maxims per se. The goal of introducing all relevant characteristics, a duty of virtue may have, can explain, why the introduction is only concerned with duties to strive.”

- 2004 [28] Ameriks, Karl (2004): Kant und das Problem der moralischen Motivation, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn 2004, S. 98–116.
- 2006 [29] Ameriks, Karl (2006): Kant and Motivational Externalism, in *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, hrsg. von Heiner F. Klemme, Manfred Kühn und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. 3–22.
- 2010 [30] Ameriks, Karl (2010): Reality, Reason, and Religion in the Development of Kant’s Ethics, in *Kant’s Moral Metaphysics. God, Freedom, and Immortality*, hrsg. von Benjamin J. Bruxvoort Lipscomb und James Krueger, Berlin, S. 23–47.
- 2013 [31] Ameriks, Karl (2013): Is Practical Justification in Kant Ultimately Dogmatic?, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 153–75.
- 2019 [32] Ameriks, Karl (2019): Kant on Freedom as Autonomy, in *Freiheit nach Kant. Tradition, Rezeption, Transformation, Aktualität*, hrsg. von Saša Josifović und Jörg Noller, Leiden, Boston, S. 95–116.
- 2009 [33] Ameriks, Karl/Höffe, Otfried (Hrsg.) (2009): *Kant’s Moral and Legal Philosophy*, Cambridge.<sup>8</sup>
- 2004 [34] Ameriks, Karl/Sturma, Dieter (Hrsg.) (2004): *Kants Ethik*, Paderborn.
- 2008 [35] Anderson, Elizabeth (2008): Emotions in Kant’s Later Moral Philosophy: Honour and the Phenomenology of Moral Value, in *Kant’s Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 123–45.
- 1921 [36] Anderson, Georg (1921): Die ‘Materie’ in Kants Tugendlehre und der Formalismus in der kritischen Ethik, *Kant-Studien* 26, S. 289–311.
- 1923 [37] Anderson, Georg (1923): Kants Metaphysik der Sitten – ihre Idee und ihr Verhältnis zur Wolffschen Schule, *Kant-Studien* 28, S. 41–61.

---

<sup>8</sup> Acknowledgments ix. Contributors xi. Works by Kant xv. Introduction – Karl Ameriks and Otfried Höffe 1. I Early Conceptions 27. 1 Hutcheson and Kant – Dieter Henrich 29. 2 The Theory of Obligation in Wolff, Baumgarten, and the Early Kant – Clemens Schwaiger 58. II Groundwork of The Metaphysics of Morals 75. 3 What Is the Purpose of a Metaphysics of Morals? Some Observations on the Preface to the Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals – Ludwig Siep 77. 4 The Transition from Common Rational Moral Knowledge to Philosophical Rational Moral Knowledge in the Groundwork – Dieter Schönecker 93. 5 Reason Practical in Its Own Right – Gerold Prauss 123. 6 Kant’s Justification of the Role of Maxims in Ethics – Michael Albrecht 134. III Critique of Practical Reason 157. 7 The Form of the Maxim as the Determining Ground of the Will (The Critique of Practical Reason: §§4–6, 27–30) – Otfried Höffe 159. 8 ‘On the Concept of an Object of Pure Practical Reason’ (Chapter 2 of the Analytic of Practical Reason) – Annemarie Pieper 179. 9 The Dialectic of Pure Practical Reason in the Second Critique (CPrR:107–121) – Eckart Förster 198. 10 The Postulates of Pure Practical Reason (CPrR:122–148) – Friedo Ricken 213. IV Legal and Political Philosophy 229. 11 On How to Acquire Something External, and Especially on the Right to Things (A Commentary on the Metaphysics of Morals §§10–17) – Kristian Kühl 231. 12 ‘The Civil Constitution in Every State Shall Be a Republican One’ – Wolfgang Kersting 246. 13 Commentary on Kant’s Treatment of Constitutional Right (Metaphysics of Morals II: General Remark A; §§51–52, Conclusion, Appendix) – Bernd Ludwig 265. 14 Refusing Sovereign Power – The Relation between Philosophy and Politics in the Modern Age – Volker Gerhardt 284. Bibliography 305. Index 317.

- 1986 [38] Anderson-Gold, Sharon (1986): Kant's Ethical Commonwealth: The Highest Good as a Social Goal, *International Philosophical Quarterly* 16, S. 23–32.
- 2008 [39] Anderson-Gold, Sharon (2008): The Purposiveness of Nature: Kant and Environmental Ethics, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 3–12.
- 2010 [40] Anderson-Gold, Sharon (2010): Privacy, Respect and the Virtues of Reticence in Kant, *Kantian Review* 15, S. 28–42.
- 1996 [41] Annas, Julia (1996): Aristotle and Kant on Morality and Practical Reasoning, in *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics. Rethinking Happiness and Duty*, hrsg. von Stephen Engstrom und Jennifer Whiting, Cambridge, S. 237–58.
- 1991 [42] Arntzen, Sven (1991): Kant on Willing a Maxim as a Universal Law, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 265–75.
- 1998 [43] Arrington, Robert L. (1998): *Western Ethics. An Historical Introduction*, Oxford, S. 261–94 ("Kant").
- 2017 [44] Arroyo, Christopher (2017): *Kant's Ethics and the Same-Sex Marriage Debate. An Introduction*, Cham.<sup>9</sup>
- 2007 [45] Atterton, Peter (2007) A Duty to Be Charitable? A Rigoristic Reading of Kant, *Kant-Studien* 98, S. 135–55.
- 1969 [46] Atwell, John (1969): Are Kant's First Two Moral Principles Equivalent?, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 7, S. 273–84.
- 1974 [47] Atwell, John (1974): The Uniqueness of the Good Will, *Akten des 4. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses Mainz 1974*, hrsg. von G. Funke, Berlin, Bd. 2, S. 479–84.
- 1974 [48] Atwell, John (1974): Objective Ends in Kant's Ethics, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 56, S. 156–71.
- 1986 [49] Atwell, John (1986): *Ends and Principles in Kant's Moral Thought*, Dordrecht.
- 1991 [50] Atwell, John (1991): Man as Creator of the Value of Life, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 491–500.
- 1995 [51] Atwell, John (1995): Kant and the Duty to Promote Others' Happiness, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson,

---

<sup>9</sup> "This book defends the thesis that Kant's normative ethics and his practical ethics of sex and marriage can be valuable resources for people engaged in the contemporary debate over same-sex marriage. It does so by first developing a reading of Kant's normative ethics that explains the way in which Kant's notions of human moral imperfection unsocial sociability inform his ethical thinking. The book then offers a systematic treatment of Kant's views of sex and marriage, arguing that Kant's views are more defensible than some of his critics have made them out to be. Drawing on Kant's account of marriage and his conception of moral friendship, the book argues that Kant's ethics can be used to develop a defense of same-sex marriage."

Milwaukee, Band 1, S. 727–34. – Dazu Stephen Engstrom: Comment: Happiness and Beneficence, S. 735–42.

- 2016 [52] Audi, Robert (2016): *Means, Ends, and Persons: The Meaning and Psychological Dimensions of Kant's Humanity Formula*, Oxford.
- 1983 [53] Aul, Joachim (1983): Aspekte des Universalisierungspostulats in Kants Ethik, *Neue Hefte für Philosophie* 22: *Kants Ethik heute*, S. 62–94.
- 1979 [54] Aune, Bruce (1979): *Kant's Theory of Morals*, Princeton.
- 1979 [55] Auxter, Thomas (1979): The Unimportance of Kant's Highest Good, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 17, S. 121–34.
- 1982 [56] Auxter, Thomas (1982): *Kant's Moral Teleology*, Macon, GA.
- 2013 [57] Bachmann, Viktoria (2013): Der Grund des guten Lebens. Eine Untersuchung der paradigmatischen Konzepte von Sokrates, Aristoteles und Kant, Hamburg, S. 173–244 („IV. Die Begründung des guten Lebens bei Kant“).
- 2010 [58] Bacin, Stefano (2010): The Meaning of the Critique of Practical Reason for Moral Beings: the Doctrine of Method of Pure Practical Reason, in *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 197–215.
- 2013 [59] Bacin, Stefano (2013): The Perfect Duty to Oneself Merely as a Moral Being (TL 6: 428–437), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 245–68.
- 2015 [60] Bacin, Stefano (2015): Kant's Idea of Human Dignity. Between Tradition and Originality, *Kant-Studien* 106, S. 97–106. – Zu [1313].
- 2007 [61] Backström, Joel (2007): *The Fear of Openness. An Essay on Friendship and the Roots of Morality*, Åbo, S. 138–53 (“Respect vs. love (Kant)”).
- 2015 [62] Bader, Ralf M. (2015): Kantian Axiology and the Dualism of Practical Reason, in *The Oxford Handbook of Value Theory*, hrsg. von Iwao Hirose und Jonas Olson, Oxford, S. 175–201.
- 2015 [63] Bader, Ralf M. (2015): Kant's Theory of the Highest Good, in *The Highest Good in Aristotle and Kant*, hrsg. von Joachim Aufderheide und Ralf M. Bader, Oxford, S. 183–213.
- 2017 [64] Bagnoli, Carla (2017): Kant in Metaethics: The Paradox of Autonomy, Solved by Publicity, in *The Palgrave Kant Handbook*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, London, S. 355–77.
- 2013 [65] Baiasu, Sorin (2013): Introduction: Practical Justification in Kant, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 1–21.
- 2013 [66] Baiasu, Sorin (2013): Kant's *Rechtfertigung* and the Epistemic Character of Practical Justification, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 22–41.
- 1993 [67] Baier, Annette (1993): Moralism and Cruelty: Reflections on Hume and Kant, *Ethics* 103, S. 436–57. Wiederabgedruckt in Baier, *Moral Prejudices. Essays on Ethics*, Cambridge, Mass. 1995, S. 268–93.

- 1958 [68] Baier, Kurt (1958): *The Moral Point of View. A Rational Basis of Ethics*, Ithaca, London, S. 277–95 (“Kant’s Doctrines”). – *Der Standpunkt der Moral. Eine rationale Grundlegung der Ethik*, Düsseldorf 1974, S. 259–75 („Kants Lehren“).
- 2010 [69] Bailey, Tom (2010): Analysing the Good Will: Kant’s Argument in the First Section of the Groundwork, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 18, S. 635–62.<sup>10</sup>
- 1986 [70] Baker, Judith (1986): Do One’s Motives Have to be Pure?, in *Philosophical Grounds of Rationality: Intentions, Categories, Ends*, hrsg. von Richard Grandy und Richard Warner, Oxford, S. 457–73.
- 1988 [71] Baker, Judith (1988): Counting Categorical Imperatives, *Kant-Studien* 79, S. 389–406.
- 2011 [72] Bambauer, Christoph (2011): *Deontologie und Teleologie in der kantischen Ethik*, Freiburg/München.
- 2003 [73] Banham, Gary (2003): *Kant’s Practical Philosophy. From Critique to Doctrine*, New York.
- 2007 [74] Banham, Gary (2007): Kant’s Moral Theory, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 15, S. 581–93.
- 1998 [75] Barcalow, Emmett (1998): *Moral Philosophy. Theories and Issues*, Belmont, CA, 2. Auflage, S. 142–61 (“Kantian Moral Theory”).
- 1971 [76] Barnes, G. W. (1971): In Defense of Kant’s Doctrine of the Highest Good, *Philosophical Forum* 2, S. 466–58.
- 1984 [77] Baron, Marcia W. (1984): The Alleged Moral Repugnance of Acting from Duty, *Journal of Philosophy* 81, S. 197–220.
- 1987 [78] Baron, Marcia W. (1987): Kantian Ethics and Supererogation, *Journal of Philosophy* 84, S. 237–62.
- 1995 [79] Baron, Marcia W. (1995): *Kantian Ethics Almost without Apology*, Ithaca.
- 1997 [80] Baron, Marcia W. (1997): Kantian Ethics, in Marcia W. Baron, Philip Pettit, Michael Slote, *Three Methods of Ethics: A Debate*, Oxford, S. 3–91.
- 1997 [81] Baron, Marcia W. (1997): Love and Respect in the Doctrine of Virtue, in *Spindel Conference 1997 on Kant’s Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Nelson Potter und Mark Timmons (*Southern Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 36, Supplement), Memphis, S. 29–44 (dazu: Robert Johnson, Comments: Love in Vain, S. 45–50).
- 1998 [82] Baron, Marcia W. (1998): Imperfect Duties and Supererogatory Acts, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 6, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 57–71.

---

<sup>10</sup> “This article contends that the first section of Kant’s *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* provides a sophisticated and valid argument, and that commentators are therefore mistaken in dismissing this section as flawed. In particular, the article undertakes to show that in this section Kant argues from a conception of the goodness of a good will to two distinctive features of moral goodness, and from these features to his ‘formula of universal law’. The article reveals the sophistication and validity of this argument by considering it in the light of a number of criticisms that are commonly levelled at the section. In conclusion, the article proposes that this interpretation of the section also has significant implications for the understanding of Kant’s method, his formulas and his basic conception of the ‘moral’.”

- 2002 [83] Baron, Marcia W. (2002): Love and Respect in the *Doctrine of Virtue*, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 391–408.
- 2002 [84] Baron, Marcia (2002): Acting from Duty, in Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, edited and translated by Allen W. Wood. With Essays by J. B. Schneewind, Marica Baron, Shelly Kagan, Allen W. Wood, New Haven 2002, S. 92–110. – Handeln aus Pflicht, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn 2004, S. 80–97.
- 2006 [85] Baron, Marcia (2006): Acting from Duty (GMS, 397–401), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 72–92.
- 2006 [86] Baron, Marcia (2006): Moral Paragons and the Metaphysics of Morals, in *A Companion to Kant*, hrsg. von Graham Bird, Oxford, S. 335–49.
- 2006 [87] Baron, Marcia (2006): Overdetermined Actions and Imperfect Duties, in *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, hrsg. von Heiner F. Klemme, Manfred Kühn und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. 23–37.
- 2008 [88] Baron, Marcia (2008): Virtue Ethics, Kantian Ethics, and the “One Thought Too Many” Objection, in *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 245–77.
- 2011 [89] Baron, Marcia (2011): Virtue Ethics in Relation to Kantian Ethics: An Opinionated Overview and Commentary, in *Perfecting Virtue. New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence Jost und Julian Wuerth, Cambridge, S. 8–37.
- 2013 [90] Baron, Marcia (2013): Friendship, Duties Regarding Specific Conditions of Persons, and the Virtues of Social Intercourse (TL 6: 468–474), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 365–82.
- 2013 [91] Baron, Marcia (2013): Moral Worth and Moral Rightness, Maxims and Actions, in *Reading Onora O'Neill*, hrsg. von David Archard, Monique Deveaux, Neil Manson und Daniel Weinstock, London, S. 11–16.
- 2014 [92] Baron, Marcia (2014): Kantian Moral Maturity and the Cultivation of Character, in *Kant on Emotion and Value*, hrsg. von Alix Cohen, Houndmills, S. 69–87.
- 2009 [93] Baron, Marcia/Seymour Fahmy, Melissa (2009): Beneficence and Other Duties of Love in *The Metaphysics of Morals*, in *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*, hrsg. von Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Malden, MA, S. 211–28.
- 2015 [94] Barry, Peter Brian (2015): The Kantian Case Against Torture, *Philosophy* 90, S. 593–621.<sup>11</sup>
- 2004 [95] Bartuschat, Wolfgang (2004): Kant über Grundsatz und Grundsätze in der Moral, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik*, Band 12, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C.

---

<sup>11</sup> “There is a decided consensus that Kantian ethics yields an absolutist case against torture – that torture is morally wrong and absolutely so. I argue that while there is a Kantian case against torture, Kantian ethics does not clearly entail absolutism about torture. I consider several arguments for a Kantian absolutist position concerning torture and explain why none are sound. I close by clarifying just what the Kantian case against torture is. My contention is that while Kantian ethics does not support a variety of moral absolutism about torture, it does suggest a strong version of legal absolutism.”

Joerden, Berlin, S. 283–98.

- 1917 [96] Bauch, Bruno (1917): *Immanuel Kant*, Berlin, Leipzig, S. 303–38 („Die Prinzipien der Sittlichkeit“).
- 1998 [97] Baum, Manfred (1998): Probleme der Begründung Kantischer Tugendpflichten, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 6, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 41–56.
- 2005 [98] Baum, Manfred (2005): Sittlichkeit und Freiheit in Kants *Grundlegung*, in *Ethikbegründungen zwischen Universalismus und Relativismus*, hrsg. von Kristina Engelhard und Dietmar H. Heidemann, Berlin, S. 183–202.
- 2006 [99] Baum, Manfred (2006): Gefühl, Begehren und Wollen in Kants praktischer Philosophie, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 125–39.
- 2007 [100] Baum, Manfred (2007): Recht und Ethik in Kants praktischer Philosophie, in *Kant in der Gegenwart*, hrsg. von Jürgen Stolzenberg, Berlin, S. 213–26.
- 2009 [101] Baum, Manfred (2009): Politik und Moral in Kants praktischer Philosophie, in *Kant und die Zukunft der europäischen Aufklärung*, hrsg. von Heiner Klemme, Berlin, S. 386–99.
- 2013 [102] Baum, Manfred (2013): Freiheit und Recht bei Kant, in *Kant und die Philosophie in weltbürgerlicher Absicht. Akten des XI. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Stefano Bacin, Alfredo Ferrarin, Claudio La Rocca und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, New York, Band 1, S. 73–92.
- 2013 [103] Baum, Manfred (2013): Prior Concepts of the Metaphysics of Morals (MS 6: 221–228), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 113–38.
- 2014 [104] Baum, Manfred (2014): Kant über die Empfänglichkeit des Gemüts für Pflichtbegriffe überhaupt, in *Affektivität und Ethik bei Kant und in der Phänomenologie*, hrsg. von Inga Römer, Berlin, S. 101–16.
- 2014 [105] Baum, Manfred (2014): Sittengesetz und Freiheit. Kant 1785 und 1788, in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 209–26.
- 2016 [106] Baum, Manfred (2016): Drei kategorische Imperative bei Kant, in *Das Verhältnis von Recht und Ethik in Kants praktischer Philosophie*, hrsg. von Bernd Dörflinger, Dieter Hüning und Günter Kruck, Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, S. 131–52.
- 1991 [107] Baumann, Lutz (1991): Verstand, Vernunft, Gesetz. Bemerkungen zur Struktur der praktischen Philosophie Kants, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 501–12.
- 2001 [108] Baumann, Peter (2001): Epistemologische Aspekte in Kants Moralphilosophie, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 3–12.
- 1982 [109] Baumanns, Peter (1982): Kants kategorischer Imperativ und das Problem der inhaltlichen

Pflichtbestimmung, in *Überlieferung und Aufgabe. Festschrift für Erich Heintel zum 70. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Herta Nagl-Docekal, Wien, 2. Teilband, S. 165–79.

- 2000 [109] Baumanns, Peter (2000): *Kants Ethik. Die Grundlehre*, Würzburg.
- 2001 [110] Baumgarten, Hans-Ulrich (2001): Kants kritischer Begriff der Gesinnung, in *Systematische Ethik mit Kant*, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 55–81.
- 2001 [111] Baumgarten, Hans-Ulrich/Held, Carsten (Hrsg.) (2001): *Systematische Ethik mit Kant*, Freiburg.
- 2003 [112] Baxley, Anne Margaret (2003): Does Kantian Virtue Amount to More than Continenence?, *Review of Metaphysics* 56, S. 559–86.
- 2007 [113] Baxley, Anne Margaret (2007): Kantian Virtue, *Philosophy Compass* 2, S. 396–410.<sup>12</sup>
- 2010 [114] Baxley, Anne Margaret (2010): The Aesthetics of Morality: Schiller's Critique of Kantian Rationalism, *Philosophy Compass* 5, S. 1084–95.
- 2010 [115] Baxley, Anne Margaret (2010): *Kant's Theory of Virtue: The Value of Autocracy*, Cambridge. – Vgl. Dazu [467].
- 2005 [116] Baz, Avner (2005): Moral Justification and the Idea of an Ethical Position, *Philosophy* 80, S. 101–23.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> “Kant’s most familiar and widely read works in practical reason are the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785) and the *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788). His principal aims in these works are to analyze the nature and ground of morality and to justify its supreme principle (the categorical imperative). Nevertheless, in these texts, Kant also paints a picture of what it means to have a good will or good character, and it is this account of the good will and the associated theory of moral motivation that have been the target of many of the historical and contemporary objections to Kant’s rationalism. From the perspective of these foundational works in Kant’s moral theory, it appears that all that is required for Kantian character is a firm commitment to do one’s duty from the motive of duty in the absence of inclination, or in the teeth of countervailing inclination. Kant’s defenders have rightly insisted that it would be hasty to draw any final conclusions about his considered views on character and moral psychology on the basis of the *Groundwork* and the second *Critique*. An adequate assessment of these kinds of charges against Kant, they have argued, must address his theory of virtue, as it is set out in his other important ethical texts, especially the *Doctrine of Virtue* (1797) and *Religion Within the Boundaries of Mere Reason* (1793). In his theory of virtue, Kant presents a detailed account of virtue as a character trait, provides lengthy discussions of the various virtues he sees as central for the ethical life, and maintains that there are moral feelings that are part of a virtuous character and serviceable for morality. For these reasons, those interested in gleaning a more complete picture of Kant’s ethics await a detailed, systematic account of Kant’s views about virtue. This entry aims to sketch the outlines of such an account.”

<sup>13</sup> “In this paper I develop a critique of Kantian ethics, and more precisely a critique of a particular conception of moral reasoning. The fundamental assumption that underlies the conception that I am targeting is that to justify (morally or otherwise) an action is (perhaps with an ‘all things being equal’ clause) to settle its value, in such a way that all rational participants would have to acknowledge that value. As an alternative to the Kantian conception, I propose a conception in which the basic unit of moral reasoning is not an action but rather what I call an ‘ethical position’ – where an ethical position is where, at any given moment and with respect to the matter at hand, you stand, and where moral reasoning consists in the articulation of ethical positions.”

- 2008 [117] Baz, Avner (2008): Being Right, and Being in the Right, *Inquiry* 51, S. 627–44.<sup>14</sup>
- 2006 [118] Beck, Gunnar (2006): Immanuel Kant's Theory of Rights, *Ratio Juris* 19, S. 371–401.<sup>15</sup>
- 1949 [119] Beck, Lewis White (1949): Introduction, in Immanuel Kant: *Critique of Practical Reason and Other Writings in Moral Philosophy*, übersetzt und hrsg. von L. W. Beck, New York 1976, S. 1–49.
- 1955 [120] Beck, Lewis White (1955): Sir David Ross on Duty and Purpose in Kant, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 16, S. 98–107. Wiederabgedruckt in Beck, *Studies in the Philosophy of Kant*, Indianapolis 1965, S. 165–76.
- 1957 [121] Beck, Lewis White (1957): Apodictic Imperatives, *Kant-Studien* 49, S. 7–24. Wiederabgedruckt in Beck, *Studies in the Philosophy of Kant*, Indianapolis 1965, S. 177–99.
- 1960 [122] Beck, Lewis White (1960): Das Faktum der Vernunft: Zur Rechtfertigungsproblematik in der Ethik, *Kant-Studien* 52, S. 271–82. – The Fact of Reason: An Essay on Justification in Ethics, in Beck, *Studies in the Philosophy of Kant*, Indianapolis 1965, S. 200–214.
- 1960 [123] Beck, Lewis White (1960): *A Commentary on Kant's Critique of Practical Reason*, Chicago. – *Kants „Kritik der praktischen Vernunft“. Ein Kommentar*, München 1974.
- 1962 [124] Beck, Lewis White (1962/63): The Importance of the Highest Good in Kant's Ethics, *Ethics* 73, S. 179–87. – Deutsch in *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 23 (1969), S. 537–49.
- 1993 [125] Becker, Don (1993): Kant's Moral and Political Philosophy, in *The Age of German Idealism*, hrsg. von Robert C. Solomon und Kathleen Higgins, London, New York, S. 68–102 (*Routledge History of Philosophy* vol. 6).
- 1991 [126] Bencivenga, Ermanno (1991): The Metaphysical Structure of Kant's Moral Philosophy, *Philosophical Topics* 19, S. 17ff.

---

<sup>14</sup> “This paper presents a critique of a prevailing conception of the relation between moral reasoning and judgment on the one hand, and moral goodness on the other. I argue that moral reasoning is inescapably vulnerable to moral, as opposed to merely theoretical, failure. This, I argue, means that there is something deeply misleading in the way that Kant's moral theory, and some of its main rivals, have invited us to conceive of their subject matter.”

<sup>15</sup> “It is common for Kant's rights-based liberalism to be contrasted with the communitarian authoritarianism of the later Fichte and of Hegel, and it is the concept of autonomy that is generally regarded as the theoretical fount of Kant's theory of natural rights, providing the analytical link between Kant's moral philosophy and his political and legal theory. The author argues that this view is erroneous: The notion of autonomy ultimately remains contentless and incapable of providing practical political and legal prescriptions without Kant's substantive account of human nature, an account specifying both the proper moral ends that humans should strive for and the anthropological limits of human perfectibility. Kant's theory of rights is informed by both sets of considerations. Contrary to the received view, Kant develops a socially sensitive account of the self in his later writings, and comes to believe that individual autonomy depends in large measure on the realisation of certain propitious sociocultural and political arrangements. For Kant, natural rights, like individual freedom, are not ahistorical, universal standards of political justice but the historical outcome of the long process of enlightenment. As such, what is right will depend on what is timely. Here Kant is much closer to Fichte and Hegel than is generally acknowledged.”

- 2006 [127] Bencivenga, Ermanno (2006): *Ethics Vindicated: Kant's Transcendental Legitimation of Moral Discourse*, Oxford.<sup>16</sup>
- 1998 [128] Benn, Piers (1998): *Ethics*, Montreal, S. 91–111 ("Kant's Ethics").
- 1980 [129] Benton, Robert J. (1980): Kant's Categories of Practical Reason as Such, *Kant-Studien* 71, S. 181–201.
- 2014 [130] Berg, Jan (2014): *Die theoretische Philosophie Kants. Unter Berücksichtigung der Grundbegriffe seiner Ethik*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, S. 193–240 („Moralphilosophie“).
- 2015 [131] Berger, Larissa (2015): Der »Zirkel« im dritten Abschnitt der Grundlegung – Eine neue Interpretation und ein Literaturbericht, in *Kants Begründung von Freiheit und Moral in Grundlegung III. Neue Interpretationen*, hrsg. von Dieter Schönecker, Münster, S. 9–82.
- 1999 [132] Berkowitz, Peter (1999): *Virtue and the Making of Modern Liberalism*, Princeton, S. 106–33 ("Kant: Virtue within the Limits of Reason Alone").
- 1910 [133] Bernays, Paul (1910): Das Moralprinzip bei Sidgwick und bei Kant, *Abhandlungen der Fries'schen Schule*, Neue Folge 3, Heft 3, S. 501–82: S. 554–82 („Das Kantische Moralprinzip“).
- 2006 [134] Bernecker, Sven (2006): Kant zur moralischen Selbsterkenntnis, *Kant-Studien* 97, S. 163–83.<sup>17</sup>
- 2001 [135] Betzler, Monika (2001): Moralische Konflikte: Versuch einer kantischen Deutung, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 141–51.
- 2008 [136] Betzler, Monika (Hrsg.) (2008): *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, Berlin.
- 2015 [137] Biasetti, Pierfrancesco (2015): *From Beauty to Love: A Kantian Way to Environmental Moral*

---

<sup>16</sup> "Can we regard ourselves as having free will? What is the place of values in a world of facts? What grounds the authority of moral injunctions, and why should we care about them? Unless we provide satisfactory answers to these questions, ethics has no credible status and is likely to be subsumed by psychology, history, or rational decision theory. According to Ermanno Bencivenga, this outcome is both common and regrettable.

Bencivenga points to Immanuel Kant for the solution. Kant's philosophy is a sustained, bold, and successful effort aiming at offering us the answers we need. *Ethics Vindicated* is a clear and thorough account of this effort that builds on Bencivenga's previous interpretation of transcendental philosophy (as articulated in his Kant's Copernican Revolution) and draws on the entire Kantian corpus."

<sup>17</sup> „Der intentionalistischen Ethik oder Gesinnungsethik zufolge ist das, was an einer Handlung moralisch beurteilt wird, die Handlungsabsicht oder Intention. Der bedeutendste Vertreter des ethischen Intentionalismus, Immanuel Kant, spricht freilich nicht von „Absichten“ sondern von „Maximen“. Dem hier zugrundegelegten Verständnis zufolge sind Maximen weder Handlungsmotive noch Handlungsstrukturen, sondern Handlungsabsichten. Jedoch ist nicht jede beliebige Absicht eine Maxime. Eine Maxime zu haben, heißt für Kant, sich bewußt entschlossen zu haben, so-und-so zu handeln. Handeln nach Maximen ist regelgeleitetes Verhalten. Der Begriff der Maxime bezieht sich nur auf okkurren (nicht auf dispositionale) Absichten. Und schließlich sind Maximen solche Absichten, die nicht auf eine singulare Verwirklichung abzielen, sondern für einen ganzen Lebensbereich das leitende Handlungsprinzip aufstellen.“

Theory, *Environmental Philosophy* 12, S. 139–60.

- 1980 [138] Bierman, A. K. (1980): *Life and Morals. An Introduction to Ethics*, New York, S. 240–376, 390–94.
- 2004 [139] Biller-Andorno, Nikola (2004): Die Kantische Moraltheorie im Kontext der modernen Medizinethik, in *Angewandte Ethik im Spannungsfeld von Begründung und Anwendung*, hrsg. von Hans Friesen und Karsten Berr, Frankfurt a. M., S. 295–308.
- 1993 [140] Billington, Ray (1993): *Living Philosophy. An Introduction to Moral Thought*, London, S. 109–31 (“Ends and Means I: Kant”).
- 2003 [141] Birnbacher, Dieter (2003): *Analytische Einführung in die Ethik*, Berlin, S. 136–54 („4.3.1 Kants Kategorischer Imperativ“).
- 2015 [142] Biss, Mavis (2015): Kantian Moral Striving, *Kantian Review* 20, S. 1–23.<sup>18</sup>
- 1974 [143] Bittner, Rüdiger (1974): Maximen, in *Akten des 4. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses Mainz 1974*, hrsg. von G. Funke, Berlin, Teil II.2, S. 485–98.
- 1980 [144] Bittner, Rüdiger (1980): Hypothetische Imperative, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 34, S. 210–26.
- 1983 [145] Bittner, Rüdiger (1983): *Moralisches Gebot oder Autonomie*, Freiburg, München, S. 115–72.
- 1989 [146] Bittner, Rüdiger (1989): Das Unternehmen einer Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 13–30.
- 1975 [147] Bittner, Rüdiger/Cramer, Konrad (Hrsg.) (1975): *Materialien zu Kants „Kritik der praktischen Vernunft“*, Frankfurt a. M.
- 1998 [148] Blackburn, Simon (1998): *Ruling Passions. A Theory of Practical Reasoning*, Oxford, S. 214–24 (“Kant’s Dream”).
- 2000 [149] Blackburn, Simon (2001): *Being Good. A Short Introduction to Ethics*, Oxford, S. 116–24 (“The Categorical Imperative”).
- 2015 Blöser, Claudia (2015): Degrees of Responsibility in Kant’s Practical Philosophy, *Kantian Review* 20, S. 183–209.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> “This paper focuses on a single question that highlights some of the most puzzling aspects of Kant’s explanation of the duty of moral self-perfection. What kinds of activity count as striving for purity in one’s disposition to duty, or strength of will? I argue that a dominant strand of Kant’s approach to moral striving does not fit familiar models of striving. I seek to address this problem in a way that avoids the flaws of synchronic and atomistic approaches to moral self-discipline by developing an account of Kantian moral striving as an ongoing contemplative activity complexly engaged with multiple forms of self-knowledge.”

<sup>19</sup> “It has been argued that Kant’s practical philosophy cannot allow for degrees of responsibility for one’s actions. However, it would be uncompromising to allow for only two possibilities: either full responsibility or none. Moreover, in the *Metaphysics of Morals* Kant himself claims that there can be degrees of responsibility, depending on the magnitude of the obstacles that have to be overcome when acting. I will show that this claim is consistent with Kant’s theory as a whole and thereby make transparent how degrees of responsibility are possible for Kant. The solution is based on the distinction between two senses of

- 1995 [150] Blosser, Philip (1995): *Scheler's Critique of Kant's Ethics*, Athens, OH.
- 2008 [151] Bobko, Aleksander (2008): The Relationship between Ethics and Religion in Kant's Philosophy, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 53–62.
- 2012 [152] Bojanowski, Jochen (2012): Is Kant a Moral Realist, *Kant-Yearbook 4: Kant and Contemporary Moral Philosophy*, S. 1–22.<sup>20</sup>
- 2014 [153] Bojanowski, Jochen (2014): Kants Disjunktivismus in GMS 446f., in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 189–208.
- 2015 [154] Bojanowski, Jochen (2015): Categories of Freedom as Categories of Practical Cognition, *Kantian Review* 20, S. 211–34.<sup>21</sup>
- 2015 [155] Bojanowski, Jochen (2015): Die Deduktion des Kategorischen Imperativs, in *Kants Begründung von Freiheit und Moral in Grundlegung III. Neue Interpretationen*, hrsg. von Dieter Schönecker, Münster, S. 83–108.
- 2015 [156] Bojanowski, Jochen (2015): Kant on Human Dignity. A Response to Oliver Sensen, *Kant-Studien* 106, S. 78–87. – Zu [1313].

---

responsibility: taking oneself to be an accountable person is an all-or-nothing affair, whereas praise- or blameworthiness for a particular action can still be a matter of degree.”

<sup>20</sup> “In “The Sources of Normativity” Christine Korsgaard attempts to defend Kant’s moral ontology as a kind of moral realism. She does so by way of drawing a distinction between substantial and procedural moral realism. After dismissing substantial realism as dogmatic and defending procedural moral realism, she goes on to claim that Kant’s view is best described as procedural moral realism. It has been argued against Korsgaard that procedural moral realism is a misnomer and that it turns out to be an anti-realist position. I don’t think that this criticism is correct and I will defend Korsgaard against the subjectivist objections that have been leveled against her. However, my main concern is to show why even Korsgaard’s procedural moral realism is still not completely in line with Kant’s own epistemological and ontological commitments. In contrast to Korsgaard, I argue that Kant’s conception of reason as a capacity that is “by itself practical” commits him to a position which is best described by what I will call “moral idealism.” Practical reason is not merely a faculty for cognizing some testing procedure that would reliably distinguish between good and bad maxims. In Kant, practical cognition consists in cognition of what I ought to do such that I do it, i. e. bring the object of my cognition into existence through a kind of self-affection.”

<sup>21</sup> “Kant famously claims that the table of the categories of freedom does not require explanation, ‘since it is intelligible enough of itself’ (*Critique of Practical Reason* 5 : 67). Kant interpreters have been baffled by this claim, and the disagreement among the increasing number of studies in more recent years suggests that the table is not as straightforward as Kant took it to be. In this article I want to show that a coherent interpretation of the table depends essentially on a clarification of what have been taken to be three fundamental ambiguities in Kant’s presentation of the table. This assumption about ambiguities in Kant’s text is, I argue, rooted in a hybrid conception of practical rationality assumed by his interpreters. I believe the task of disambiguating the table in all three cases can be completed. But it will require spelling out Kant’s moral cognitivism in such a way that he emerges as holding what I will call a unitary account of practical rationality.”

- 2017 [157] Bojanowski, Jochen (2017): Kant on the Justification of Moral Principles, *Kant-Studien* 108, S. 55–88.
- 2018 [158] Bojanowski, Jochen (2018): Thinking about Cases: Applying Kant's Universal Law Formula, *European Journal of Philosophy* 26, S. 1253–68.<sup>22</sup>
- 1966 [159] Bollnow, Otto Friedrich (1966): „Als allein ein guter Wille ...“. Zum Anfang der „Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten“, in *Rationalität – Phänomenalität – Individualität. Festgabe für Hermann und Marie Glockner*, hrsg. von Wolfgang Ritzel, Bonn, S. 165–74.
- 2001 [160] Borges, Maria de Lourdes (2001): Sympathy in Kant's Moral Theory, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 152–58.
- 2008 [161] Borges, Maria (2008): Reasons and Causes of Actions in Kant, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 63–70.
- 2003 [162] Bowman, Curtis (2003): A Deduction of Kant's Concept of the Highest Good, *Journal of Philosophical Research* 28, S. 45–63.
- 2008 [163] Braga, Antonio Frederico Saturnino (2008): Brief Comments on the Concept of Categorical Imperative, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 13–22.
- 2015 [164] Braham, Matthew/van Hees, Martin (2015): The Formula of Universal Law: A Reconstruction,

---

<sup>22</sup> “According to a widespread view, Kant's claim that moral wrongness has its ground in a contradiction underlying every immoral action is a “bluff” rooted in “dogmatic moralism”. Ever since Benjamin Constant's exchange with Kant, counterexamples have played a crucial role in showing why Kant's “universalization procedure” fails to determine the moral validity of our judgments. Despite recent attempts to bring Kant's ethics closer to Aristotle's, these counterexamples have prevailed. Most recently, Jesse Prinz has launched another attack along the same lines. Prinz insists that Kant's universalization procedure fundamentally begs the question and fails to generate plausible results. Even authors who are very sympathetic to Kant, such as Allen Wood, have tried to downplay universalization, focusing instead on other formulations of the categorical imperative. In this paper, I respond directly to four of the most prominent counterexamples. In each case, I aim to show how we can uphold Kant's fundamental claim that the universal law formulation of the categorical imperative articulates the form of our particular moral judgments.”

- 1988 [165] Brandt, Reinhard (1988): Der Zirkel im dritten Abschnitt von Kants Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten, in *Kant. Analysen – Probleme – Kritik*, hrsg. von Hariolf Oberer und Gerhard Seel, Würzburg, S. 169–91.
- 1993 [166] Brandt, Reinhard (1993): Gerechtigkeit bei Kant, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 1, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 25–44.<sup>24</sup>
- 2002 [167] Brandt, Reinhard (2002): „Kritische Beleuchtung der Analytik der reinen praktischen Vernunft“ (89–106), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 153–72.
- 2006 [168] Brandt, Reinhard (2006): Die Selbstverwirklichung des Menschen in der Kantischen Moralphilosophie (Ein Stenogramm), in *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, hrsg. von Heiner F. Klemme, Manfred Kühn und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. 39–58.
- 2008 [169] Brandt, Reinhard/Esler, Andrea/Forst, Rainer/Leist, Anton (2008): Kants Ethik in der Diskussion. Stellungnahmen von Reinhard Brandt, Andrea Esser, Rainer Forst und Anton Leist, *Information Philosophie* 36, Nr. 2, S. 26–35.
- 1959 [170] Brandt, Richard B. (1959): *Ethical Theory. The Problems of Normative and Critical Ethics*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., S. 27–35 (“Immanuel Kant’s Test for the Morality of Actions”).
- 1952 [171] Brentano, Franz (1952): *Grundlegung und Aufbau der Ethik*. Nach den Vorlesungen über „Praktische Philosophie“ aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Franziska Mayer-Hillebrand, Hamburg 1978 (Erste Auflage: Bern 1952), S. 33–40.
- 2001 [172] Brewer, Talbot (2001): Rethinking our Maxims: Perceptual Salience and Practical Judgment in Kantian Ethics, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 4, S. 219–30.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> “This paper provides a methodologically original construction of Kant’s “Formula of Universal Law” (FUL). A formal structure consisting of possible worlds and games—a “game frame”—is used to implement Kant’s concept of a maxim and to define the two tests FUL comprises: the “contradiction in conception” and “contradiction in the will” tests. The paper makes two contributions. Firstly, the model provides a formal account of the variables that are built into FUL: agents, maxims, intentions, actions, and outcomes. This establishes a clear benchmark for understanding how the mechanics of FUL actually work. Secondly, the analysis of the resulting framework sheds new light on discussions about the implications of FUL. On the basis of this, we suggest a move to “comprehensive Kantianism”, which is the application of FUL to systems of maxims rather than to isolated maxims.”

<sup>24</sup> “Kant’s ethics do not include a discussion of justice as a specific virtue, and the “Metaphysical First Principles of the Doctrine of Right” appear to deal only with private and public law, but not with justice. In fact, Kant’s ethics in the three Critiques and later relevant writings is dependent on God’s *iustitia distributiva* as the highest good and the institution of the state is labelled as “public justice”. This article attempts to explain this connection and to provide a contribution to the topic of Kantian justice. The Epilogue to this article discusses a letter dated November 6, 1790, which Kant wrote in one of his official capacities at the University of Königsberg and which as of yet has remained unpublished.”

<sup>25</sup> “Some contemporary Kantians have argued that one could not be virtuous without having internalized certain patterns of awareness that permit one to identify and respond reliably to moral reasons for action. I agree, but I argue that this insight requires unrecognized, far-reaching, and thoroughly welcome changes in

- 2002 [173] Brewer, Talbot (2002): Maxims and Virtues, *Philosophical Review* 111, S. 539–72.
- 2002 [174] Brewer, Talbot (2002): The Character of Temptation: Towards a More Plausible Kantian Moral Psychology, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 83, S. 103–30.<sup>26</sup>
- 1997 [175] Brink, David O. (1997): Kantian Rationalism: Inescapability, Authority, and Supremacy, in *Ethics and Practical Reason*, hrsg. von Garrett Cullity und Berys Gaut, Oxford, S. 255–91.
- 2001 [176] Brinkmann, Walter (2001): Die Goldene Regel und der Kategorische Imperativ: Rationalität und praktische Notwendigkeit, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 13–20.
- 2003 [177] Brinkmann, Walter (2003): *Praktische Notwendigkeit. Eine Formalisierung von Kants kategorischem Imperativ*, Paderborn.
- 2008 [178] Brito, Adriano Naves de (2008): Will, Value, and the Fact of Reason, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: Sektionen III–IV, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 23–32.
- 1930 [179] Broad, C. D. (1930): *Five Types of Ethical Theory*, London, S. 116–42 (“Kant”).
- 1963 [180] Broad, C. D. (1963): *A Commentary on Kant’s Critique of Practical Reason*, Chicago.
- 1975 [181] Brodie, A./Pybus, E. M. (1975): Kant’s Concept of Respect, *Kant-Studien* 66, S. 58–64.
- 1964 [182] Brugger, Walter (1964): Kant und das höchste Gut, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 18, S. 50–61.
- 1979 [183] Brülisauer, Bruno (1979): Kants kategorischer Imperativ aus utilitaristischer Sicht betrachtet, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 26, S. 426–55.

---

the traditional Kantian understanding of maxims and virtues. In particular, it implies that one’s characteristic emotions and desires will partly determine one’s maxims, and hence the praiseworthiness of one’s actions. I try to show this by pointing out an instability in the Kantian understanding of maxims. On the one hand, maxims are thought of as consciously affirmed, subjective principles of action. On the other hand, Kantians claim that nothing counts as an action, nor as morally assessable, unless it has a maxim. One cannot take both thoughts seriously without implausibly constricting the range of behavior that counts as action, hence as morally assessable. This difficulty can be overcome, I suggest, by jettisoning the idea that maxims must be consciously affirmed, and by stressing the way in which maxims are grounded in the pruning and shaping of one’s emotions and desires during socialization. This opens the door to a rich Kantian theory of virtue. It also raises questions about the scope and ground of our moral responsibility, which I address at the end of the paper.”

<sup>26</sup> “Kant maintained that dutiful action can have the fullest measure of moral worth even if chosen in the face of powerful inclinations to act immorally, and indeed that opposing inclinations only highlight the worth of the action. I argue that this conclusion rests on an implausibly mechanistic account of desires, and that many desires are constituted by tendencies to see certain features of one’s circumstances as reasons to perform one or another action. I try to show that inclinations to violate moral requirements sometimes manifest a morally objectionable half-heartedness in one’s commitment to those very requirements, and – by extension – to the values that undergird these requirements.”

- 1988 [184] Brülisauer, Bruno (1988): *Moral und Konvention. Darstellung und Kritik ethischer Theorien*, Frankfurt a. M., S. 287–305 („Der Kategorische Imperativ“).
- 2000 [185] Bruton, Samuel V. (2000): Establishing Kant’s Formula of Humanity, *Southwest Philosophy Review* 16, S. 41–49.
- 2001 [186] Bubner, Rüdiger (2001): Another Look at Maxims, in *Kant’s Legacy: Essays in Honor of Lewis White Beck*, hrsg. von Predrag Cicovacki, Rochester, S. 245–59.
- 1990 [187] Burri, Alex/Freudiger, Jürg (1990): Zur Analytizität hypothetischer Imperative, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 44, S. 98–105.
- 2008 [188] Bustos, Keith (2008): Defending a Kantian Conception of Duties to Self and Others, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 42, S. 241–254. – Zu [686].
- 2016 [189] Byers, Philippa (2016): Dependence and a Kantian Conception of Dignity as a Value, *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics* 37, S. 61–69.<sup>27</sup>
- 1997 [190] Byrd, B. Sharon (1997): Kant’s Theory of Contract, in *Spindel Conference 1997 on Kant’s Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Nelson Potter und Mark Timmons (*Southern Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 36, Supplement), Memphis, S. 131–53 (dazu: Kenneth R. Westphal, Comments: Is Kant’s Table of Contracts Complete?, S. 155–60).
- 2002 [191] Byrd, B. Sharon (2002): Kant’s Theory of Contract, in *Kant’s Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 111–32.
- 2006 [192] Byrd, B. Sharon/Hruschka, Joachim (2006): Der ursprünglich und a priori vereinigte Wille und seine Konsequenzen in Kants *Rechtslehre*, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 141–65.
- 2006 [193] Byrd, B. Sharon/Hruschka, Joachim (2006): Kant on “Why Must I Keep My Promise?”, *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 81, S. 47–74.
- 1997 [194] Byrd, B. Sharon/Hruschka, Joachim/Joerden, Jan C. (1997): *200 Jahre Kants Metaphysik der Sitten (Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik Band 5)*, Berlin.
- 2005 [195] Cagle, Randy (2005): Becoming a Virtuous Agent: Kant and the Cultivation of Feelings and Emotions, *Kant-Studien* 96, S. 452–67.<sup>28</sup>
- 1889 [196] Caird, Edward (1889): *The Critical Philosophy of Immanuel Kant*, Vol. II, Glasgow. Reprint:

---

<sup>27</sup> “Kantian moral concepts concerning respect for human dignity have played a central role in articulating ethical guidelines for medical practice and research, and for articulating some central positions within bioethical debates more generally. The most common of these Kantian moral concepts is the obligation to respect the dignity of patients and of human research subjects as autonomous, self-determining individuals. This article describes Kant’s conceptual distinction between dignity and autonomy as values, and draws on the work of several contemporary Kantian philosophers who employ the distinction to make sense of some common moral intuitions, feelings, and norms. Drawing on this work, the article argues that the conceptual distinction between dignity and autonomy as values is indispensable in the context of considering our obligations to those who are dependent and vulnerable.”

<sup>28</sup> “In this paper I take up two problems that arise in connection with the Kantian duty to cultivate certain moral and non-moral feelings and emotions.”

Amsterdam 1969, S. 143–405 (Book II: Kant's Ethical Works<sup>29</sup>).

- 2005 [197] Calder, Todd (2005): Kant and Degrees of Wrongness, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 39, S. 229–44.
- 2013 [198] Callanan, John J. (2013): *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. An Edinburgh Philosophical Guide*, Edinburgh.
- 2008 [199] Callender, Lenval A. (2008): Kant's Moral Teleology and 'Consequentialism', in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 33–42.
- 1980 [200] Campbell, J. I. G. (1980): *Kantian Conceptions of Moral Worth*, Princeton.
- 1930 [201] Carritt, E. F. (1930): *The Theory of Morals. An Introduction to Ethical Philosophy*, London 1945 (Reprint with corrections), S. 76–86 ("Duty for Duty's Sake").
- 2010 [202] Carson, Thomas L. (2010): *Lying and Deception*, Oxford, S. 67–88 ("Kant and the Absolute Prohibition against Lying").
- 1987 [203] Cartwright, David (1987): Kant's View of the Moral Significance of Kindhearted Emotions and the Moral Insignificance of Kant's View, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 21, S. 291–304.
- 2008 [204] Casas, Vicente Duran (2008): Immanuel Kant: Professor of Ethics, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 93–105.
- 2006 [205] Caswell, Mathew (2006): Kant's Conception of the Highest Good, the *Gesinnung*, and the Theory of Radical Evil, *Kant-Studien* 97, S. 184–209.<sup>30</sup>
- 2008 [206] Cecchinato, Giorgia (2008): Die praktische Urteilskraft and das Gesetz der Freiheit, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 71–82.
- 2008 [207] Chagas, Flávia Carvalho (2008): The Fact of Reason and the Feeling of Respect, in *Recht und*

---

<sup>29</sup> Ch. 1: The Relation of Theoretical and Practical Reason. Ch. 2: The Formulation of the Moral Law. Ch. 3: The Idea of Freedom. Ch. 4: Moral Feeling. Ch. 5: The Summum Bonum. Ch. 6: Applied Ethics – The Principles of Jurisprudence. Ch. 7: Applied Ethics – The System of the Moral Virtues.

<sup>30</sup> "Early in the Preface to *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, Kant claims that "morality leads ineluctably to religion". This thesis is hardly an innovation of the *Religion*. Again and again throughout the critical corpus, Kant argues that religious belief is ethically significant, that it makes a morally meaningful difference whether an agent believes or disbelieves. And yet these claims are surely among the most doubted of Kant's positions – and they are often especially doubted by readers who consider themselves Kantians. That Kant of all people should have so cherished religion is perhaps surprising: his moral view enshrines the notion that moral worth arises solely from the "good will", that is, from a will determined by the moral law. Kant claims to be able to deduce this law and to account for how it motivates without ever relying on religious propositions. Rather, he grounds morality in the conception of autonomy, in the absolutely free self-legislation of the moral principle. So why, after effecting this dramatic Copernican revolution in ethics, does Kant appear to backslide, insisting on the moral necessity of religious belief?"

*Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 83–92.

- 2009 [208] Chappell, Timothy (2009): *Ethics and Experience. Life Beyond Moral Theory*, Montreal, S. 153–76.
- 2009 [209] Cherkasova, Evgenia (2009): *Dostoevsky and Kant. Dialogues on Ethics*, Amsterdam.
- 2009 [210] Cholbi, Michael (2009): The Murderer at the Door: What Kant Should Have Said, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 79, S. 17–46.<sup>31</sup>
- 2015 [211] Cholbi, Michael (2015): Kant on Euthanasia and the Duty to Die: Clearing the Air, *Journal of Medical Ethics* 41, S. 607–10.<sup>32</sup>
- 2016 [212] Cholbi, Michael (2016): *Understanding Kant’s Ethics*, Cambridge.<sup>33</sup>
- 2008 [213] Christiano, Thomas (2008): Two Conceptions of the Dignity of Persons, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 16, S. 101–27.
- 2001 [214] Cicovacki, Predrag (2001): Zwischen gutem Willen und Kategorischem Imperativ. Die Zweideutigkeit der menschlichen Natur in Kants Moralphilosophie, in *Systematische Ethik mit*

---

<sup>31</sup> “Embarrassed by the apparent rigorism Kant expresses so bluntly in ‘On a Supposed Right to Lie,’ numerous contemporary Kantians have attempted to show that Kant’s ethics can justify lying in specific circumstances, in particular, when lying to a murderer is necessary in order to prevent her from killing another innocent person. My aim is to improve upon these efforts and show that lying to prevent the death of another innocent person could be required in Kantian terms. I argue (1) that our perfect Kantian duty of self-preservation can require our lying to save our own lives when threatened with unjust aggression, and (2) that Kant’s understanding of moral duty was that duties are symmetrical, such that if one has a duty to perform a given action on one’s own behalf or to protect one’s own rational nature, then one also has a duty to perform similar acts on other’s behalf or to protect their rational nature. Thus, that the individual protected against aggression by means of deception is not oneself should be of no consequence from a Kantian perspective. Lying to the murderer is thus an extension of the Kantian requirement of self-defense.”

<sup>32</sup> “Thanks to recent scholarship, Kant is no longer seen as the dogmatic opponent of suicide that he appears to be at first glance. However, some interpreters have recently argued for a Kantian view of the morality of suicide with surprising, even radical, implications. More specifically, they have argued that Kantianism (1) requires that those with dementia or other rationality-eroding conditions end their lives before their condition results in their loss of identity as moral agents and (2) requires subjecting the fully demented or those confronting future dementia to non-voluntary euthanasia. Properly understood, Kant’s ethics have neither of these implications (1) wrongly assumes that rational agents’ duty of self-preservation entails a duty of self-destruction when they become non-rational, (2) further neglects Kant’s distinction between duties to self and duties to others and wrongly assumes that duties can be owed to rational agents only during the time of their existence.”

<sup>33</sup> Preface (p. ix). List of abbreviations (x). Introduction (1). Part I (9). 1 Kant’s Pursuit of the Supreme Principle of Morality (11). 2 The Categorical Imperative and the Kantian Theory of Value, Part I (35). 3 The Categorical Imperative and the Kantian Theory of Value, Part II (74). 4 Dignity (107). 5 Freedom, Reason, and the Possibility of the Categorical Imperative (122). Part II (143). 6 Objections to the Formula of Universal Law (145). 7 Three Problems in Kant’s Practical Ethics (174). 8 Reason, Sentiment, and Happiness: Kantian Ethics in a Good Human Life (199). 9 Conclusion (229) Index (233).

Kant, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 330–54.

- 2002 [215] Cicovacki, Predrag (2002): Introduction: Kant's Practical Philosophy Today, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 151–159.
- 2002 [216] Cicovacki, Predrag (2002): The Illusory Fabric of Kant's True Morality, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 383–99.
- 2006 [217] Clayton Coleman, Mary (2006): Korsgaard on Kant on the Value of Humanity, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 40, S. 475–78. – Zu [1538].
- 2009 [218] Clewis, Robert R. (2009): *The Kantian Sublime and the Revelation of Freedom*, Cambridge, S. 126–45 (“Moral Feeling and the Sublime”).
- 2001 [219] Clohesy, William W. (2001): Seeking Altruism in Kant's Practical Philosophy, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 159–65.
- 2008 [220] Clohesy, William W. (2008): Kant's Opposition to Lying from Expediency, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 43–52.
- 2003 [221] Coble, Kelly (2003): Kant's Dynamic Theory of Character, *Kantian Review* (Cardiff) 7, S. 38–71.
- 2004 [222] Coeckelbergh, Mark (2004): *The Metaphysics of Autonomy. The Reconciliation of Ancient and Modern Ideals of the Person*, Houndmills, S. 147–68 (“Hill's Ideal of Autonomy”), S. 169–95 (“The Ideal of the Person in Kant's *Groundwork*”).<sup>34</sup>
- 2016 [223] Cohen, Alix (2016): The Role of Feelings in Kant's Account of Moral Education, *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 50, S. 511–23.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> “7. Hill's Ideal of Autonomy 7.1. Introduction 7.2. Hill's Kantian ideal of autonomy 7.2.1. What the Kantian ideal of autonomy is not, according to Hill 7.2.2. What the Kantian ideal of autonomy is, according to Hill 7.3. Merits of Hill's ideal: the extent to which he achieves his aims and solves the problems of the extended ideal of autonomy 7.4. Why Hill fails to achieve his own aims: Is Hill's ideal Kantian? 7.5. Objections to Hill's idea of choice and deliberation 7.6. Why Hill fails to solve Problem Three of the extended ideal 7.7. Conclusion 8 The Ideal of the Person in Kant's *Groundwork* 8.1. Introduction 8.2. The ideal person according to Kant 8.2.1. Principles and reasons 8.2.2. Autonomy 8.2.3. Good will and the good 8.2.4. Why Kant's ideal of autonomy is not morally 'neutral' 8.2.5. Is self-control a Kantian virtue? More on Kant's second-best ideal of the person 8.3. Kant's answer to Problem Three 8.3.1. Two contradictory positions on the relation between autonomy and morality 8.3.2. The Wille/Willkür distinction reconsidered: Kant's concept of radical evil 8.3.3. Conclusion 8.4. Conclusion 8.4.1. Kantian autonomy and the extended ideal of autonomy 8.4.2. General conclusion.”

<sup>35</sup> “In line with familiar portrayals of Kant's ethics, interpreters of his philosophy of education focus essentially on its intellectual dimension: the notions of moral catechism, ethical gymnastics and ethical ascetics, to name but a few. By doing so, they usually emphasise Kant's negative stance towards the role of feelings in moral education. Yet there seem to be noteworthy exceptions: Kant writes that the inclinations to be honoured and loved are to be preserved as far as possible. This statement is not only at odds with Kant's general claim that education should not encourage feelings, but more importantly, it encourages a feeling

- 2014 [224] Cohen, Alix (Hrsg.) (2014): *Kant on Emotion and Value*, Houndmills.<sup>36</sup>
- 2014 [225] Cohen, G. A. (2014): *Lectures on the History of Moral and Political Philosophy*, Princeton, S. 138–82 (“Kant’s Ethics”).
- 1877 [226] Cohen, Hermann (1877): *Kants Begründung der Ethik*, Berlin.
- 1910 [227] Cohen, Hermann (1910): *Kants Begründung der Ethik nebst ihren Anwendungen auf Recht, Religion und Geschichte*, zweite verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage, Berlin. Reprint: Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag 2001 (*Werke* Band 2).
- 2017 [228] Constâncio, João/Bailey, Tom (Hrsg.) (2017): *Nietzsche and Kantian Ethics*, London. (= *Nietzsche’s Engagements with Kant and the Kantian Legacy*, hrsg. von Marco Brusotti, Herman Siemens, João Constâncio, Tom Bailey, Vol. II.)
- 1988 [229] Cooper, Neil (1988): The Formula of the End in Itself, *Philosophy* 63, S. 401f.
- 1992 [230] Copp, David (1992): The “Possibility” of A Categorical Imperative: Kant’s *Groundwork*, Part III, in *Philosophical Perspectives*, 6, *Ethics*, 1992, hrsg. von James E. Tomberlin, Atascadero, Cal., S. 261–84.
- 1984 [231] Cox, J. G. (1984): *The Will at the Crossroads. A Reconstruction of Kant’s Moral Philosophy*, Washington.
- 1983 [232] Craemer-Ruegenberg, Ingrid (1983): Logische und andere Eigenschaften des kategorischen Imperativs, *Neue Hefte für Philosophie* 22: *Kants Ethik heute*, S. 45–61.
- 1972 [233] Cramer, Konrad (1972): Hypothetische Imperative?, in *Rehabilitierung der praktischen Philosophie*, hrsg. von Manfred Riedel, Freiburg, Bd. 1, S. 159–212.
- 1991 [234] Cramer, Konrad (1991): Metaphysik und Erfahrung in Kants Grundlegung der Ethik, *Neue Hefte für Philosophie* 30/31: *Metaphysik und Erfahrung*, S. 15–68.

---

that is in many ways paradigmatically un-Kantian. How are we to understand the fact that of all feelings, the love of honour should be preserved? To answer this question, I begin by clarifying the reasons behind Kant’s negative stance towards feelings in moral education. I then turn to his account of the feeling of love of honour. After distinguishing between its good and its bad forms, I consider two ways of making sense of the positive role Kant assigns to it. The first, modest reading will suggest that the feeling of love of honour is morally useful because it has two functions: an epistemic one, and a motivational one. The second, more ambitious reading will suggest that the feeling of love of honour enables the child to experience her inner worth as bearer of value.”

<sup>36</sup> Acknowledgments. Notes on Contributors. List of Abbreviations. Alix Cohen: Introduction. Nancy Sherman: The Place of Emotions in Kantian Morality. Christine M. Korsgaard: From Duty and for the Sake of the Noble: Kant and Aristotle on Morally Good Action. Marcia Baron: Kantian Moral Maturity and the Cultivation of Character. Angelica Nuzzo: The Place of the Emotions in Kant’s Transcendental Philosophy. Wiebke Deimling: Kant’s Pragmatic Concept of Emotions. Melissa McBay Merritt: Kant on the Pleasures of Understanding. Pauline Kleingeld: Debunking Confabulation: Emotions and the Significance of Empirical Psychology for Kantian Ethics. Patrick R. Frierson: Affective Normativity. Lara Denis: Love of Honor as a Kantian Virtue. Jeanine M. Grenberg: All You Need Is Love? Pablo Muchnik: The Heart as Locus of Moral Struggle in the Religion. Michelle Grier: Kant and the Feeling of Sublimity. Katrin Flikschuh: Enthusiastic Cosmopolitanism. Bibliography. Index.

- 2001 [235] Cramer, Konrad (2001): „Depositum“ – Zur logischen Struktur eines Kantischen Beispiels für moralisches Argumentieren, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. 1, S. 116–130. – Vgl. dazu [1436], [1459].
- 2018 [236] Crisp, Roger (2018): Moral Rationalism and Demandingness in Kant: A Response to van Ackeren and Sticker, *Kantian Review* 23, S. 429–33. – Zu [2].
- 1992 [237] Croitoru, Rodica (1992): Critic and Doctrinal in Kant’s Ethics: The Moral Purpose, in *Critic and Doctrinal in Kant. The Third International Symposium, September 19–21, 1992*, hrsg. von Rodica Croitoru, Bukarest, S. 89–94.
- 2002 [238] Crowell, Steven Galt (2002): Kantianism and Phenomenology, in *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy. A Handbook*, hrsg. von John J. Drummond und Lester Embree, Dordrecht, S. 47–67.
- 1990 [239] Cummiskey, David (1990): Kantian Consequentialism, *Ethics* 100, S. 586–615.
- 1996 [240] Cummiskey, David (1996): *Kantian Consequentialism*, New York, Oxford. – Vgl. dazu: Dean, Richard (2000): Cummiskey’s Kantian Consequentialism, *Utilitas* 12, S. 25–40; Weinstock, Daniel M. (2000): Critical Notice of David Cummiskey, *Kantian Consequentialism, Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 30, S. 315–39; Wolf, Jean-Claude (2000): Rezension von David Cummiskey, *Kantian Consequentialism, Kant-Studien* 91, S. 507–11.
- 2008 [241] Cummiskey, David (2008): Dignity, Contractualism and Consequentialism, *Utilitas* 20, S. 383–408.<sup>37</sup>
- 1999 [242] Cunningham, Anthony (1999): Kantian Ethics and Intimate Attachments, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 36, S. 279–94.
- 2001 [243] Cunningham, Anthony (2001): *The Heart of What Matters. The Role for Literature in Moral Philosophy*, Berkeley, S. 20–68 (“The Aim of Ethical Theory”), 158–79 (“Kant, Moral Conflict, and Tragedy”).
- 2018 [244] Cureton, Adam (2018): Reasonable Hope in Kant’s Ethics, *Kantian Review* 23, S. 181–203.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> “Kantian respect for persons is based on the special status and dignity of humanity. There are, however, at least three distinct kinds of interpretation of the principle of respect for the dignity of persons: the contractualist conception, the substantive conception and the direct conception. Contractualist theories are the most common and familiar interpretation. The contractualist assumes that some form of consent or agreement is the crucial factor that is required by respect for persons. The substantive conceptions of dignity, on the other hand, treat the concept of dignity as a substantive value that justifies a deontological conception of respect for persons. A third conception of respect for the dignity of persons, the conception that I favor, focuses directly on the special value of our rational nature. According to this consequentialist conception, we respect the dignity of persons by promoting the flourishing of rational nature.”

<sup>38</sup> “The most apparent obstacles to a just, enlightened and peaceful social world are also, according to Kant, nature’s way of compelling us to realize those and other morally good ends. Echoing Adam Smith’s idea of the ‘invisible hand’, Kant thinks that selfishness, rivalry, quarrelsomeness, vanity, jealousy and self-conceit, along with the oppressive social inequalities they tend to produce, drive us to perfect our talents, develop culture, approach enlightenment and, through the strife and instability caused by our unsocial sociability,

- 2015 [245] Cureton, Adam/Hill, Thomas E. (2015): Kant on Virtue and the Virtues, in *Cultivating Virtue. Perspectives from Philosophy, Theology, and Psychology*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 87–109.
- 1998 [246] Darwall, Stephen (1998): *Philosophical Ethics*, Boulder, S. 139–73 (“Kant I”, “Kant II”).
- 2006 [247] Darwall, Stephen (2006): Morality and Practical Reason: A Kantian Approach, in *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory*, hrsg. von David Copp, Oxford, S. 282–320.
- 2008 [248] Darwall, Stephen (2008): Kant on Respect, Dignity, and the Duty of Respect, in *Kant’s Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 175–99.
- 2009 [249] Darwall, Stephen (2009): Why Kant Needs the Second-Person Standpoint, in *The Blackwell Guide to Kant’s Ethics*, hrsg. von Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Malden, MA, S. 138–58.
- 1996 [250] Dean, Richard (1996): What Should We Treat as an End in Itself?, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 77, S. 268–88.
- 2006 [251] Dean, Richard (2006): *The Value of Humanity in Kant’s Moral Theory*, Oxford.<sup>39</sup>

---

push us towards justice, political equality and the highest good. What are we to make of these arguments, which seem to rely on questionable empirical assumptions, invoke dubious claims about natural teleology and sit uncomfortably with fundamental aspects of Kant’s ethical framework? I suggest that the arguments reveal one of Kant’s deep and important insights about the moral life by partially describing what a good and virtuous person reasonably hopes for.”

<sup>39</sup> “The humanity formulation of Kant’s Categorical Imperative demands that we treat humanity as an end in itself. Because this principle resonates with currently influential ideals of human rights and dignity, contemporary readers often find it compelling, even if the rest of Kant’s moral philosophy leaves them cold. Moreover, some prominent specialists in Kant’s ethics recently have turned to the humanity formulation as the most theoretically central and promising principle of Kant’s ethics. Nevertheless, despite the intuitive appeal and the increasingly recognized philosophical importance of the humanity formulation, it has received less attention than many other, less central, aspects of Kant’s ethics. Richard Dean offers the most sustained and systematic examination of the humanity formulation to date.

Dean argues that the ‘rational nature’ that must be treated as an end in itself is not a minimally rational nature, consisting of the power to set ends or the unrealized capacity to act morally, but instead is the more properly rational nature possessed by someone who gives priority to moral principles over any contrary impulses. This non-standard reading of the humanity formulation provides a firm theoretical foundation for deriving plausible approaches to particular moral issues – and, contrary to first impressions, does not impose moralistic demands to pass judgment on others’ character. Dean’s reading also enables progress on problems of interest to Kant scholars, such as reconstructing Kant’s argument for accepting the humanity formulation as a basic moral principle, and allows for increased understanding of the relationship between Kant’s ethics and supposedly Kantian ideas such as ‘respect for autonomy’.

Contents: I. Good Will as an End in Itself. 1 Introduction. 2 What should we treat as an end in itself? 3 The good will reading meshes with major ideas of Kant’s ethics. 4 The textual dispute, and arguments in favour of minimal readings. 5 Is the good will reading just too hard to swallow? II. The Humanity Formulation as a Moral Principle. 6 The argument for the humanity formula. 7 How duties follow from the categorical imperative. 8 Kantian value, beneficence, and consequentialism. 9 Non-human animals, humanity, and the kingdom of ends. 10 Would Kant say we should respect moral autonomy? 11 Autonomy as an end in itself? 12 Some big pictures.”

- 2009 [252] Dean, Richard (2009): The Formula of Humanity as an End in Itself, in *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*, hrsg. von Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Malden, MA, S. 83–101.
- 2010 [253] Deigh, John (2010): *An Introduction to Ethics*, Cambridge, S. 140–56 (“Kant’s way”, “Formalism in Ethics”, “The problem with Kant’s formalism”).
- 1963 [254] Delekat, Friedrich (1963): *Immanuel Kant. Historisch-kritische Interpretation der Hauptschriften*, Heidelberg, S. 255–339.<sup>40</sup>
- 2002 [255] Deligiorgi, Katerina (2002): Universalisability, Publicity, and Communication: Kant’s Conception of Reason, *European Journal of Philosophy* 10, S. 143–159.
- 2012 [256] Deligiorgi, Katerina (2012): *The Scope of Autonomy. Kant and the Morality of Freedom*, Oxford.<sup>41</sup>
- 1991 [257] den Hartogh, Govert (1991): When is a Principle a Formal Principle?, in *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 277–90.
- 1997 [258] Denis, Lara (1997): Kant’s Ethics and Duties to Oneself, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 78, S. 321–48.
- 1999 [259] Denis, Lara (1999): Kant on the Perfection of Others, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 37, S. 21–41.
- 2000 [260] Denis, Lara (2000): Kant’s Conception of Duties Regarding Animals: Reconstruction and Reconsideration, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 17, S. 405–423.
- 2005 [261] Denis, Lara (2005): Autonomy and the Highest Good, *Kantian Review* 10, S. 33–59.
- 2007 [262] Denis, Lara (2007): Abortion and Kant’s Formula of Universal Law, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 37, S. 547–80.
- 2007 [263] Denis, Lara (2007): Kant’s Formula of the End in Itself: Some Recent Debates, *Philosophy Compass* 2, S. 244–57.<sup>42</sup>
- 2008 [264] Denis, Lara (2008): Individual and Collective Flourishing in Kant’s Philosophy, *Kantian Review* 13, S. 82–115.

---

<sup>40</sup> 12. Kapitel: Begriff und Aufgabe einer Kritik der praktischen Vernunft. 13. Kapitel: Der Begriff vom guten Willen (Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten). 14. Kapitel: Die Verwirklichung der ethischen Norm (Kritik der praktischen Vernunft). 15. Kapitel: Die Metaphysik der Sitten.

<sup>41</sup> Contents: Preface. 1: Introduction: autonomy: specification of a term, recognition of a problem. 2: Moral knowledge: pure reason and the law. 3: Moral action: normativity, motivation and autonomous willing. 4: Freedom as constraint: the morality of autonomy. 5: Knowing hearts: emotion, value, and judgement. 6: The scope of autonomy: agency, freedom, and morality. Bibliography.

<sup>42</sup> “Kant’s formula of the end in itself commands that one treat humanity in oneself and in others always as an end and never merely as a means. Interest in, and debate concerning, this formulation of the categorical imperative has been growing among Kantians and ethicists more generally. After an overview of this formulation and Kant’s argument for it, this piece outlines several areas of current debate. It then explores some dominant and emerging positions regarding two questions: the identity of the end in itself, and the relation between the end in itself and the value of other things.”

- 2008 [265] Denis, Lara (2008): Kant and Hume on Morality, in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, hrsg. von Edward N. Zalta, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-hume-morality/>.
- 2010 [266] Denis, Lara (2010): Humanity, Obligation, and the Good Will: An Argument against Dean's Interpretation of Humanity, *Kantian Review* 15, S. 118–41.
- 2010 [267] Denis, Lara (2010): Freedom, Primacy, and Perfect Duties to Oneself, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 170–91.
- 2011 [268] Denis, Lara (2011): A Kantian Conception of Human Flourishing, in *Perfecting Virtue. New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence Jost und Julian Wuerth, Cambridge, S. 164–93.
- 2013 [269] Denis, Lara (2013): Virtue and Its Ends (TL 6: 394–398), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 159–82.
- 2014 [270] Denis, Lara (2014): Love of Honor as a Kantian Virtue, in *Kant on Emotion and Value*, hrsg. von Alix Cohen, Houndmills, S. 191–209.
- 2014 [271] Denis, Lara (2014): Moral Goodness and Human Equality in Kant's Ethical Theory, in *The Palgrave Handbook on German Idealism*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, Houndmills, Basingstoke, S. 85–104.
- 2010 [272] Denis, Lara (Hrsg.) (2010): *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, Cambridge.
- 2015 [273] De Pascale, Carla (2015): Die Lehre Kants von der Menschenwürde und das idealistische Erbe, in *Wege zur Menschenwürde*, hrsg. von Vanda Fiorillo und Michael Kahlo, Münster 2015, S. 206–22.
- 2011 [274] DiCenso, James J. (2011): *Kant, Religion, and Politics*, Cambridge, S. 162–218 ("Autonomy and Judgment in Kant's Ethics").
- 1953 [275] Diemer, Alwin (1953/54): Zum Problem des Materialen in der Ethik Kants, *Kant-Studien* 45, S. 21–32.
- 2002 [276] Dieringer, Volker (2002): Was erkennt die praktische Vernunft? Zu Kants Begriff des Guten in der Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, *Kant-Studien* 93, S. 137–157.
- 1964 [277] Dietrichson, Paul (1964): When Is a Maxim Fully Universalizable?, *Kant-Studien* 55, S. 143–70.
- 2011 [278] Doğan, Aysel (2011): On the Priority of the Right to the Good, *Kant-Studien* 102, S. 316–34<sup>43</sup>.

---

<sup>43</sup> "Rawls's view that the right is prior to the good has been criticized by various scholars from divergent points of view. Some contend that Rawls's teleological/deontological distinction based on the priority of the right is misleading while others claim that no plausible ethical theory can determine what is right prior to the good. There is no consensus on how to interpret the priority of right to the good; nor is there an agreement on the criteria of teleological/deontological distinction. In this article, I argue that the critics' interpretations of the principle of the priority of right to the good as well as their conceptions of the teleological/deontological distinction have serious shortcomings to the extent that they ignore rich theoretical resources we find in Kant's moral and political philosophy. Kant's conception of human dignity and his division of the doctrine of virtue and the doctrine of right supply powerful arguments to clarify and sustain the idea of the priority of right to the good and the teleological/deontological division."

- 1985 [279] Donagan, Alan (1985): The Structure of Kant's *Metaphysics of Morals*, *Topoi* 4, S. 61–72.
- 1988 [280] Donagan, Alan (1988): The Relation of Moral Theory to Moral Judgments: A Kantian Review, in *Moral Theory and Moral Judgments in Medical Ethics*, hrsg. von Baruch Brody, Dordrecht, S. 171–92. Wiederabgedruckt in Donagan, *The Philosophical Papers of Alan Donagan Volume I: Action, Reason and Value*, hrsg. von J. E. Malpas, Chicago 1994, S. 194–216.
- 1994 [281] Donagan, Alan (1994): The Moral Theory Almost Nobody Knows: Kant's, in Donagan, *The Philosophical Papers of Alan Donagan Volume I: Action, Reason and Value*, hrsg. von J. E. Malpas, Chicago, S. 144–52.
- 2007 [282] Donnelly, Bebhinn (2007): *A Natural Law Approach to Normativity*, Aldershot, S. 29–45 ("Kant and Natural Facts").<sup>44</sup>
- 1985 [283] Doore, Gary (1985): Contradiction in the Will, *Kant-Studien* 76, S. 138–51.
- 2013 [284] Dörflinger, Bernd (2013): Ethische Methodenlehre: Didaktik und Asketik (TL 6: 477–485), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 383–410.
- 2016 [285] Dörflinger, Bernd/Hüning, Dieter/Kruck, Günter (Hrsg.) (2016): *Das Verhältnis von Recht und Ethik in Kants praktischer Philosophie*, Hildesheim, Zürich, New York.
- 1900 [286] Döring, A. (1900): Kants Lehre vom höchsten Gut. Eine Richtigstellung, *Kant-Studien* 4, S. 94–101.
- 1984 [287] Downie, R. S. (1984): The Hypothetical Imperative, *Mind* 93, S. 481–90.
- 2006 [288] Driver, Julia (2006): *Ethics. The Fundamentals*, Oxford, S. 80–101.
- 1957 [289] Duncan, Alistair R. C. (1957): *Practical Reason and Morality. A Study of Immanuel Kant's Foundations for the Metaphysics of Morals*, London, New York.
- 2006 [290] Dunn, Robert (2006): *Values and the Reflective Point of View. On Expressivism, Self-Knowledge and Agency*, Aldershot, S. 107–24.
- 1971 [291] Düsing, Klaus (1971): Das Problem des höchsten Guts in Kants praktischer Philosophie, *Kant-Studien* 62, S. 5–42.
- 2004 [292] Düsing, Klaus (2004): Kants Ethik in der Philosophie der Gegenwart, in *Warum Kant heute?*, hrsg. von Dietmar H. Heidemann und Kristina Engelhard, Berlin, S. 231–63.
- 2019 [293] Düsing, Klaus (2019): Ethische Freiheit, Autonomie und Selbstbewusstsein bei Kant mit einem Ausblick auf Fichte, in *Freiheit nach Kant. Tradition, Rezeption, Transformation, Aktualität*, hrsg. von Saša Josifovič und Jörg Noller, Leiden, Boston, S. 134–50.

---

<sup>44</sup> "The purpose of this chapter is to assess how fatal or otherwise Kantian autonomy might be to the position adopted in traditional natural law theory. To this end, the focus will be on how Kant's fundamental principle of morality, the categorical imperative, is established. The concern is to compare Kant's analysis, not with competing moral positions generally, therefore, but, narrowly, with the traditional natural law suggestion that fundamental natural facts do inform reason morally and are epistemically significant in that regard." (S. 29)

- 2006 [294] Duttge, Gunnar/Löwe, Michael (2006): Das Absolute im Recht. Epilegomena zur deontologischen Legitimation abwägungsfreier Rechtsgehalte, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 351–84.
- 2012 [295] Dyck, Corey W. (2012): Chimerical Ethics and Flattering Moralists: Baumgarten's Influence on Kant's Moral Theory in the *Observations and Remarks*, in *Kant's Observations and Remarks. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Susan Meld Shell und Richard Velkley, Cambridge 2012, S. 38–56.
- 1978 [296] Dye, James Wayne (1978): Kant as Ethical Naturalist, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 12, S. 111–25.
- 1948 [297] Ebbinghaus, Julius (1948): Deutung und Mißdeutung des kategorischen Imperativs, *Studium Generale* 1, S. 411–19. Wiederabgedruckt in Ebbinghaus, *Gesammelte Aufsätze, Vorträge und Reden*, Hildesheim 1968, S. 80–96.
- 1954 [298] Ebbinghaus, Julius (1954): Kants Ableitung des Verbotes der Lüge aus dem Rechte der Menschheit, *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 8, S. 409–22.
- 1959 [299] Ebbinghaus, Julius (1959): Die Formeln des kategorischen Imperativs und die Ableitung inhaltlich bestimmter Pflichten, *Studi e Ricerche di Storia della Filosofia* 32. Wiederabgedruckt in Ebbinghaus, *Gesammelte Aufsätze, Vorträge und Reden*, Hildesheim 1968, S. 140–60.
- 1976 [300] Ebert, Theodor (1976): Kants kategorischer Imperativ und die Kriterien gebotener, verbotener und freigestellter Handlungen, *Kant-Studien* 67, S. 570–83.
- 1991 [301] Edel, Geert (1991): ‚Formalismus‘ und Universalisierung in der kantischen Ethik, in *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 291–304.
- 2000 [302] Edwards, Jeffrey (2000): Egoism and Formalism in the Development of Kant's Moral Philosophy, *Kant-Studien* 91, S. 411–32.
- 2000 [303] Edwards, Jeffrey (2000): Self-Love, Anthropology, and Universal Benevolence in Kant's Metaphysics of Morals, *Review of Metaphysics* 53, S. 887–914.
- 2001 [304] Edwards, Jeffrey (2001): Material Conditions of Practical Principles in Kant's *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 182–93.
- 2004 [305] Edwards, Jeffrey (2004): Universal Lawgiving and Material Determining Grounds in Kant's Moral Doctrine of Ends, in *Metaphysik und Kritik. Festschrift für Manfred Baum zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Sabine Doyé, Marion Heinz und Udo Rameil, Berlin, New York, S. 215–35.
- 2013 [306] Edwards, Jeffrey (2013): A Tale of Two Ends. Obligatory Ends and Material Determining Grounds in Kant's Metaphysics of Morals, in *Kants »Metaphysik der Sitten« in der Diskussion. Ein Arbeitsgespräch an der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel 2009*, hrsg. von Werner Euler und Burkhard Tuschling, Berlin, S. 147–76.
- 2015 [307] Edwards, Jeffrey (2015): Self-Love, Sociability, and Autonomy. Some Presuppositions of Kant's Account of Practical Law, in *Kant, Fichte, and the Legacy of Transcendental Idealism*,

hrsg. von Halla Kim und Steven Hoeltzel, Lanham, S. 1–29.

- 2018 [308] Edwards, Jeffrey (2018): *Autonomy, Moral Worth, and Right. Kant on Obligatory Ends, Respect for Law, and Original Acquisition*, Berlin, Boston (*Kant-Studien Ergänzungshefte* 198).
- 1966 [309] Eisenberg, Paul D. (1966): From the Forbidden to the Supererogatory: The Basic Ethical Categories in Kant's Tugendlehre, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 3.
- 1972 [310] Eisenberg, Paul D. (1972): Kant on Duties to, and Duties Regarding, Oneself or Others, in *Proceedings of the Third International Kant Congress (1970)*, hrsg. von Lewis White Beck, Dordrecht, S. 275–80.
- 1989 [311] Eldridge, Richard (1989): *On Moral Personhood. Philosophy, Literature, Criticism, and Self-Understanding*, Chicago, S. 34–63 ("Kantian Morality: Problems and Responses").
- 1977 [312] Elsigan, Alfred (1977): Zum Rigorismusproblem in der Kantischen Tugendlehre, *Wiener Jahrbuch für Philosophie* 10, S. 208–25.
- 1985 [313] Elsigan, Alfred (1985): Der Wert eines guten Willens – legitimer Grund und Zweck moralischer Verpflichtung? Zum Begriff des moralisch Guten bei Kant, *Wiener Jahrbuch für Philosophie* 17, S. 123–40.
- 1994 [314] Emmet, Dorothy (1994): *The Role of the Unrealisable. A Study in Regulative Ideals*, Houndmills, S. 10–29 ("Regulative Ideals: Kant", "A Regulative Ideal in Ethics: The Good Will").
- 1992 [315] Engstrom, Stephen (1992): The Concept of the Highest Good in Kant's Moral Theory, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 52, S. 747–80.
- 1996 [316] Engstrom, Stephen (1996): Happiness and the Highest Good in Aristotle and Kant, in *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics. Rethinking Happiness and Duty*, hrsg. von Stephen Engstrom und Jennifer Whiting, Cambridge, S. 102–38.
- 1997 [317] Engstrom, Stephen (1997): Kant's Conception of Practical Wisdom, *Kant-Studien* 88, S. 16–43.
- 2002 [318] Engstrom, Stephen (2002): Introduction, in Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*. Translated by Werner S. Pluhar, Indianapolis, S. xv–liv.
- 2002 [319] Engstrom, Stephen (2002): The Inner Freedom of Virtue, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 289–316.
- 2009 [320] Engstrom, Stephen (2009): *The Form of Practical Knowledge. A Study of the Categorical Imperative*, Cambridge, Mass.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> "Immanuel Kant's claim that the categorical imperative of morality is based in practical reason has long been a source of puzzlement and doubt, even for sympathetic interpreters. Kant's own explanations, which mainly concern his often-criticized formula of universal law, are laconic and obscure, leading interpreters to dismiss them in favor of less ambitious claims involving his other famous formulas.

In *The Form of Practical Knowledge*, Stephen Engstrom provides an illuminating new interpretation of the categorical imperative, arguing that we have exaggerated and misconceived Kant's break with tradition: Kant never departs from the classical conception of practical reason as a capacity for knowledge of the good. His distinctive contribution is the idea that morality's imperatives express the form of such knowledge.

- 2010 [321] Engstrom, Stephen (2010): Reason, Desire, and the Will, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 28–50.
- 2010 [322] Engstrom, Stephen (2010): The Triebfeder of Pure Practical Reason, in *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 90–118.
- 2015 [323] Engstrom, Stephen (2015): The Complete Object of Practical Knowledge, in *The Highest Good in Aristotle and Kant*, hrsg. von Joachim Aufderheide und Ralf M. Bader, Oxford, S. 129–57.
- 1996 [324] Engstrom, Stephen/Whiting, Jennifer (Hrsg.) (1996): *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics. Rethinking Happiness and Duty*, Cambridge.
- 2001 [325] Enskat, Rainer (2001): Autonomie und Humanität. Wie kategorische Imperative die Urteilskraft orientieren, in *Systematische Ethik mit Kant*, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 82–123.
- 2015 [326] Espinet, David (2015): Lust, die glücklich macht. Kant über das höchste Gut, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 63, S. 824–54.
- 2001 [327] Esser, Andrea (2001): Kant und moralische Konflikte, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 194–201.
- 2004 [328] Esser, Andrea Marlen (2004): *Eine Ethik für Endliche. Kants Tugendlehre in der Gegenwart*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.
- 2001 [329] Esser, Andrea (2008): Kant on Solving Moral Conflicts, in *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 279–302.
- 2009 [330] Esser, Andrea Marlen (2009): Aufklärung der Praxis. Kantischer Konstruktivismus in der Ethik, in *Kant und die Zukunft der europäischen Aufklärung*, hrsg. von Heiner Klemme, Berlin, S. 319–35.
- 2013 [331] Esser, Andrea M. (2013): The Inner Court of Conscience, Moral Self-Knowledge, and the Proper Object of Duty (TL 6: 437–444), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 269–92.
- 2014 [332] Esser, Andrea Marlen (2014): Die Bedeutung von Gefühlen in Kants Moralphilosophie und die Möglichkeit ihrer phänomenologischen Erweiterung, in *Affektivität und Ethik bei Kant*

---

By developing an account of practical knowledge that situates Kant's ethics within his broader epistemology and rethinks numerous topics in his moral psychology and in his account of practical reason (including desire, intention, choice, will, as well as pleasure, happiness, and the good), Engstrom's work promises to deepen and to reshape our understanding of Kantian ethics." (Publisher's description)

Preface. Note on Citations. Introduction. **Part I. Willing as Practical Knowing.** 1. The Will and Practical Judgment. 2. Fundamental Practical Judgments: The Wish for Happiness. **Part II. From Presuppositions of Judgment to the Idea of a Categorical Imperative.** 1. The Formal Presuppositions of Practical Judgment. 2. Constraints on Willing. **Part III. Interpretation.** 1. The Categorical Imperative. 2. Applications. 3. Conclusion. – Epilogue. Index.

und in der Phänomenologie, hrsg. von Inga Römer, Berlin, S. 145–72.

- 2014 [333] Esteves, Julio (2014): The Primacy of the Good Will, *Kant-Studien* 105, S. 83–112.<sup>46</sup>
- 2013 [334] Euler, Werner (2013): Die Tugendlehre im System der praktischen Philosophie Kants, in *Kants »Metaphysik der Sitten« in der Diskussion. Ein Arbeitsgespräch an der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel 2009*, hrsg. von Werner Euler und Burkhard Tuschling, Berlin, S. 221–300.
- 2013 [335] Euler, Werner/Tuschling, Burkhard (Hrsg.) (2013): *Kants »Metaphysik der Sitten« in der Diskussion. Ein Arbeitsgespräch an der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel 2009*, Berlin 2013.
- 1938 [336] Ewing, A. C. (1938): The Paradoxes of Kant's Ethics, *Philosophy* 13, S. 40–56.
- 1953 [337] Ewing, A. C. (1953): *Ethics*, New York 1965, S. 49–61 ("Duty for Duty's Sake").
- 2015 [338] Fabbianelli, Faustino (2015): Kant's Concept of Moral *Imputatio*, in *Reading Kant's Lectures*, hrsg. von Robert R. Clewis, Berlin, S. 200–220.
- 2009 [339] Fahmy, Melissa Seymour (2019): Active Sympathetic Participation: Reconsidering Kant's Duty of Sympathy, *Kantian Review* 14, S. 31–52.
- 2010 [340] Fahmy, Melissa Seymour (2010): Kantian Practical Love, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 91, S. 313–31.<sup>47</sup>
- 2017 [341] Faizzada, Walid (2017): *Autonome Praxis und intelligible Welt. Die transzendental-praktische Freiheit in Kants Lehre vom höchsten Gut*, Leiden, Boston.
- 2014 [342] Falduto, Antonino (2014): *The Faculties of the Human Mind and the Case of Moral Feeling in Kant's Philosophy*, Berlin (*Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte* 177), Kap. 5: "Interpreting Kant's Concept of Moral Feeling on the Basis of His Theory of the Faculties", S. 204–41.

---

<sup>46</sup> "In this article I argue that Kant's conception of the good will in its relation to the gifts of nature and fortune listed in the opening paragraphs of *Groundwork* I is usually misunderstood. The misunderstanding has its roots in the attribution of the alleged predicate 'good in a conditioned sense' to those gifts, even when they are taken in isolation. As a result, the centrality and primacy of Kant's concept of the good will as the condition of the goodness of those gifts is completely obscured. However, a different picture emerges if one takes into account that 'good in a conditioned sense' properly means 'good only on the condition of being combined with a good will', so that talking of the goodness of such gifts taken in isolation or apart from the good will is a logical contradiction. Accordingly, we will see that, in his practical philosophy, Kant assigns to the good will a role very similar to the role played by Aristotle's concept of substance in his theoretical philosophy. For, according to Kant, those gifts can be good and be said to be good only on the condition of being in a will which is good. Finally, we will see how this interpretation of the primacy of the good will sheds light on Kant's view on the moral worth of actions."

<sup>47</sup> "In the Doctrine of Virtue Kant stipulates that 'Love is a matter of feeling, not of willing . . . so a duty to love is an absurdity.' Nonetheless, in the same work Kant claims that we have duties of love to other human beings. According to Kant, the kind of love which is commanded by duty is practical love. This paper defends the view that the duty of practical love articulated in the Doctrine of Virtue is distinct from the duty of beneficence and best understood as a duty of self-transformation, which agents observe by cultivating a benevolent disposition and practical beneficent desires."

- 1982 [343] Feil, Ernst (1982): Autonomie und Heteronomie nach Kant. Zur Klärung einer signifikanten Fehlinterpretation, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 29, S. 389–441.
- 2000 [344] Fairbanks, Sandra Jane (2000): *Kantian Moral Theory and the Destruction of the Self*. Boulder.
- 1978 [345] Feldman, Fred (1978): *Introductory Ethics*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., S. 97–134 (“Kant I”, “Kant II”).
- 2009 [346] Feldmeijer, Frits Reitze (2009): Trying to Understand Kant’s Ethical Views, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 43, S. 221–41.
- 2008 [347] Fenner, Dagmar (2008): *Ethik. Wie soll ich handeln?*, Tübingen, S. 100–106 („Kants Verfahren logischer Universalisierung“).
- 2012 [348] Ferguson, Benjamin (2012): Kant on Duty in the *Groundwork*, *Res Publica* 18, S. 303–19.<sup>48</sup>
- 2008 [349] Ferreira, Sofia Helena Gollnick (2008): Kant’s Concept of Moral Character, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 107–15.
- 2012 [350] Filippaki, Eleni (2012): Kant on Love, Respect and Friendship, *Kant-Yearbook 4: Kant and Con-*

---

<sup>48</sup> “Barbara Herman offers an interpretation of Kant’s *Groundwork* on which an action has moral worth if the primary motive for the action is the motive of duty. She offers this approach in place of Richard Henson’s sufficiency-based interpretation, according to which an action has moral worth when the motive of duty is sufficient by itself to generate the action. Noa Latham criticizes Herman’s account and argues that we cannot make sense of the position that an agent can hold multiple motives for action and yet be motivated by only one of them, concluding that we must accept a face-value interpretation of the *Groundwork* where morally worthy actions obtain only when the agent’s sole motive is the motive of duty. This paper has two goals, one broad and one more constrained. The broader objective is to argue that interpretations of moral worth, as it is presented in the *Groundwork*, depend on interpretations of Kant’s theory of freedom. I show that whether we can make sense of the inclusion of nonmoral motives in morally worthy actions depends on whether the ‘always causal framework’ is consistent with Kant’s theory of freedom. The narrow goal is to show that *if* we adopt an ‘always causal’ framework for moral motivation, then Herman’s position and her critique of the sufficiency-based approach fail. Furthermore, within this framework I will specify a criterion for judging whether an action is determined by the motive of duty, even in the presence of nonmoral motives. Thus, I argue Latham’s conclusion that we must accept a face-value interpretation is incorrect.”

- 1987 [351] Finnis, John (1987): Legal Enforcement of “Duties to Oneself”: Kant vs. Neo-Kantians, *Columbia Law Review* 87, S. 433–56.
- 1981 [352] Firla, M. (1981): *Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Anthropologie und Moralphilosophie bei Kant*, Frankfurt a. M./Bern.
- 1983 [353] Fischer, Norbert (1983): Tugend und Glückseligkeit. Zu ihrem Verhältnis bei Aristoteles und Kant, *Kant-Studien* 74, S. 1–21.
- 1988 [354] Fischer, Norbert (1988): Der formale Grund der bösen Tat. Das Problem der moralischen Zurechnung in der praktischen Philosophie Kants, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 42, S. 18–44.
- 2003 [355] Fischer, Peter (2003): *Moralität und Sinn. Zur Systematik von Klugheit, Moral und symbolischer Erfahrung im Werk Kants*, München.<sup>50</sup>
- 2003 [356] Fischer, Peter (2003): *Einführung in die Ethik*, München, S. 146–66 („Immanuel Kants Konzept der Freiheit als Autonomie“).
- 1963 [357] Fleischer, Margot (1963): Das Problem der Begründung des kategorischen Imperativs bei Kant, in *Sein und Ethos. Untersuchungen zur Grundlage der Ethik*, hrsg. von Paulus Engelhardt, Mainz, S. 387–404.
- 1964 [358] Fleischer, Margot (1964): Die Formeln des kategorischen Imperativs in Kants ‘Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten’, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 46, S. 201–26.

---

<sup>49</sup> “This paper focuses on Kant’s claim that friendship is governed by a polarity between love and respect conceived as attractive and repulsive forces. It argues that interpreting this polarity is crucial for understanding Kant’s moral vision and how it is anything but inimical to an ethics of intimacy. More specifically, it shows that the notion of attractive and repulsive moral forces is a key element for understanding both Kant’s theory of friendship and its importance for the ethical vision of the *Metaphysics of Morals* as a whole. The tension between love and respect underlies all moral relations, whether universal and impersonal, or particular and personal, and, moreover, echoes the attractive and repulsive struggle that Kant believes governs the material world. The picture of Kantian morality that emerges against this background is thus one where individuals constantly strive both to retain their agency and open up to others by acknowledging and embracing ends other than one’s own, hence finding themselves in a constant struggle for balance. Part I examines Kant’s claim against his theory of matter and force. Part II argues that intimate, personal friendships provide only the most concrete and specific example of the tensions inherent in the kind of universal friendship that Kantian morality requires of all. The final part, offered as a variation upon the theme, sketches a reply to Rae Langton’s critique of Kant’s morality and theory of friendship.”

<sup>50</sup> „Nicht historisierend, wie es in der Kant-Exegese zumeist geschieht, sondern in systematischer Absicht wird Kants Moralphilosophie aus dem Kontext seines Gesamtwerkes der kritischen Periode interpretiert. So werden jene Themenbereiche erschlossen, die eine jede Ethik berücksichtigen muß, wenn sie als systematisch vollständig gelten möchte. Dadurch werden neue Sichtweise auf traditionelle Probleme der Ethik Kants ermöglicht und Schnittstellen zu neueren Debatten aufgewiesen. Ein Kernstück der Arbeit bilden die Deutungen des moralischen Sinns der ästhetischen Urteile über das Schöne und das Erhabene sowie der teleologischen Urteile der Natur- und Geschichtsbetrachtung. Durch eine Explikation verschiedener Erfahrungsbegriffe wird es möglich, den Typus des kantischen Moralisten als Lebensform zu verstehen.“

- 2003 [359] Fleischer, Margot (2003): *Schopenhauer als Kritiker der Kantischen Ethik. Eine kritische Dokumentation*, Würzburg.
- 1997 [360] Flikschuh, Katrin (1997): On Kant's Rechtslehre, *European Journal of Philosophy* 5, S. 50–73.
- 2002 [361] Flikschuh, Katrin (2002): Kantian Desires: Freedom of Choice and Action in the *Rechtslehre*, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 185–208.
- 2007 [362] Flikschuh, Katrin (2007): Duty, Nature, Right: Kant's Response to Mendelssohn in *Theory and Practice III*, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 4, S. 223–41.<sup>51</sup>
- 2007 [363] Flikschuh, Katrin (2007): Kant's Indemonstrable Postulate of Right: A Response to Paul Guyer, *Kantian Review* 12, S. 1–39.
- 2009 [364] Flikschuh, Katrin (2009): Kant's Kingdom of Ends: Metaphysical, Not Political, in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 119–39.
- 2010 [365] Flikschuh, Katrin (2010): Justice without Virtue, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 51–70.
- 2018 [366] Flikschuh, Katrin (2018): Kant's Contextualism, *Kantian Review* 23, S. 555–79.<sup>52</sup>
- 1893 [367] Foerster, Friedrich Wilhelm (1893): *Der Entwicklungsgang der Kantischen Ethik*, Berlin.
- 2004 [368] Fonnesu, Luca (2004): Kants praktische Philosophie und die Verwirklichung der Moral, in *Recht – Geschichte – Religion. Die Bedeutung Kants für die Gegenwart*, hrsg. von Herta Nagl-Docekal und Rudolf Langthaler, Berlin, S. 49–61.

---

<sup>51</sup> “This paper offers an imminent interpretation of Kant's political teleology in the context of his response to Moses Mendelssohn in *Theory and Practice III* concerning prospects of humankind's moral progress. The paper assesses the nature of Kant's response against his mature political philosophy in the *Doctrine of Right*. In ‘Theory and Practice III’ Kant's response to Mendelssohn remains incomplete: whilst insisting that individuals have a duty to contribute towards humankind's moral progress, Kant has no conclusive answer as to how individuals might act on that duty. ‘Theory and Practice III’ lacks a clear conception of the distinctness of political morality from the domain of virtue; Kant's resort to teleological argumentation is indicative of his lack of an account of *instituting* Right. The latter can be found in the *Doctrine of Right* – yet Kant's earlier teleological arguments contribute crucially to the development of his mature morality of Right.”

<sup>52</sup> “This article builds on David Velleman's recent work on moral relativism to argue that Kant's account of moral judgement is best read in a contextualist manner. More specifically, I argue that while for Kant the form of moral judgement is invariant, substantive moral judgements are nonetheless context-dependent. The same form of moral willing can give rise to divergent substantive judgements. To some limited extent, Kantian contextualism is a development out of Rawlsian constructivism. Yet while for constructivists the primary concern is with the derivation of generally valid principles of morality, Velleman's Kant-inspired form of moral relativism demonstrates the indispensability to a Kantian approach of indexical reasons for action. I argue in turn that Velleman's focus on the indexical nature of reasons for action must be supplemented by an account of agential reflexivity. The latter divides Kantian contextualism from Kantian relativism.”

- 2012 [369] Forman, David (2012): Kant on Moral Freedom and Moral Slavery, *Kantian Review* 17, S. 1–32.<sup>53</sup>
- 2008 [370] Formosa, Paul (2008): ‘All politics must bend its knee before right’: Kant on the relation of morals to politics, *Social Theory and Practice* 34, S. 157–81.
- 2009 [371] Formosa, Paul (2009): Kant on the Limits of Human Evil, *Journal of Philosophical Research* 34, S. 189–214.
- 2010 [372] Formosa, Paul (2010): Kant on the Highest Moral-Physical Good: The Social Aspect of Kant’s Moral Philosophy, *Kantian Review* 15, S. 1–36.
- 2013 [373] Formosa, Paul (2013): Is Kant a Moral Constructivist or a Moral Realist?, *European Journal of Philosophy* 21, S. 170–96.<sup>54</sup>
- 2014 [374] Formosa, Paul (2014): The Role of Vulnerability in Kantian Ethics, in *Vulnerability. New Essays in Ethics and Feminist Philosophy*, hrsg. von Catriona Mackenzie, Wendy Rogers und Susan Dodds, Oxford, S. 88–109.
- 2012 [375] Forschler, Scott (2012): From Supervenience to “Universal Law”: How Kantian Ethics Become Heteronomous, *Kant-Yearbook 4: Kant and Contemporary Moral Philosophy*, S. 49–67.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> “Kant’s account of the freedom gained through virtue builds on the Socratic tradition. On the Socratic view, when morality is our end, nothing can hinder us from attaining satisfaction: we are self-sufficient and free since moral goodness is (as Kant says) ‘created by us, hence is in our power’. But when our end is the fulfilment of sensible desires, our satisfaction requires luck as well as the cooperation of others. For Kant, this means that happiness requires that we get other people to work for our ends; and this requires, in turn, that we gain control over the things *other* people value so as to have influence over them. If this plan for happiness is not subordinated to morality, then what is most valuable to us will be precisely what *others* value. This is the root of the ‘passions’ that make us evil and make us slaves whose satisfaction depends on others. But, significantly, this dependence is a *moral* slavery and hence does not signal a loss, or even diminishment of the kind of freedom required for moral responsibility.”

<sup>54</sup> “The dominant interpretation of Kant as a moral constructivist has recently come under sustained philosophical attack by those defending a moral realist reading of Kant. In light of this, should we read Kant as endorsing moral constructivism or moral realism? In answering this question we encounter disagreement in regard to two key independence claims. First, the independence of the value of persons from the moral law (an independence that is rejected) and second, the independence of the content and authority of the moral law from actual acts of willing on behalf of those bound by that law (an independence that is upheld). The resulting position, which is called not ‘all the way down’ constructivism, is attributed to Kant.”

<sup>55</sup> “In his *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant’s desiderata for a supreme principle of practical reasoning and morality require that the subjective conditions under which some action is thought of as justified via some maxim be sufficient for judging the same action as justified by any agent in those conditions. This describes the kind of universalization conditions now known as moral supervenience. But when he specifies his “formula of universal law” (FUL) Kant replaces this condition with a quite different kind of universality: the judgment that some agent could rationally (i. e., without willing the frustration of his own valued ends) will his adoption of some maxim under the condition that this would cause all agents in his world to adopt it as well. Our wills typically lack this efficacy, so requiring that our wills conform to what would be rational for a hypothetical agent in this situation to will is a heteronomous requirement.

- 2013 [376] Forschler, Scott (2013): Kantian and Consequentialist Ethics: The Gap Can Be Bridged, *Meta-philosophy* 44, S. 88–104. – Vgl. dazu [1527].
- 2013 [377] Forschler, Scott (2013): Two Dogmas of Kantian Ethics, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 47, S. 255–69.
- 1983 [378] Forschner, Maximilian (1983): Reine Morallehre und Anthropologie, *Neue Hefte für Philosophie* 22: *Kants Ethik heute*, S. 25–44.
- 1988 [379] Forschner, Maximilian (1988): Moralität und Glückseligkeit in Kants Reflexionen, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 42, S. 351–70.
- 1989 [380] Forschner, Maximilian (1989): Guter Wille und Haß der Vernunft, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 66–82.
- 1993 [381] Forschner, Maximilian (1993): *Über das Glück des Menschen. Aristoteles, Epikur, Stoa, Thomas von Aquin*, Darmstadt, S. 107–50 („Moralität und Glückseligkeit in Kants Reflexionen“).
- 2005 [382] Forschner, Maximilian (2005): Immanuel Kant über Vernunftglaube und Handlungsmotivation, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 59, S. 327–44.
- 2002 [383] Förster, Eckart (2002): Die Dialektik der reinen praktischen Vernunft (107–121), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 173–86. – The Dialectic of Pure Practical Reason in the *Second Critique* (CPrR: 107–21), in *Kant’s Moral and Legal Philosophy*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Otfried Höffe, Cambridge 2009, S. 198–212.
- 2012 [384] Franklin, Julian H. (2012): Animal Rights and Kantian Ethics, in *Strangers to Nature. Animal Lives and Human Ethics*, hrsg. von Gregory R. Smulewicz-Zucker, Lanham, S. 21–34.
- 1993 [385] Freudiger, Jürg (1993): *Kants Begründung der praktischen Philosophie. Systematische Stellung, Methode und Argumentationsstruktur der „Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten“*, Bern, Stuttgart, Wien.
- 2005 [386] Freyberg, Bernard (2005): *Imagination in Kant’s Critique of Practical Reason*, Bloomington.
- 2012 [387] Freyenhagen, Fabian (2012): The Empty Formalism Objection Revisited: §135R and Recent Kantian Responses, in *Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*, hrsg. von Thom Brooks, Chichester, Oxford, S. 43–72.
- 2001 [388] Fricke, Christel (2001): Kants Theorie des guten Willens zwischen empiristischer Konsentstheorie und Crusianischer Moralthologie, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 202–10.
- 2008 [389] Fricke, Christel (2008): Maximen, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 125–36.
- 2001 [390] Friebe, Cord (2001): Der Kategorische Imperativ bei Kant und Freund, in *Systematische Ethik*

---

Several intuitively wrong maxims pass Kant’s test but fail the test of supervenience, because they generate no contradiction in a world of universal compliance but do so in non-ideal worlds, demonstrating the inadequacy of the FUL and the logical superiority of moral supervenience.”

mit Kant, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 192–210.

- 1984 [391] Friedman, R. Z. (1984): The Importance and Function of Kant's Highest Good, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 22, S. 325–42.
- 2003 [392] Frierson, Patrick (2003): *Freedom and Anthropology in Kant's Moral Philosophy*, Cambridge.<sup>56</sup>
- 2012 [393] Frierson, Patrick R. (2012): Two Concepts of Universality in Kant's Moral Theory, in *Kant's Observations and Remarks. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Susan Meld Shell und Richard Velkley, Cambridge 2012, S. 57–76.
- 2014 [394] Frierson, Patrick (2014): Affective Normativity, in *Kant on Emotion and Value*, hrsg. von Alix Cohen, Houndmills, S. 166–90.
- 2006 [395] Fröhlich, Günter (2006): *Nachdenken über das Gute. Ethische Positionen bei Aristoteles, Cicero, Kant, Mill und Scheler*, Göttingen, S. 69–102 („Kant und der Kategorische Imperativ“).
- 2006 [396] Fulda, Hans Friedrich (2006): Notwendigkeit des Rechts unter Voraussetzung des Kategorischen Imperativs der Sittlichkeit, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 167–213.
- 1974 [397] Funke, Gerhard (1974): „Achtung fürs moralische Gesetz“ und Rigorismus/Impersonalismus-Problem, *Akten des 4. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Bd. 1, Berlin, S. 45–67.
- 2019 [398] Furner, James (2019): Can Kant's Formula of the End in Itself Condemn Capitalism? *Kantian Review* 24, S. 1–25.<sup>57</sup>
- 1991 [399] Gaita, Raimond (1991): *Good and Evil: An Absolute Conception*, Houndmills, S. 144–50.
- 1985 [400] Galvin, Richard (1985): Tennis Anyone? Problem Cases for Formal Universalizability Tests, *Southwest Philosophy Review* 2, S. 79–85.
- 1991 [401] Galvin, Richard (1991): Does Kant's Psychology of Morality Need Basic Revision?, *Mind* 100, S. 221–36.
- 1991 [402] Galvin, Richard (1991): Ethical Formalism: The Contradiction in Conception Test, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 8, S. 357–408.
- 1999 [403] Galvin, Richard F. (1999): Slavery and Universalizability, *Kant-Studien* 90, S. 191–203.
- 2009 [404] Galvin, Richard (2009): The Universal Law Formulas, in *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*,

---

<sup>56</sup> Contents: Introduction: Kant's anthropology and Schleiermacher's dilemma; Part I. The Problem: 1. The asymmetry in Kant's conception of freedom; 2. Anthropology as an empirical science; 3. The moral significance of Kant's 'pragmatic anthropology'; 4. Moral anthropology in contemporary neokantian ethics; Part II. The Solution: 5. Transcendental evil, radical evil, and moral anthropology; 6. Moral influence on others; Epilogue. Incorporating moral anthropology and defending Kantian moral philosophy.

<sup>57</sup> "Kantian socialists at the turn of the twentieth century, as well as contemporary authors seeking a principle with which to condemn capitalism, have turned to Kant's Formula of the End in Itself (FEI). This article assesses the arguments from FEI against capitalism from the perspective of the issues that arise in interpreting and applying Kant's formula. There are various strategies with which a Kantian might use FEI to condemn conduct that Kant did not use FEI to condemn. The article asks whether any of the existing arguments from FEI employ plausible versions of these strategies to derive a strict duty from that formula's Never Merely as a Means principle that condemns capitalism."

hrsg. von Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Malden, MA, S. 52–82.

- 2011 [405] Galvin, Richard (2011): Rounding Up the Usual Suspects: Varieties of Kantian Constructivism in Ethics, *Philosophical Quarterly* 61, S. 16–36.<sup>58</sup>
- 2019 [406] Galvin, Richard (2019): Freedom and the Fact of Reason, *Kantian Review* 24, S. 27–51.<sup>59</sup>
- 2012 [407] Garcia, Ernesto V. (2012): A New Look at Kantian Respect for Persons, *Kant-Yearbook 4: Kant and Contemporary Moral Philosophy*, S. 69–89.<sup>60</sup>
- 2006 [408] Gardner, Sebastian (2006): The Primacy of Practical Reason, in *A Companion to Kant*, hrsg. von Graham Bird, Oxford, S. 259–74.
- 2010 [409] Gasché, Rodolphe (2010): A Material A Priori? On Max Scheler’s Critique of Kant’s Formal Ethics, *Philosophical Forum* 41, S. 113–26. – Dazu: Kosch, Michelle (2010): Gasché on

---

<sup>58</sup> “Some commentators have attributed constructivism to Kant at the first-order level; others cast him as a meta-ethical constructivist. Among meta-ethical constructivist interpretations I distinguish between ‘atheistic’ and ‘agnostic’ versions regarding the existence of an independent moral order. Even though these two versions are incompatible, each is linked with central Kantian doctrines, revealing a tension within Kant’s own view. Moreover, among interpretations that cast Kant as rejecting substantive realism but embracing procedural realism, some (i.e., those that are ‘constructivist’) face charges of indeterminacy or relativism, while others (practical reasoning views) face ‘daunting rationalism’ objections. I close with some objections to interpreting Kant as a meta-ethical constructivist.”

<sup>59</sup> “The focus of my argument is whether, and in what sense, freedom is ‘revealed’ by the fact of reason in Kant’s second Critique. I examine the passages in which Kant refers to the fact of reason and conclude that he uses the term to refer to our taking morality as authoritative, and to our apprehending the content of the moral law. I then point out how various commentators have claimed each to be the fact of reason. Next I address how each is claimed by Kant to reveal ‘freedom’ to us and argue that our taking morality as authoritative is best understood as referring to our conception of ourselves as autonomous beings, and that our apprehending the moral law’s content reveals only the idea of freedom as a coherent one. Neither would demonstrate that we actually are autonomous, nor would their conjunction, despite what some commentators have claimed. In closing I defend the deflationary position that the fact of reason entitles us to postulate our freedom, but only from the practical point of view, and that it demonstrates that freedom is a coherent idea.”

<sup>60</sup> “In this paper, I argue that we can identify *three* different kinds of ‘respect for persons’ in Kant’s writings: (1) respect as ‘honor’ or ‘esteem’ based upon a person’s unequal comparative value vis-à-vis other people; (2) ‘political respect’ based upon a person’s equal comparative value vis-à-vis other people; and (3) ‘moral respect’ based upon a person’s absolute and incomparable value vis-à-vis non-rational animals and things. My approach challenges standard readings of Kant in two ways. First, *contra* many of Kant’s critics and defenders, I argue that he explicitly recognizes more partial ways we can respect people in terms of (1) respect as ‘honor’ or ‘esteem.’ Second, *contra* dominant contractualist readings of Kant, I argue that such views mistakenly conflate (2) ‘political respect’ which involves treating people in ways they would agree to based on principles of mutual reciprocity and fairness and (3) ‘moral respect’ for people as ends-in-themselves. I conclude by examining the overall relevance of this approach for recent debates about political liberalism. In the end, I argue that this new Kantian framework offers us a highly systematic, principled, and perhaps even exhaustive taxonomy for capturing the many different ways in which we can respect people in general.”

Scheler, *Philosophical Forum* 41, S. 127–30.

- 1997 [410] Gaut, Berys (1997): The Structure of Practical Reason, in *Ethics and Practical Reason*, hrsg. von Garrett Cullity und Berys Gaut, Oxford, S. 161–88.
- 1999 [411] Gaut, Berys/Kerstein, Samuel (1999): The Derivation without the Gap: Rethinking *Groundwork I*, *Kantian Review* 3, S. 18–40.
- 1963 [412] Gauthier, David (1963): *Practical Reasoning. The Structure and Foundations of Prudential and Moral Arguments and their Exemplification in Discourse*, Oxford, S. 111–18.
- 1985 [413] Gauthier, David (1985): The Unity of Reason: A Subversive Reinterpretation of Kant, *Ethics* 96, S. 74–88. Wiederabgedruckt in Gauthier, *Moral Dealing. Contract, Ethics, and Reason*, Ithaca 1990, S. 110–26.
- 1997 [414] Gauthier, Jeffrey A. (1997): Schiller’s Critique of Kant’s Moral Psychology: Reconciling Practical Reason and an Ethics of Virtue, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 27, S. 513–544.
- 2004 [415] Geiger, Ido (2004): Hegel’s Critique of Kant’s Practical Philosophy. Moral Motivation and the Founding of the Modern State, *Internationales Jahrbuch des Deutschen Idealismus 2: Der Begriff des Staates*, S. 12–49.
- 2008 [416] Geiger, Ido (2008): How Do We Derive Moral Laws?, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 137–47.
- 2010 [417] Geiger, Ido (2010): What is the Use of the Universal Law Formula of the Categorical Imperative?, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 18, S. 271–295.
- 2011 [418] Geiger, Ido (2011): Rational Feelings and Moral Agency, *Kantian Review* 16, S. 283–308.<sup>61</sup>
- 2015 [419] Geiger, Ido (2015): How Are the Different Formulas of the Categorical Imperative Related, *Kantian Review* 20, S. 395–419.<sup>62</sup>
- 1988 [420] Geismann, Georg (1988): Versuch über Kants rechtliches Verbot der Lüge, in *Kant. Analysen – Probleme – Kritik*, hrsg. von Hariolf Oberer und Gerhard Seel, Würzburg, S. 293–316.

---

<sup>61</sup> “Kant’s conception of moral agency is often charged with attributing no role to feelings. I suggest that respect is the effective force driving moral action. I then argue that four additional types of rational feelings are necessary conditions of moral agency: (1) The affective inner life of moral agents deliberating how to act and reflecting on their deeds is rich and complex (conscience). To act morally we must turn our affective moral perception towards the ends of moral action: (2) the welfare of others (love of others); and (3) our own moral being (self-respect). (4) Feelings shape our particular moral acts (moral feeling). I tentatively suggest that the diversity of moral feelings might be as great as the range of our duties.”

<sup>62</sup> “The article defends three claims regarding the relation between the different formulas of the categorical imperative. (1) On its prevailing reading, FUL gives different moral guidance than FH; left answered, this problem is an argument for adopting a competing perspective on FUL. (2) The prohibitions and commands of the formulas should be taken to be extensionally the same; but FKE adds a dimension missing from the others, gained by uniting their perspectives, namely, bringing the variety of moral laws into systematic unity. (3) The grammatically ambiguous phrase in GMS, 4 : 436 . 9–10 claims that FA alone unites the other formulas in itself.”

- 2000 [421] Geismann, Georg (2000): Sittlichkeit, Religion und Geschichte in der Philosophie Kants, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 8, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 437–531.
- 2002 [422] Geismann, Georg (2002): Die Formeln des kategorischen Imperativs nach H. J. Paton, N. N., Klaus Reich und Julius Ebbinghaus, *Kant-Studien* 93, S. 374–84.
- 2004 [423] Geismann, Georg (2004): Über Pflicht und Neigung in Kants Moralphilosophie, in *Metaphysik und Kritik. Festschrift für Manfred Baum zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Sabine Doyé, Marion Heinz und Udo Rameil, Berlin, New York, S. 237–50.
- 2006 [424] Geismann, Georg (2006): Recht und Moral in der Philosophie Kants, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 3–124.
- 1986 [425] Geismann, Georg/Oberer, Hariolf (Hrsg.) (1986): *Kant und das Recht der Lüge*, Würzburg.
- 1978 [426] Genova, A. C. (1978): Kant's Transcendental Deduction of the Moral Law, *Kant-Studien* 69, S. 299–313.
- 2002 [427] Gerhardt, Volker (2002): *Immanuel Kant. Vernunft und Leben*, Stuttgart, S. 183–239 („Was soll ich tun? Ethik und Recht aus dem Prinzip der Vernunft“).
- 2006 [428] Gerhardt, Volker (2006): Menschheit in meiner Person. Exposé zu einer Theorie des exemplarischen Handelns, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 215–24.
- 2009 [429] Gerhardt, Volker (2009): Die Menschheit in der Person des Menschen. Zur Anthropologie der menschlichen Würde bei Kant, in *Kant und die Zukunft der europäischen Aufklärung*, hrsg. von Heiner Klemme, Berlin, S. 269–91.
- 1979 [430] Gerhardt, Volker/Kaulbach, Friedrich (1979): *Kant*, Darmstadt, S. 57–97 („II. Praktische Philosophie“).
- 2006 [431] Gilibert, Pablo (2006): Considerations on the Notion of Moral Validity in the Moral Theories of Kant and Habermas, *Kant-Studien* 97, S. 210–27.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> “In what follows I will consider Kant's and Habermas's conceptions of moral validity in a comparative and critical way. First, I will reconstruct Habermas's discursive or deliberative reformulation of Kant's moral theory (sec.1). And, second, I will introduce some comparative critical considerations (2). I will contend that, though much is gained with Habermas's intersubjectivist reformulation of Kant's moral philosophy, some problems emerge that could be treated with the help of certain Kantian insights. I will focus on Kant's and Habermas's strictly moral writings. The issue of political validity or legitimacy (i.e., of the validity of norms that are to be enforced by a coercive state apparatus) is of course of great importance, but I will not address it here.”

- 2016 [432] Gillissen, Jens (2016): Kants ethischer Kohärentismus, *Kant-Studien* 107, S. 651–80.<sup>64</sup>
- 2007 [433] Gilly, Thomas Albert (2007): What has Kant to do with Terrorism? Part 1 – Categorical Imperative, *The Homeland Security Review* 1, S. 205–19.
- 2007 [434] Giordanetti, Piero (2007): Die Realität des Ethischen „Faktum der Vernunft“ und Gefühl in der *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, *Secretum-online* 34 (November 2007) (Verfaßt 1998):<sup>65</sup>  
<http://www.secretum-online.it/default.php?idnodo=8&PHPSESSID=b5b311690ea1ddabebbc148bfed0e1f5>
- 2007 [435] Giordanetti, Piero (2007): Zu Kants Tugendlehre, *Itinera* (Dezember 2007) (Verfaßt 2005)<sup>66</sup>  
<http://www.filosofia.unimi.it/itinera/mat/saggi/?ssectitle=Saggi&authorid=giordanettip&docid=tugendlehre&format=html> bzw.  
[http://www.filosofia.unimi.it/itinera/mat/saggi/giordanettip\\_tugendlehre.pdf](http://www.filosofia.unimi.it/itinera/mat/saggi/giordanettip_tugendlehre.pdf)

---

<sup>64</sup> “In ethics, deductivism strives for self-evident premises as a foundation for normative claims, whereas coherentism seeks moral justification in relations between abstract normative claims and moral judgments. While Immanuel Kant is still widely believed to have pursued a deductivist project, the article contends that he endeavored to justify his moral philosophy in general, and the Categorical Imperative in particular, in the coherentist manner that has since been advocated by John Rawls. First, the characteristics of Rawls’s method of reflective equilibrium are summarized and traced within Kant’s writings. The resulting coherentist interpretation is then defended against the opposing view that Kant’s appeal to the ‘fact of reason’ proves his adherence to ethical intuitionism.”

<sup>65</sup> „In der Forschung wird die Realität des Ethischen bei Kant fast ausschließlich hinsichtlich des Formcharakters des kategorischen Imperativs und des moralischen Urteils untersucht. Die Aufmerksamkeit konzentriert sich dabei auf einen Vergleich mit der in der Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten angekündigten und nicht gelungenen „Deduktion“ des kategorischen Imperativs sowie auf die Einführung der Zwei-Welten-Lehre. Dieser weitverbreiteten Ansicht möchte ich durch folgende These entgegenzutreten: Kant hat die Frage nach der Realität des Ethischen nicht schnell und flüchtig durch die Lehre vom Faktum der Vernunft beantwortet, sondern hat ihr neben den Erwägungen in der „Analytik der Grundsätze“ und der „Begriffe“ auch die ganze Triebfederlehre und endlich die Methodenlehre gewidmet. Der Rekurs auf die Apriorität des Achtungsgefühls, welcher in diesen beiden Textstücken vorgenommen wird, gewährleistet den Beweis der objektiven Realität des moralischen Gesetzes und der ihm angemessenen menschlichen Tugend. Es wird auch kurz auf das apriorische Gefühl der Zufriedenheit eingegangen, welches nach Kant die Möglichkeit der apriorischen Verbindung von Moralität und Glückseligkeit beweist.“

<sup>66</sup> „Gegen soziale oder sogar politische Umdeutungen der Kantischen Tugendlehre wird eingewandt, daß sich Kant nicht auf die empirische Tatsache einer intersubjektiven Menschenvernunft beruft, sondern im Gegenteil dazu behauptet, daß die Tugendlehre bis auf die Elemente der Metaphysik zurückgehen muß. Es wird die These vertreten, gemäß welcher die Tugendlehre keine Anthropologie, sondern eine „Anthroponomie“ (VI 405–406) ist, welche ohne den Rückbezug auf die Metaphysik weder Sicherheit noch Reinheit und vor allem keine bewegende Kraft haben kann. Außerdem wird die Besonderheit der Kantischen Tugendlehre als Eleutheronomie und Anthroponomie betont, in welcher den „ästhetischen Vorbegriffen“ (Ziffer XII der Einleitung) eine wesentliche Rolle zukommt. Sie sind insgesamt ästhetisch und vorhergehende, aber natürliche Gemütsanlagen, durch Pflichtbegriffe affiziert zu werden. Das Bewußtsein derselben ist nicht empirischen Ursprungs, sondern kann nur auf das eines moralischen Gesetzes, als Wirkung desselben aufs Gemüt, folgen. In diesem Kontext wird der Nexus mit der apriorischen Triebfederlehre und mit der ebenfalls apriorischen Methodenlehre der Kritik der praktischen Vernunft ans Licht gestellt und zwar in der Absicht, die fundierende Rolle apriorischer Gefühle zu betonen.“

- 2001 [436] Glasgow, Joshua M. (2001): Kant's Non-Prudential Duty of Beneficence, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 211–19.
- 2003 [437] Glasgow, Joshua M. (2003): Expanding the Limits of Universalization: Kant's Duties and Kantian Moral Deliberation, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 33, S. 23–47.<sup>67</sup>
- 2007 [438] Glasgow, Joshua (2007): Kant's Conception of Humanity, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 45, S. 291–308.<sup>68</sup>
- 1971 [439] Glass, Ronald (1971): The Contradictions in Kant's Examples, *Philosophical Studies* 69, S. 65–70.
- 2017 [440] Goldberg, Zachary J. (2017): Can Kant's Theory of Radical Evil Be Saved?, *Kantian Review* 22, S. 395–419.<sup>69</sup>
- 1988 [441] Goldman, Alan H. (1988): *Moral Knowledge*, London, S. 91–130 ("Kant: Objective Rationality and Obligation").
- 2006 [442] González Valenzuela, Juliana (2006): Kant's Ethics and its Influence on Bioethics, in *Kant Today – Kant aujourd'hui – Kant heute. Results of the IIP Conference/Actes des Entretiens de l'Institut International de Philosophie Karlsruhe/Heidelberg 2004*, hrsg. von Hans Lenk und Reiner Wiehl, Münster, S. 127–41.
- 1994 [443] Gowans, Christopher W. (1994): *Innocence Lost. An Examination of Inescapable Moral Wrongdoing*, New York, Oxford, S. 184–217 ("Kantian Critiques of the Phenomenological Argument").

---

<sup>67</sup> "Conventional wisdom on Kantian ethics holds that in order to find out if one's action is morally permissible, one must "interpersonally universalize" the maxim behind that action, i.e., be able to will it for everyone without falling into some sort of contradiction. I argue in this paper that this conventional wisdom must be supplemented by a requirement to "temporally universalize" one's maxim, such that it hypothetically holds for all times. Doing so, I argue, allows us to better understand Kant's arguments for duties to oneself in the Groundwork, and it also allows us to avoid putative problem maxims for Christine Korsgaard's "practical contradiction" interpretation of the universalization procedure, namely those offered by Barbara Herman that contain a coordination feature (e.g., "I will play tennis at 10:00 on Sundays")."

<sup>68</sup> "Contemporary Kant scholarship generally takes 'humanity' in Kant's ethical writings to refer to beings with rational capacities. However, his claims that only the good will has unqualified goodness and that humanity is unconditionally valuable suggests that humanity might be the good will. This problem seems to have infiltrated some prominent scholarship, and Richard Dean has recently argued that, in fact, humanity is indeed the good will. This paper defends, and tries to make sense of, the more conventional view that humanity and the good will are distinct."

<sup>69</sup> "In this article, I assess three contemporary criticisms levelled at Kant's theory of evil in order to evaluate whether his theory can be saved. Critics argue that Kant does not adequately distinguish between evil and mundane wrongdoing, making his use of the term 'evil' emotional hyperbole; by defining evil as the subordination of the moral law to self-love his analysis is seemingly overly simplistic and empirically false; and by focusing solely on the moral character of the perpetrator of evil, Kant's theory apparently ignores the most salient aspect of evil – the suffering of victims. While I will not claim that Kant provides us with a fully adequate theory of evil, I respond to each of these criticisms and conclude that Kant's theory can still provide significant insight into both the nature of evil and the moral psychology of perpetrators of evil."

- 2007 [444] Goy, Ina (2007): Immanuel Kant über das moralische Gefühl der Achtung, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 61, S. 337–60.
- 2013 [445] Goy, Ina (2013): Virtue and Sensibility (TL 6: 399–409), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 183–206.
- 2014 [446] Goy, Ina (2014): Die Deduktion des Sittengesetzes in den Jahren 1785, 1788 und 1788 – 90 und der Wandel in Kants Naturbegriff, in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S.167–88.
- 2005 [447] Graband, Claudia (2005): Das Vermögen der Freiheit: Kants Kategorien der praktischen Vernunft, *Kant-Studien* 96, S. 41–65.
- 2015 [448] Graband, Claudia (2015): *Klugheit bei Kant*, Berlin (*Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte* 185), S. 248–92 („Klugheit und Moral“).
- 1990 [449] Graham, Gordon (1990): *Living the Good Life. An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*, St. Paul, MN., S. 92–124 (“The Moral Life I: Duty for Duty’s Sake”).
- 2004 [450] Graham, Gordon (2004): *Eight Theories of Ethics*, London, S. 98–127 (“Kantianism”).
- 1992 [451] Green, Michael K. (1992): Kant and Moral Self-Deception, *Kant-Studien* 83, S. 149–69.
- 1991 [452] Green, Ronald M. (1991): The First Formulation of the Categorical Imperative as Literally a ‘Legislative’ Metaphor, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 8, S. 163–79.
- 2001 [453] Green, Ronald M. (2001): What Does it Mean to Use Someone as “A Means Only”: Rereading Kant, *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal* 11 (3), S. 247–61.<sup>70</sup>
- 2011 [454] Greenberg, Robert (2011): On a Presumed Omission in Kant’s Derivation of the Categorical Imperative, *Kantian Review* 28, S. 449–59.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> “Debates about commodification in bioethics frequently appeal to Kant’s famous second formulation of the categorical imperative, the formula requiring us to treat the rational (human) being as “an end in itself” and “never as a means only.” In the course of her own treatment of commodification, Margaret Jane Radin observes that Kant’s application of this formula “does not generate noncontroversial particular consequences.” This is so, I argue, because Kant offers three different – and largely incompatible – interpretations of the formula. One focuses on the obligation to preserve rational willing; the second stresses respect for human (physical) dignity and integrity; the third views respect for others as “ends in themselves” as primarily involving a willingness to govern one’s conduct by a procedure of impartial co-legislation. Only the third of these interpretations, I conclude, offers a reasonable and coherent approach to moral judgment about the limits of commodification.”

<sup>71</sup> “A new book by Stephen Engstrom repeats a criticism of Bruce Aune’s of Kant’s derivation of the universalizability formula of the categorical imperative. The criticism is that Kant omitted at least one substantive premise in the derivation of the formula: ‘Act only on that maxim through which you can at the same time *will* that it become a universal law.’ The grounds for the formula that are given in the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, however, are said to support only a weaker requirement, namely, that a maxim *conform* to a universal law. Hence, Kant omits at least one necessary substantive premise of the derivation. This paper attempts to show that nothing substantive is omitted from the argument. It only needs two principles of inference that it is assumed add nothing substantive to the premises.”

- 2016 [455] Greenberg, Robert (2016): *The Bounds of Freedom: Kant's Causal Theory of Action*, Berlin (*Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte* 191), S. 57–116 (Kap. 4: Conscience: Remembering One's Forbidden Actions, Kap. 5: The New Problem of the Imputability of Actions, Kap. 6: Maxims and Categorical Imperatives, Kap. 7: Necessity and Practical A Priori Knowledge: Kant and Kripke, Kap. 8: The Bounds of Freedom.)
- 2005 [456] Greenberg, Sean (2005): From Canon to Dialectic to Antinomy: Giving Inclinations Their Due, *Inquiry* 48, S. 232–48.<sup>72</sup>
- 1960 [457] Gregor, Mary J. (1960): Kant's Conception of a "Metaphysic of Morals", *Philosophical Quarterly* 10, S. 238–251.
- 1963 [458] Gregor, Mary (1963): *Laws of Freedom. A Study of Kant's Method of Applying the Categorical Imperative in the Metaphysik der Sitten*, Oxford.
- 1990 [459] Gregor, Mary (1990): Kants System der Pflichten in der Metaphysik der Sitten, in Immanuel Kant, *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Tugendlehre. Metaphysik der Sitten, zweiter Teil*, neu herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Bernd Ludwig, Hamburg, S. XXIX–LXV.
- 1993 [460] Gregor, Mary (1993): Kant on Obligation, Rights, and Virtue, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 1, S. 69–102.
- 2003 [461] Greimann, Dirk (2003): Kants Ableitung der Formel des kategorischen Imperativs aus seinem bloßen Begriff, in *Philosophiegeschichte und logische Analyse*, hrsg. von Uwe Meixner und Albert Newen, Band 6: *Geschichte der Ethik*, Paderborn, S. 97–111.
- 2004 [462] Greimann, Dirk (2004): Ist Kants Ethik ontologisch unschuldig?, *Kant-Studien* 95, S. 107–27.
- 2001 [463] Grenberg, Jeanine M. (2001): Feeling, Desire and Interest in Kant's Theory of Action, *Kant-Studien* 92, S. 153–79.
- 2005 [464] Grenberg, Jeanine M. (2005): *Kant and the Ethics of Humility. A Story of Dependence, Corruption and Virtue*, Cambridge.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> "In a recent paper, Eckart Förster challenges interpreters to explain why in the first Critique practical reason has a canon but no dialectic, whereas in the second Critique, there is not only a dialectic, but an antinomy of practical reason. In the Groundwork, Kant claims that there is a natural dialectic with respect to morality (4:405), a different claim from those advanced in the first and second Critiques. Förster's challenge may therefore be reformulated as the problem of explaining why practical reason has a canon in the first Critique, a dialectic in the Groundwork, and an antinomy in the second Critique. In this paper, I answer this challenge. I argue that these differences are due to the different aims and scope of the works, and in particular, the different place of the inclinations in their arguments."

<sup>73</sup> "In recent years, philosophers have either ignored the virtue of humility or found it to be in need of radical redefinition. But humility is a central human virtue, and it is the purpose of this book to defend that claim from a Kantian point of view. Jeanine Grenberg argues that we can indeed speak of Aristotelian-style, but still deeply Kantian, virtuous character traits. She proposes moving from focus on action to focus on person, not leaving the former behind, but instead taking it up within a larger, more satisfying Kantian moral theory. Using examples from literature as well as philosophy, she shows that there is a Kantian virtue theory to be explored in which humility plays a central role. Her book will have a wide appeal to readers not only in Kant studies but also in theological ethics and moral psychology."

- 2009 [465] Grenberg, Jeanine M. (2009): The Phenomenological Failure of *Groundwork III*, *Inquiry* 52, S. 335–56.<sup>74</sup>
- 2010 [466] Grenberg, Jeanine (2010): What is the Enemy of Virtue?, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 152–69.
- 2011 [467] Grenberg, Jeanine (2011): Making Sense of the Relationship of Reason and Sensibility in Kant's Ethics, *Kantian Review* 28, S. 461–72.<sup>75</sup> – Zu [115].
- 2013 [468] Grenberg, Jeanine (2013): *Kant's Defense of Common Moral Experience. A Phenomenological Account*, Cambridge.<sup>76</sup> – Dazu: [961] und [1533].

---

Contents: "Introduction; Part I. Kantian Virtue: 1. Dependent and corrupt rational agency; 2. Constraints on any possible Kantian account of virtue; 3. A Kantian account of virtue; Part II. A Kantian Response to Recent Accounts of Humility: 4. A Kantian response to recent accounts of humility; Part III: 5. The Kantian Virtue of Humility: 5. The Kantian virtue of humility; 6. Humility and self-respect; 7. The humble person; Part IV. The Virtues of Kantian Humility: 8. The humble pursuit of self-knowledge; 9. The humble pursuit of respect for persons; Conclusion."

<sup>74</sup> "Henry Allison and Paul Guyer have recently offered interpretations of Kant's argument in *Groundwork III*. These interpretations share this premise: the argument moves from a non-moral, theoretical premise to a moral conclusion, and the failure of the argument is a failure to make this jump from the non-moral to the moral. This characterization both of the nature of the argument and its failure is flawed. Consider instead the possibility that in *Groundwork III*, Kant is struggling toward something rather different from this, not trying to pull the moral rabbit out of the theoretical hat, but instead seeking a proto-phenomenological grounding of morality: a grounding that begins from first personal felt experiences that already possess moral content, and proceeds to its further practical claims via attentive reflection on these felt experiences. This paper brings this assumption to our reading of *Groundwork III*, showing that in doing so we acquire a deeper appreciation both of the argument, and the reasons it fails. Kant's argument is practical throughout. And the failure of the argument is the failure of Kant's nascent efforts to provide a new, phenomenological method for the grounding of practical philosophy."

<sup>75</sup> "In this essay, I look at some claims Anne Margaret Baxley makes, in her recent book *Kant's Theory of Virtue: The Value of Autocracy*, about the relationship between reason and sensibility in Kant's theory of virtue. I then reflect on tensions I find in these claims as compared to the overall goal of her book: an account of Kant's conception of virtue as autocracy. Ultimately, I argue that interpreters like Baxley (and myself) who want to welcome a more robust role for feeling in Kantian ethics must, in order to achieve our purposes, move beyond the general account of the limits for the role of the moral feeling of respect in the grounding of Kant's ethics which Henry Allison established in his influential *Kant's Theory of Freedom*."

<sup>76</sup> "In this book, Jeanine Grenberg argues that everything important about Kant's moral philosophy emerges from careful reflection upon the common human moral experience of the conflict between happiness and morality. Through careful readings of both the *Groundwork* and the *Critique of Practical Reason*, Grenberg shows that Kant, typically thought to be an overly technical moral philosopher, in fact is a vigorous defender of the common person's first-personal encounter with moral demands. Grenberg uncovers a notion of phenomenological experience in Kant's account of the Fact of Reason, develops a new reading of the Fact, and grants a moral epistemic role for feeling in grounding Kant's a priori morality. The book thus challenges readings which attribute only a motivational role to feeling; and Fichtean readings which violate Kant's commitments to the limits of reason. This study will be valuable to students and scholars engaged in Kant studies."

- 2014 [469] Grenberg, Jeanine (2014): All You Need Is Love?, in *Kant on Emotion and Value*, hrsg. von Alix Cohen, Houndmills, S. 210–23.
- 2015 [470] Grenberg, Jeanine (2015): Response to Ware and Moyar, *Kantian Review* 20, S. 313–30. – Zu [961] und [1533].
- 2010 [471] Gressis, Rob (2010): Recent Work on Kantian Maxims I: Established Approaches, *Philosophy Compass* 5, S. 216–27.<sup>77</sup>
- 2010 [472] Gressis, Rob (2010): Recent Work on Kantian Maxims II, *Philosophy Compass* 5, S. 228–39.<sup>78</sup>
- 2002 [473] Grimm, Stephen R. (2002): Kant’s Argument for Radical Evil, *European Journal of Philosophy* 10, S. 160–77.
- 2000 [474] Grondin, Jean (2000): Zur Phänomenologie des moralischen ‚Gesetzes‘. Das kontemplative

---

<sup>77</sup> “Maxims play a crucial role in Kant’s ethical philosophy, but there is significant disagreement about what maxims are. In this two-part essay, I survey eight different views of Kantian maxims, presenting their strengths, and their weaknesses. Part I: Established Approaches, begins with Rüdiger Bubner’s view that Kant took maxims to be what ordinary people of today take them to be, namely pithily expressed precepts of morality or prudence. Next comes the position, most associated with Rüdiger Bittner and Otfried Höffe, that maxims are Lebensregeln, or ‘life-rules’ – quite general rules for how to conduct oneself based on equally general outlooks on how the world is. These first two interpretations make sense of Kant’s claim, made in his anthropological and pedagogical writings, that we have to learn how to act on maxims, but they become less plausible in light of Kant’s probable view that people always act on maxims – after all, how can people learn how to act on something they always act on anyway? The next two views, each advanced, at different times, by Onora O’Neill, make better sense of the fact that people always act on maxims, for they hold that maxims are intentions – either specific intentions, such as ‘to open the door’, or general intentions, such as ‘to make guests feel welcome’– and it is perfectly sensible to claim that people always act on intentions. However, they face the same problem as the two previous views, which is that if people always act on maxims, what sense does it make to say they also have to learn how to act on them? Henry Allison, the main representative of the fifth view, claims, on the basis of Kant’s doctrine of the ‘highest maxim’, that maxims are principles organized hierarchically, such that an agent endorses one maxim because she endorses a more general maxim. Unfortunately for Allison, there is little direct textual support for his claim that maxims are organized hierarchically.”

<sup>78</sup> “Maxims play a crucial role in Kant’s ethical philosophy, but there is significant disagreement about what maxims are. In this two-part essay, I survey eight different views of Kantian maxims, presenting their strengths and their weaknesses. In Part II: New Approaches, I look at three more recent views in somewhat greater detail than I do the five treatments canvassed in ‘Recent Works on Kantian Maxims I: Established Approaches’. First, there is Richard McCarty’s Interpretation, which holds that Kant’s understanding of maxims can be illuminated by placing them in the context of the Wolffian tradition, according to which maxims are the major premises of practical syllogisms. The next subject Maria Schwartz, holds that careful attention to Kant’s distinction between rules and maxims, as well as Kant’s concept of happiness, allows us to make sense of almost all of Kant’s remarks on maxims. It may be, however, that on Schwartz’s view agents turn out to perform actions as opposed to thoughtlessly habitual behaviors much less often than is plausible. This leads to the final approach, exemplified by Jens Timmermann, which is that Kant understands maxims equivocally. I claim that something like Timmermann’s approach is the only way to make sense of all of what Kant has to say on maxims.”

Motiv der Erhebung in Kants praktischer Metaphysik, *Kant-Studien* 91, S. 385–94.

- 1988 [475] Grünewald, Bernward (1988): Praktische Vernunft und transzendente Einheit. Das Problem einer transzendentalen Deduktion des Sittengesetzes, in *Kant. Analysen – Probleme – Kritik*, hrsg. von Hariolf Oberer und Gerhard Seel, Würzburg, S. 127–67.
- 1993 [476] Grünewald, Bernward (1993): Zur moralphilosophischen Funktion des Prinzips vom höchsten Gut, in *Naturzweckmäßigkeit und ästhetische Kultur. Studien zu Kants Kritik der Urteilskraft*, hrsg. von Karl-Heinz Schwabe und Martina Thom, St. Augustin, S. 133–39.
- 2004 [477] Grünewald, Bernward (2004): Form und Materie der reinen praktischen Vernunft. Über die Haltlosigkeit von Formalismus- und Solipsismus-Vorwürfen und das Verhältnis des kategorischen Imperativs zu seinen Erläuterungsformeln, in *Metaphysik und Kritik. Festschrift für Manfred Baum zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Sabine Doyé, Marion Heinz und Udo Rameil, Berlin, New York, S. 183–201.
- 2008 [478] Grünewald, Bernward (2008): Wahrhaftigkeit, Recht and Lüge, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: Sektionen III–IV, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 149–60.
- 1999 [479] Guevara, Daniel (1999): The Impossibility of Supererogation in Kant's Moral Theory, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 59, S. 593–624.
- 2000 [480] Guevara, Daniel (2000): *Kant's Theory of Moral Motivation*, Boulder.
- 1971 [481] Gupta, R. K. (1971): Kant's Groundwork of Morality, *Studi Internazionali di Filosofia* 3, S. 111–61.
- 1973 [482] Gupta, R. K. (1973): Kant's Problem of the Possibility of the Categorical Imperative, *Kant-Studien* 64, S. 49–55.
- 1997 [483] Gupta, R. K. (1997): Notes on Kant's Derivation of the Various Formulae of the Categorical Imperative, *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 5, S. 383–96.
- 1993 [484] Guyer, Paul (1993): Kant's Morality of Law and Morality of Freedom, in *Kant and Critique. New Essays in Honor of W. H. Werkmeister*, hrsg. von R. M. Dancy, Dordrecht, S. 43–89. Wiederabgedruckt in Guyer, *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*, Cambridge 2000, S. 129–71.
- 1995 [485] Guyer, Paul (1995): The Possibility of the Categorical Imperative, *Philosophical Review* 104, S. 353–85. Wiederabgedruckt in Guyer, *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*, Cambridge 2000, S. 172–206 sowie in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa 1998, S. 215–46.
- 1996 [486] Guyer, Paul (1996): The Value of Agency. Review Essay of Barbara Herman, *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, *Ethics* 106, S. 404–23. – Zu [555].
- 1997 [487] Guyer, Paul (1997): In praktischer Absicht: Kants Begriff der Postulate der reinen praktischen Vernunft, *Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft* 104, S. 1–18. – From a Practical Point of View: Kant's Conception of a Postulate of Pure Practical Reason, in Guyer, *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*, Cambridge 2000, S. 333–71. (Erweiterte englische Fassung)

- 1997 [488] Guyer, Paul (1997): Kantian Foundations for Liberalism, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 5, S. 121–40.
- 1998 [489] Guyer, Paul (1998): Self-Understanding and Philosophy: The Strategy of Kant's *Groundwork*, in *Philosophie in synthetischer Absicht*, hrsg. von Marcelo Stamm, Stuttgart,, S. 271–97. Wiederabgedruckt als „The Strategy of Kant's *Groundwork*“ in Guyer, *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*, Cambridge 2000, S. 207–31.
- 1998 [490] Guyer, Paul (1998): Introduction, in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa, S. xi–xlv.
- 2000 [491] Guyer, Paul (2000): Moral Worth, Virtue, and Merit, in ders., *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*, Cambridge, S. 287–329.
- 2001 [492] Guyer, Paul (2001): The Form and Matter of the Categorical Imperative, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, Band I, S. 131–50. Wiederabgedruckt in Guyer, *Kant's System of Nature and Freedom. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2005, S. 146–68.
- 2002 [493] Guyer, Paul (2002): Ends of Reason and Ends of Nature: The Place of Teleology in Kant's Ethics, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 161–86. Wiederabgedruckt in Guyer, *Kant's System of Nature and Freedom. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2005, S. 169–97.
- 2002 [494] Guyer, Paul (2002): Kant's Deductions of the Principles of Right, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 23–64. Wiederabgedruckt in Guyer, *Kant's System of Nature and Freedom. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2005, S. 198–242.
- 2003 [495] Guyer, Paul (2003): Kant on the Theory and Practice of Autonomy, *Social Philosophy and Policy* 20/2, S. 70–98. Wiederabgedruckt in Guyer, *Kant's System of Nature and Freedom. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2005, S. 115–45.
- 2005 [496] Guyer, Paul (2005): Kant's System of Duties, in Guyer, *Kant's System of Nature and Freedom. Selected Essays*, Oxford, S. 243–74.
- 2007 [497] Guyer, Paul (2007): *Kant's Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals: A Reader's Guide*, London.<sup>79</sup>
- 2007 [498] Guyer, Paul (2007): Naturalistic and Transcendental Moments in Kant's Moral Philosophy, *Inquiry* 50, S. 444–64.<sup>80</sup> – Dazu: [14], [1188], [1625].

---

<sup>79</sup> Inhalt: Sources and Abbreviations (S. vii), 1. Context (S. 1), 2. Overview of Themes (S. 10), 3. Reading the Text: Preface (S. 23), 4. Reading the Text: Section I. From the Good Will to the Formula of Universal Law (S. 36), 5. Reading the Text: Section II. Formulating the Categorical Imperative (S. 66), 6. Reading the Text: Section III. The Categorical Imperative Applies to Us (S. 146), Notes (S. 172), Suggestions for Further Reading (S. 179), Index (S. 183).

<sup>80</sup> “During the 1760s and 1770s, Kant entertained a naturalistic approach to ethics based on the supposed psychological fact of a human love for freedom. During the critical period, especially in the *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant clearly rejected such an approach. But his attempt at a metaphysical foundation for ethics in section III of the *Groundwork* was equally clearly a failure. Kant recognized this in

- 2007 [499] Guyer, Paul (2007): Response to Critics, *Inquiry* 50, S. 497–510. – Zu [14], [1188], [1625].
- 2009 [500] Guyer, Paul (2009): Ist und Soll. Von Hume bis Kant, und heute, in *Kant und die Zukunft der europäischen Aufklärung*, hrsg. von Heiner Klemme, Berlin, S. 210–31.
- 2009 [501] Guyer, Paul (2009): Problems with Freedom: Kant’s Argument in *Groundwork* III and its Subsequent Emendations, in *Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 176–202.
- 2010 [502] Guyer, Paul (2010): Moral Feelings in the *Metaphysics of Morals*, in *Kant’s Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 130–51.
- 2010 [503] Guyer, Paul (2010): The Obligation to be Virtuous: Kant’s Conception of the *Tugendverpflichtung*, *Social Philosophy and Policy* 27, S. 206–32.<sup>81</sup>
- 2011 [504] Guyer, Paul (2011): Kantian Perfectionism, in *Perfecting Virtue. New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence Jost und Julian Wuerth, Cambridge, S. 194–214.
- 2012 [505] Guyer, Paul (2012): Freedom as the Foundation of Morality: Kant’s Early Efforts, in *Kant’s Observations and Remarks. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Susan Meld Shell und Richard Velkley, Cambridge 2012, S. 77–98.
- 2013 [506] Guyer, Paul (2013): Constructivism and Self-constitution, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 176–200.
- 2013 [507] Guyer, Paul (2013): Freedom and the Essential Ends of Mankind, in *Kant und die Philosophie in weltbürgerlicher Absicht. Akten des XI. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Stefano Bacin, Alfredo Ferrarin, Claudio La Rocca und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, New York, Band 1, S. 229–44.
- 2013 [508] Guyer, Paul (2013): Kant über moralische Gefühle. Von den Vorlesungen zur Metaphysik der Sitten, in *Kants »Metaphysik der Sitten« in der Diskussion. Ein Arbeitsgespräch an der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel 2009*, hrsg. von Werner Euler und Burkhard Tuschling, Berlin, S. 177–210.
- 2015 [509] Guyer, Paul (2015): Die Beweisstruktur der *Grundlegung* und die Rolle des dritten Abschnittes, in *Kants Begründung von Freiheit und Moral in Grundlegung III. Neue Interpretationen*, hrsg. von Dieter Schönecker, Münster, S. 109–36.
- 2016 [510] Guyer, Paul (2016): *Virtues of Freedom. Selected Essays on Kant*, Oxford.
- 1998 [511] Guyer, Paul (Hrsg.) (1998): *Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, Totowa.

---

his appeal to the “fact of reason” argument in the Critique of Practical Reason, but thereby gave up on any attempt to ground the fundamental principle of morality at all. So it is of interest to see how far we might now proceed along the lines of his original naturalistic approach.”

<sup>81</sup> “In the *Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant makes a distinction between duties of virtue and the obligation to be virtuous. For a number of reasons, it may seem as if the latter does not actually require any actions of us not already required by the former. This essay argues that Kant does succeed in describing obligations that we have to prepare for virtuous conduct that are different from simply fulfilling specific duties of virtue, and that in so doing he describes an important element of the moral life.”

- 1982 [512] Haardt, Alexander (1982): Die Stellung des Personalitätsprinzips in der GMS und in der KpV, *Kant-Studien* 73, S. 157–68.
- 2002 [513] Haardt, Alexander (2002): Ethik. Zum Verhältnis von Moralität und Rationalität am Beispiel der kritischen Ethik Immanuel Kants, in *Die Philosophie in ihren Disziplinen. Eine Einführung. Bochumer Ringvorlesung Wintersemester 1999/2000*, hrsg. von Burkhard Mojsisch und Orrin F. Summerell, Amsterdam, S. 49–64.
- 2003 [514] Haardt, Alexander (2003): Normativität und Normalität in den ethischen Konzeptionen Kants und Schellers, in: *Phänomenologische Forschungen / Phenomenological Studies / Recherches Phénoménologiques*, S. 5–22.
- 2017 [515] Hakim, David (2017): Kant on Moral Illusion and Appraisal of Others, *Kantian Review* 22, S. 421–40.<sup>82</sup>
- 1961 [516] Hall, Robert W. (1960/61): Kant and Ethical Formalism, *Kant-Studien* 52, S. 433–39.
- 2008 [517] Hallich, Oliver (2008): *Die Rationalität der Moral. Eine sprachanalytische Grundlegung der Ethik*, Paderborn, S. 570–83 („Kants Versuch der Kontingenzeliminierung“).
- 2014 [518] Hammer, Carl (2014): Dependence on Wrongdoing in the Consumption of Meat: A Kantian Analysis, *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 31, S. 169–87.<sup>83</sup>
- 1991 [519] Hansson, Mats G. (1991): How Can the Moral Law Determine Action in a Specific Situation?, in *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 305–12.
- 1980 [520] Harbison, W. G. (1980): The Good Will, *Kant-Studien* 71, S. 47–59.
- 2000 [521] Harbison, Warren (2000): Self-Improvement, Beneficence, and the Law of Nature Formula, *Kant-Studien* 91, S. 17–24.
- 2000 [522] Hare, John E. (2000): Kant on Recognizing Our Duties as God’s Commands, *Faith and Philosophy* 17, S. 459–478.

---

<sup>82</sup> “Kant’s accounts of moral education, appraisal respect and gratitude each depend on the assumption that human beings see and judge each other’s actions to be morally good. This assumption appears to stand in tension with the Opacity Thesis, Kant’s claim that we can never know if an action is morally good. This paper examines Kant’s discussion of moral illusion to relieve this tension. It is argued that we are required to uphold moral illusion, i.e. to represent others’ actions to be morally good (while knowing that we may be mistaken), due to the duty of beneficence for others’ moral well-being.”

<sup>83</sup> “Kant’s ethics is used by some as a defence of the exploitation of animals and is criticised by others for not recognising any moral relevance of the plight of animals. These appeals overlook the broad applicability of Kant’s principles. In this article, I argue that Kant’s ethics implies a duty to abstain from most meat and some other animal products derived from farming. I argue that there is a Kantian principle not to choose goods that have been derived from wrongdoing, with certain qualifications. This principle isolates the wrong of using others to commit wrongdoing on one’s behalf. As has been argued by others, Kant’s ethics implies that animal farming as we know it in our society almost universally involves wrongdoing and the slaughter of animals is especially tied to wrongdoing. I argue for a broad sense in which these ideas together imply that choosing farmed meat, and probably other animal products, is treating animal industry workers as mere means. Thus, we have a Kantian duty to abstain from these products.”

- 2000 [523] Hare, John E. (2000): Kant's Divine Command Theory and Its Reception within Analytic Philosophy, in *Kant and Kierkegaard on Religion*, hrsg. von D. Z. Phillips und Timothy Tessin, London, S. 263–277.
- 2006 [524] Hare, John E. (2006): On Recognizing our Duties as God's Commands, in *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, hrsg. von Heiner F. Klemme, Manfred Kühn und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. 275–85.
- 2013 [525] Hare, John E. (2013): The Place of Kant's Theism in His Moral Philosophy, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 300–14. – Dazu: A. W. Moore (2013): Freedom, Temporality and Belief. A Reply to Hare, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 315–18.
- 1993 [526] Hare, R. M. (1993): Could Kant Have Been A Utilitarian?, in ders., *Sorting Out Ethics*, Oxford 1997, S. 147–65 (revidierte Version). – Könnte Kant ein Utilitarist gewesen sein?, in *Zum moralischen Denken*, hrsg. von Christoph Fehige und Georg Meggle, Frankfurt a. M. 1995, Bd. 2, S. 11–34.
- 1988 [527] Harris, Nigel G. E. (1988): Imperfect Duties and Conflict of Will, *Kant-Studien* 79, S. 33–42.
- 1992 [528] Harris, Nigel G. E. (1992): Kantian Duties and Immoral Agents, *Kant-Studien* 83, S. 336–43.
- 1957 [529] Harrison, Jonathan (1957): Kant's Examples of the First Formulation of the Categorical Imperative, *Philosophical Quarterly* 7, S. 50–62.
- 1985 [530] Harrison, Jonathan (1985): Utilitarianism, Universalization, Heteronomy and Necessity or Unkantian Ethics, in *Morality and Universality*, hrsg. von Nelson T. Potter und Mark Timmons, Dordrecht, S. 237–65. Wiederabgedruckt in Harrison, *Ethical Essays Volume I*, Aldershot 1993, S. 81–109.
- 1925 [531] Hartmann, Nicolai (1925): *Ethik*, Berlin 1962 (4., unveränderte Aufl.), S. 98–119 („Die Kantische Ethik“).
- 2006 [532] Harzer, Regina (2006): Über die Bedeutsamkeit des Kategorischen Imperativs für die Rechtslehre Kants, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 225–41.
- 2002 [533] Haucke, Kai (2002): Moralische Pflicht und die Frage nach dem gelingenden Leben. Überlegungen zu Kants Glücksbegriff, *Kant-Studien* 93, S. 177–99.
- 1994 [534] Hayward, Tim (1994): Kant and the Moral Considerability of Non-Rational Beings, in *Philosophy and the Natural Environment*, hrsg. von Robin Attfield und Andrew Belsey (*Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement* 36), S. 129–42.
- 2008 [535] Heil, Joachim (2008): Einleitung in die praktische Philosophie Kants, in *Texte zur praktischen Philosophie: Kant*. Ausgewählt und eingeleitet von Joachim Heil, London, S. XVII–LXVII.
- 2001 [536] Held, Carsten (2001): Kant über Willensfreiheit und Moralität, in *Systematische Ethik mit Kant*, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 124–61.
- 1955 [537] Henrich, Dieter (1954/55): Das Prinzip der Kantischen Ethik, *Philosophische Rundschau* 2, S. 20–38.

- 1958 [538] Henrich, Dieter (1957/58): Hutcheson und Kant, *Kant-Studien* 49, S. 49–69. – Hutcheson and Kant, in *Kant's Moral and Legal Philosophy*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Otfried Höffe, Cambridge 2009, S. 29–57.
- 1960 [539] Henrich, Dieter (1960): Der Begriff der sittlichen Einsicht und Kants Lehre vom Faktum der Vernunft, in *Die Gegenwart der Griechen im neueren Denken. Festschrift für Hans-Georg Gadamer zum 60. Geburtstag*, Tübingen, S. 77–115.
- 1963 [540] Henrich, Dieter (1963): Das Problem der Grundlegung der Ethik bei Kant und im spekulativen Idealismus, in *Sein und Ethos. Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung der Ethik*, hrsg. von Paulus Engelhardt, Mainz, S. 350–86.
- 1963 [541] Henrich, Dieter (1963): Über Kants früheste Ethik. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion, *Kant-Studien*, S. 404–31. – Concerning Kant's Earliest Ethics. An Attempt at a Reconstruction, in *Kant's Observations and Remarks. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Susan Meld Shell und Richard Velkley, Cambridge 2012, S. 13–37.
- 1975 [542] Henrich, Dieter (1975): Die Deduktion des Sittengesetzes, in *Denken im Schatten des Nihilismus. Festschrift für Wilhelm Weischedel*, hrsg. von Alexander Schwan, Darmstadt, S. 55–112.
- 1979 [543] Henson, R. (1979): What Kant Might Have Said: Moral Worth and the Overdetermination of Dutiful Action, *Philosophical Review* 88, S. 39–54.
- 2001 [544] Hepfer, Karl (2001): „... der Stein der Weisen“: Motivation und Maximen, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 220–29.
- 1981 [545] Herman, Barbara (1981): On the Value of Acting from the Motive of Duty, in dies., *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, S. 1–22.
- 1983 [546] Herman, Barbara (1983): Integrity and Impartiality, in dies., *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, S. 23–44.
- 1984 [547] Herman, Barbara (1984): Mutual Aid and Respect for Persons, in dies., *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, S. 45–72. Wiederabgedruckt in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa 1998, S. 133–64.
- 1985 [548] Herman, Barbara (1985): The Practice of Moral Judgment, in dies., *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, S. 73–93.
- 1989 [549] Herman, Barbara (1989): Murder and Mayhem, in dies., *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, S. 113–31.
- 1990 [550] Herman, Barbara (1990): Obligation and Performance: A Kantian Account of Moral Conflict, in *Identity, Character, and Morality. Essays in Moral Psychology*, hrsg. von Owen Flanagan und Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, Cambridge, Mass., S. 311–37. Wiederabgedruckt als "Obligation and Performance" in Herman, *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, S. 159–83.
- 1991 [551] Herman, Barbara (1991): Agency, Attachment, and Difference, in dies., *The Practice of Moral*

*Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, S. 184–207.

- 1992 [552] Herman, Barbara (1992): What Happens to the Consequences?, in dies., *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, S. 94–112.
- 1993 [553] Herman, Barbara (1993): Moral Deliberation and the Derivation of Duties, in dies., *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass., S. 132–58.
- 1993 [554] Herman, Barbara (1993): Leaving Deontology Behind, in dies., *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass., S. 208–40. – Jenseits der Deontologie, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn 2004, S. 117–54.
- 1993 [555] Herman, Barbara (1993): *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. – Vgl. dazu [486], [1554].
- 1996 [556] Herman, Barbara (1996): Making Room for Character, in *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics. Rethinking Happiness and Duty*, hrsg. von Stephen Engstrom und Jennifer Whiting, Cambridge, S. 36–60. Revidierte Version in Herman, *Moral Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass. 2007, S. 1–28.
- 1997 [557] Herman, Barbara (1997): A Cosmopolitan Kingdom of Ends, in *Reclaiming the History of Ethics. Essays for John Rawls*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath, Barbara Herman und Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge, S. 187–213. Revidierte Version in Herman, *Moral Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass. 2007, S. 51–78.
- 1998 [558] Herman, Barbara (1998): Training to Autonomy: Kant and the Question of Moral Education, in *Philosophers on Education [New] Historical Perspectives*, hrsg. von Amélie O. Rorty, London. Revidierte Version in Herman, *Moral Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass. 2007, S. 130–53.
- 2001 [559] Herman, Barbara (2001): Rethinking Kant's Hedonism, in *Fact and Value: Essays on Ethics and Metaphysics for Judith Jarvis Thomson*, Cambridge. Revidierte Version in Herman, *Moral Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass. 2007, S. 176–202.
- 2002 [560] Herman, Barbara (2002): The Scope of Moral Requirement, *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 30, S. 227–56. Wiederabgedruckt in Herman, *Moral Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass. 2007, S. 203–29.
- 2006 [561] Herman, Barbara (2006): Reasoning to Obligation, *Inquiry* 49, S. 44–61.<sup>84</sup>
- 2007 [562] Herman, Barbara (2007): *Moral Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass.

---

<sup>84</sup> "If, as Kant says, "the will is practical reason", we should think of willing as a mode of reasoning, and its activity represented in movement from evaluative premises to intention by way of a validity-securing principle of inference. Such a view of willing takes motive and rational choice out of empirical psychology, thereby eliminating grounds for many familiar objections to Kant's account of morally good action. The categorical imperative provides the fundamental principle of valid practical inference; however, for good willing, we also require correct premises. These come from specifications of the two obligatory ends – our own perfection and the happiness of others. Interpreting good willing as good reasoning not only fits well with Kant's metaphysics of free action, it also offers a sound method for reasoning to and about individual as well as role-dependent moral obligations."

Dazu:

- Reath, Andrews (2011): Will, Obligatory Ends and the Completion of Practical Reason: Comments on Barbara Herman's *Moral Literacy*, *Kantian Review* 16, S. 1–15.<sup>85</sup>
- Engstrom, Stephen (2011): Herman on Moral Literacy, *Kantian Review* 16, S. 17–31.<sup>86</sup>
- Sedgwick, Sally (2011): 'Letting the Phenomena In': On How Herman's Kantianism Does and Does Not Answer the Empty Formalism Critique, *Kantian Review* 16, S. 33–47.<sup>87</sup>
- Herman, Barbara (2011): Embracing Kant's Formalism, *Kantian Review* 16, S. 49–66.<sup>88</sup>
- 2007 [563] Herman, Barbara (2007): Obligatory Ends, in dies., *Moral Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass., S. 254–75.
- 2007 [564] Herman, Barbara (2007): The Will and Its Objects, in dies., *Moral Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass., S. 230–53.
- 2011 [565] Herman, Barbara (2011): A Mismatch of Methods, in Derek Parfit, *On What Matters* Volume 2, Oxford, S. 83–115.
- 2011 [566] Herman, Barbara (2011): The Difference that Ends Make, in *Perfecting Virtue. New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence Jost und Julian Wuerth, Cambridge, S. 92–115.
- 2013 [567] Herman, Barbara (2013): Making Exceptions, in *Kant und die Philosophie in weltbürgerlicher Absicht. Akten des XI. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Stefano Bacin, Alfredo Ferrarin, Claudio La Rocca und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, New York, Band 1, S.

---

<sup>85</sup> "This paper discusses three inter-related themes in Barbara Herman's *Moral Literacy* – the idea that, for Kant, the will is a 'norm-constituted power' whose activity is guided by its own internal norm, that the obligatory ends are reasonably viewed as the ends of all rational choice, and that morality 'completes' practical reason or rational agency."

<sup>86</sup> "In her recent book, Barbara Herman explores a range of topics commonly associated with virtue ethics; her focus, however, is not so much on virtue as on normal moral competence and the basic moral capacity underpinning it. To explicate this competence, Herman introduces the idea of moral literacy, arguing that it reveals Kantian ethical thought to be better able than Humean views to account for our readiness to hold persons responsible even for conduct reflecting character flaws that stem from deficiencies in their upbringing. Examination of Herman's account raises a question, however, about how intimately moral literacy is related to the basic moral capacity."

<sup>87</sup> "In *Moral Literacy*, Barbara Herman informs us that she will defend an 'enlarged version of Kantian moral theory' (Herman 2008: ix). Her 'enlarged version', she says, will provide a much-needed alternative to the common but misguided characterization of Kant's practical philosophy as an empty formalism. I begin with a brief sketch of the main features of Herman's corrective account. I endorse her claim that the enlarged Kantianism she defends is true to Kant's intentions as well as successful in correcting the objections she outlines. I then argue that there is another version of the empty formalism worry Herman does not address. Not only does she not address it, but her form of Kantianism provides fuel for its fire."

<sup>88</sup> "In response to critical discussions of my book, *Moral Literacy*, by Stephen Engstrom, Sally Sedgwick and Andrews Reath, I offer a defence of Kant's formalism that is not only friendly to my claims for the moral theory's sensitivity to a wide range of moral phenomena and practices at the ground level, but also consistent with Kant's high rationalist ambitions."

- 2006 [568] Hernandez, Jill (2006): On Asymmetry in Kant's Doctrine of Moral Worth, *Florida Philosophical Review* 6, S. 43–52.<sup>89</sup>
- 2010 [569] Hernandez, Jill Graper (2010): Impermissibility and Kantian Moral Worth, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 13, S. 403–19.<sup>90</sup>
- 2000 [570] Herrera, Larry (2000): Kant on the Moral Triebfeder, *Kant-Studien* 91, S. 395–410.
- 1971 [571] Hess, Heinz-Jürgen (1971): *Die obersten Grundsätze Kantischer Ethik und ihre Konkretisierbarkeit*, Bonn (*Kant-Studien* Ergänzungsheft 102).
- 2008 [572] Heubel, Friedrich/Manzeschke, Arne (2008): Kants kategorischer Imperativ als Management-Technik und Marketing-Strategie?, *Ethik in der Medizin* 20, S. 86–93.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> “That an act can have moral worth even if the end of the action is not realized seems asymmetrical with Kant's dual notion that acts cannot have moral worth if the maxim for action is impermissible. Recent scholarship contends that fixing the asymmetry will allow impermissible acts done from a morally worthy motive to have moral worth. I argue against the asymmetry thesis and contend that Kant cannot consistently maintain a class of impermissible, morally worthy action and the view that right acts respect the dignity of humanity.”

<sup>90</sup> “Samuel Kerstein argues that an asymmetry between moral worth and maxims prevents Kant from accepting a category of acts that are impermissible, but have moral worth. Kerstein contends that an act performed from the motive of duty should be considered as a candidate for moral worth, even if the action's maxim turns out to be impermissible, since moral worth depends on the correct moral motivation of an act, rather than on the moral rightness of an act. I argue that Kant cannot consistently maintain that there are morally forbidden, though good, acts since one of the conditions of acting from the moral law should be that one has a true belief about what the moral law requires. My project, then, rejects the possibility of morally impermissible, worthy acts for Kant, and qualifies the conditions for moral worth Kerstein gives with an epistemological constraint on moral worth.”

<sup>91</sup> „Eine der deutschen Krankenhausketten versucht, ihr Geschäftsmodell u. a. auf Elemente der Kantschen Moralphilosophie zu stützen. In den Dienstverträgen der führenden Manager werden Verhaltensnormen spezifiziert, und es wird auf den kategorischen Imperativ Bezug genommen. Frage ist, ob dies mit der Kantschen Ethik vereinbar ist, und ob es sich dazu eignet, moralischen Anforderungen an Krankenhäuser besser gerecht zu werden. Eine Analyse der einschlägigen Texte zeigt, dass Kants kategorischer Imperativ mit der Goldenen Regel gleichgesetzt wird, wogegen Kant sich ausdrücklich gewehrt hat. Die Goldene Regel wird außerdem entstellt. Dass der kategorische Imperativ nicht nur Achtungs-, sondern auch Fürsorgepflichten normiert, wird übersehen. Es bleibt offen, ob aus der Kantschen Ethik nicht doch Folgerungen für die Krankenhausorganisation zu ziehen sind, der hier kritisierte Versuch ist jedoch missglückt, weil – ganz abgesehen von den Anwendungsproblemen – schon die Kantschen Konzepte missverstanden wurden. Immerhin zeigt der Versuch, dass es im Management ein Bewusstsein für die Wichtigkeit moralischer Vorgaben im Krankenhaus gibt.“

“*Problem* One of the German commercial hospital chains is trying to ground their business policy on elements of Kantian moral philosophy. Allegedly, the categorical imperative is inserted as a norm of conduct into the contracts of leading officers. We discuss whether the reference to Kantian ethics is sound and is suited to improving the moral standards of hospitals.

- 1980 [573] Heyd, David (1980): Beyond the Call of Duty in Kant's Ethics, *Kant-Studien* 71, S. 308–24.
- 1982 [574] Heyd, David (1982): *Supererogation. Its Status in Ethical Theory*, Cambridge, S. 49–72 (“The Morality of Duty: Kant on Supererogation”).
- 1997 [575] Heyd, David (1997): Moral and Legal Luck. Kant's Reconciliation with Practical Contingency, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 5, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 27–42.
- 2017 [576] Hickey, Colin (2017): Biomedical Enhancement and the Kantian Duty to Cultivate Our Talents, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 51, S. 165–85.
- 1971 [577] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1971): Kant on Imperfect Duty and Supererogation, *Kant-Studien*, S. 55–76. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca 1992, S. 147–75.
- 1972 [578] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1972): The Kingdom of Ends, in *Proceedings of the Third International Kant Congress*, hrsg. von Lewis White Beck, Dordrecht, S. 307–15. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca 1992, S. 58–66.
- 1973 [579] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1973): The Hypothetical Imperative, *Philosophical Review* 82, S. 429–50. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca 1992, S. 17–37.
- 1974 [580] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1974): Kant's Utopianism, in *Akten des 4. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1974*, Teil II, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke, Berlin, S. 918–24. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca 1992, S. 67–75.
- 1978 [581] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1978): Kant's Anti-Moralistic Strain, *Theoria* 44, S. 131–51. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca 1992, S. 176–225.
- 1980 [582] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1980): Humanity as an End in Itself, *Ethics* 91, S. 84–90. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca 1992, S. 38–57.
- 1985 [583] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1985): Kant's Argument for the Rationality of Moral Conduct, in *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 66, S. 3–23. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca 1992, S. 97–122 sowie in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa 1998, S. 249–72.
- 1989 [584] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1989): The Kantian Conception of Autonomy, in *The Inner Citadel: Essays on Individual Autonomy*, hrsg. von John Christman, Oxford. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca 1992, S. 76–96.

---

*Arguments* Scrutiny of the companies' statements reveals that the categorical imperative is equated with the Golden Rule, which Kant explicitly rejects, and that the Golden Rule is distorted. In addition, the texts ignore that the categorical imperative entails not only duties of respect but also duties of beneficence.

*Conclusion* Kantian arguments may indeed have some impact on hospital organisation but if so they should be genuine. In the case at stake, they are misused. However, even this misuse indicates an intuition that running a hospital includes moral demands.”

- 1989 [585] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1989): Kant's Theory of Practical Reason, in Hill, *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca 1992, S. 123–46.
- 1992 [586] Hill Jr., Thomas E. (1992): Kantian Pluralism, *Ethics* 102, S. 743–62. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Respect, Pluralism, and Justice. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2000, S. 11–32.
- 1992 [587] Hill Jr., Thomas E. (1992): A Kantian Perspective on Moral Rules, in *Philosophical Perspectives*, 6, *Ethics*, 1992, hrsg. von James E. Tomberlin, Atascadero, Cal., S. 285–304. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Respect, Pluralism, and Justice. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2000, S. 33–55.
- 1992 [588] Hill Jr., Thomas E. (1992): *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*, Ithaca.
- 1994 [589] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1994): Kant on Responsibility for Consequences, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 2, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 159–76. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Respect, Pluralism, and Justice. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2000, S. 155–72.
- 1996 [590] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1996): Moral Dilemmas, Gaps, and Residues: A Kantian Perspective, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 167–98.
- 1996 [591] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1996): Is a Good Will Overrated?, *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Volume 20: *Moral Concepts*, hrsg. von Peter French, Theodore E. Uehling und Howard Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 299–317. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Human Welfare and Moral Worth. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2002, S. 37–60.
- 1997 [592] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1997): Punishment, Conscience, and Moral Worth, in *Spindel Conference 1997 on Kant's Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Nelson Potter und Mark Timmons (*Southern Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 36, Supplement), Memphis, S. 51–71 (dazu: Nelson Potter, Comments: Punishment, Conscience, and Moral Worth, S. 73–77). Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Human Welfare and Moral Worth. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2002, S. 340–61.
- 1997 [593] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1997): Kant on Punishment: A Coherent Mix of Deterrence and Retribution?, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 5, S. 291–314. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Respect, Pluralism, and Justice. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2000, S. 173–99.
- 1999 [594] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1999): Kant on Wrongdoing, Desert, and Punishment, *Law and Philosophy* 18, S. 407–441. Wiederabgedruckt als "Wrongdoing, Desert, and Punishment" in Hill, *Human Welfare and Moral Worth. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2002, S. 310–39.
- 1999 [595] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1999): Happiness and Human Flourishing in Kant's Ethics, in *Human Flourishing*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 143–75. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Human Welfare and Moral Worth. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2002, S. 164–200.
- 2000 [596] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2000): *Respect, Pluralism, and Justice. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford.
- 2000 [597] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2000): Kantianism, in *The Blackwell Guide to Ethical Theory*, hrsg. von Hugh LaFollette, Oxford, S. 227–46. Wiederabgedruckt als "Kantian Analysis: From Duty to Autonomy" in Hill, *Human Welfare and Moral Worth. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2002, S. 13–36.

- 2002 [598] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2002): Punishment, Conscience, and Moral Worth, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 233–54.
- 2002 [599] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2002): Meeting Needs and Doing Favors, in ders., *Human Welfare and Moral Worth. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford, S. 201–43.
- 2002 [600] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2002): Personal Values and Setting Oneself Ends, in ders., *Human Welfare and Moral Worth. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford, S. 244–74.
- 2005 [601] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2005): Assessing Moral Rules: Utilitarian and Kantian Perspectives, *Philosophical Issues* 15, S. 158–178.
- 2006 [602] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2006): Kantian Normative Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory*, hrsg. von David Copp, Oxford, S. 480–514.
- 2008 [603] Hill, Jr., Thomas (2008): Kantian Virtue and 'Virtue Ethics', in *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 29–59.
- 2008 [604] Hill, Jr., Thomas (2008): Legislating the Moral Law and Taking One's Choices to Be Good, *Philosophical Books* 49, S. 97–106. – Zu [1147].
- 2008 [605] Hill, Jr., Thomas (2008): Moral Construction as a Task: Sources and Limits, *Social Philosophy and Policy* 25 (1), S. 214–236.
- 2010 [606] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2010): Kant's *Tugendlehre* as Normative Ethics, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 234–55.
- 2012 [607] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2012): *Virtue, Rules, and Justice: Kantian Aspirations*, Oxford.<sup>92</sup>
- 2013 [608] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (2013): Imperfect Duties to Oneself (TL 6: 444–447), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 293–308.
- 2002 [609] Hill, Jr., Thomas E./Zweig, Arnulf (2002): Editors' Introduction: Some Main Themes of the *Groundwork* (S. 19–108), Analysis of Arguments (S. 109–77), in Immanuel Kant (1785): *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, translated by Arnulf Zweig and edited by Thomas E. Hill, Jr. and Arnulf Zweig, Oxford 2002.
- 2009 [610] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (Hrsg.) (2009): *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*, Malden, MA.
- 2005 [611] Hills, Alison (2005): Rational Nature as the Source of Value, *Kantian Review* 10, S. 60–81.
- 2008 [612] Hills, Alison (2008): Kantian Value Realism, *Ratio* 21, S. 182–200.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> General Introduction (1). I. Basic Themes. 1. Kant's Ethical Theory: An Overview (21). 2. Kantian Normative Ethics (35). 3. Kantian Constructivism as Normative Ethics (71). II. Virtue. 4. Finding Value in Nature (95). 5. Kant on Weakness of Will (107). 6. Kantian Virtue and "Virtue Ethics" (129). 7. Kant's *Tugendlehre* as Normative Ethics (160). III. Moral Rules and Principles. 8. The Dignity of Persons: Kant, Problems, and a Proposal (185). 9. Assessing Moral Rules: Utilitarian and Kantian Perspectives (203). 10. The Importance of Moral Rules and Principles (225). 11. Moral Construction as a Task: Sources and Limits (249). IV. Practical Questions. 12. Questions about Kant's Opposition to Revolution (277). 13. Treating Criminals as Ends in Themselves (296). 14. Kant and Humanitarian Intervention (320). 15. Moral Responsibilities of Bystanders (343). References (358). Index (367).

- 2009 [613] Hills, Alison (2009): Happiness in the *Groundwork*, in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 29–44.
- 1996 [614] Hiltcher, Reinhard (1996): Zur systematischen Stellung des Bösen in Kants Moralphilosophie, in *Wahrheit und Geltung. Festschrift für Werner Flach*, hrsg. von Alexander Riebel und Reinhard Hiltcher, Würzburg, S. 85–117.
- 2015 [615] Hiltcher, Reinhard (2015): Stellt Kants Moralphilosophie eine „Ontologie des Intelligiblen“ dar?, *Kant-Studien* 106, S. 276–85.
- 2001 [616] Himmelmann, Beatrix (2001): Die Lüge als Problem für Kants praktische Philosophie, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 230–38.
- 2003 [617] Himmelmann, Beatrix (2003): *Kants Begriff des Glücks*, Berlin (*Kant-Studien – Ergänzungshefte* 142).
- 1986 [618] Hinman, L. (1983): On the Purity of Moral Motives: A Critique of Kant's Account of the Emotions and Acting for the Sake of Duty, *Monist* 66, S. 251–66.
- 1998 [619] Hinman, Lawrence M. (1998): *Ethics. A Pluralistic Approach to Moral Theory*, Second Edition, Fort Worth, S. 208–42 (“The Ethics of Duty and Respect: Immanuel Kant”).
- 1989 [620] Hinske, Norbert (1989): Die „Ratschläge der Klugheit“ im Ganzen der *Grundlegung*, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 131–47.
- 1934 [621] Hirst, E. W. (1934): The Categorical Imperative and the Golden Rule, *Philosophy* 9, S. 328–35.
- 1973 [622] Hochberg, Gary M. (1973): A Re-Examination of the Contradiction in Kant's Examples, *Philosophical Studies* 24, S. 264–67.
- 2010 [623] Hoche, Hans-Ulrich/Knoop, Michael (2010): Logical Relations Between Kant's Categorical Imperative and the Two Golden Rules, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 18, S. 483–518.

---

<sup>93</sup> “Why should we be interested in Kant's ethical theory? One reason is that we find his views about our moral responsibilities appealing. Anyone who thinks that we should treat other people with respect, that we should not use them as a mere means in ways to which they could not possibly consent, will be attracted by a Kantian style of ethical theory.

But according to recent supporters of Kant, the most distinctive and important feature of his ethical theory is not his claims about the particular ethical duties that we owe to each other, but his views about the nature of value. They argue that Kant has an account of the relationship between practical reason and value, known as “Kantian constructivism” that is far superior to the traditional “value realist” theory, and that it is because of this that we should accept his theory.

It is now standard for both supporters and critics to claim that Kant's moral theory stands or falls with Kantian constructivism. But this is a mistake. In this paper, I sketch a rival Kantian theory of value, which I call Kantian value realism. I argue that there is textual evidence that Kant himself accepted value realism rather than constructivism. Whilst my aim in this paper is to set out the theory clearly rather than to defend it, I will try to show that Kantian value realism is preferable to Kantian constructivism and that it is worthy of further study.”

- 1974 [624] Hoerster, Norbert (1974): Kants kategorischer Imperativ als Test unserer sittlichen Pflichten, in *Rehabilitierung der praktischen Philosophie* Bd. II, hrsg. von Manfred Riedel, Freiburg, S. 455–75.
- 2003 [625] Hoerster, Norbert (2003): *Ethik und Interesse*, Stuttgart, S. 105–21 („Kants kategorischer Imperativ“).
- 1898 [626] Höffding, Harald (1898): Rousseaus Einfluß auf die definitive Form der Kantischen Ethik, *Kant-Studien* 2, S. 11–21.
- 1979 [627] Höffe, Otfried (1979): Kants kategorischer Imperativ als Kriterium des Sittlichen, in ders., *Ethik und Politik. Grundmodelle und -probleme der praktischen Philosophie*, Frankfurt a. M., S. 84–119.
- 1979 [628] Höffe, Otfried (1979): Recht und Moral: ein kantischer Problemaufriß, *Neue Hefte für Philosophie* 17: *Recht und Moral*, S. 1–36.
- 1983 [629] Höffe, Otfried (1983): *Immanuel Kant*, München, S. 173–207 („9. Die Kritik der praktischen Vernunft“).
- 1987 [630] Höffe, Otfried (1987): Der kategorische Imperativ als Grundbegriff einer normativen Rechts- und Staatsphilosophie, in *OIKEIOSIS. Festschrift für Robert Spaemann*, hrsg. von Reinhard Löw, Weinheim, S. 87–100.
- 1989 [631] Höffe, Otfried (1989): Kants nichtempirische Verallgemeinerung: zum Rechtsbeispiel des falschen Versprechens, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 206–33.
- 1990 [632] Höffe, Otfried (1990): Universalistische Ethik und Urteilskraft: Ein aristotelischer Blick auf Kant, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 44, S. 537–63.
- 1990 [633] Höffe, Otfried (1990): *Kategorische Rechtsprinzipien. Ein Kontrapunkt der Moderne*, Frankfurt a. M.
- 1992 [634] Höffe, Otfried (1992): Ethik des kategorischen Imperativs, in *Geschichte der neueren Ethik*, Band 1: *Neuzeit*, hrsg. von Annemarie Pieper, Tübingen, S. 124–50.
- 1993 [635] Höffe, Otfried (1993): Empirie und Apriori in Kants Rechtsethik, in *Ethische Norm und empirische Hypothese*, hrsg. von Lutz H. Eckensberger und Ulrich Gähde, Frankfurt a. M., S. 21–44.
- 1998 [636] Höffe, Otfried (1998): Kant als Theoretiker der internationalen Rechtsgemeinschaft, in *Recht, Staat und Völkerrecht bei Immanuel Kant*, hrsg. von Dieter Hüning und Burkhard Tuschling, Berlin, S. 233–46.
- 2001 [637] Höffe, Otfried (2001): „Königliche Völker“. Zu Kants kosmopolitischer Rechts- und Friedentheorie, Frankfurt a. M., S. 36–104 („Moral“).
- 2002 [638] Höffe, Otfried (2002): Immanuel Kant: Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, in *Klassische Werke der Philosophie. Von Aristoteles bis Habermas*, hrsg. von Reinhard Brandt und Thomas Sturm, Leipzig, S. 161–91.
- 2002 [639] Höffe, Otfried (2002): Einführung in die *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 1–23.

- 2002 [640] Höffe, Otfried (2002): Die Form der Maximen als Bestimmungsgrund (§§ 4–6, 27–30), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 63–80. – The Form of the Maxim as the Determining Ground of the Will (*The Critique of Practical Reason: §§ 4–6, 27–30*), in *Kant's Moral and Legal Philosophy*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Otfried Höffe, Cambridge 2009, S. 159–78.
- 2004 [641] Höffe, Otfried (2004): Kant über Recht und Moral, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn, S. 249–68.
- 2006 [642] Höffe, Otfried (2006): „Gerne dien ich den Freunden, doch tue ich es leider mit Neigung ...“ – Überwindet Schillers Gedanke der schönen Seele Kants Gegensatz von Pflicht und Neigung?, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 60, S. 1–20.<sup>94</sup>
- 2010 [643] Höffe, Otfried (2010): Kant's Innate Right as a Rational Criterion for Human Rights, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 71–92.
- 2012 [644] Höffe, Otfried (2012): *Kants Kritik der praktischen Vernunft. Eine Philosophie der Freiheit*, München.
- 2013 [645] Höffe, Otfried (2013): Anthropology and Metaphysics in Kant's Categorical Imperative of Law: An Interpretation of *Rechtslehre*, §§B and C, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 110–24.
- 1989 [646] Höffe, Otfried (Hrsg.) (1989): *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, Frankfurt a. M.
- 2002 [647] Höffe, Otfried (Hrsg.) (2002): *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, Berlin.
- 2002 [648] Hoffmann, Thomas Sören (2002): Gewissen als praktische Apperzeption. Zur Lehre vom Gewissen in Kants Ethik-Vorlesungen, *Kant-Studien* 93, S. 424–443.
- 2016 [649] Holberg, Erica A. (2016): The Importance of Pleasure in the Moral for Kant's Ethics, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 54, S. 226–46.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> „Der Autor untersucht in diesem Aufsatz den Versuch von Schiller, den Gegensatz von Pflicht und Neigung, der in der Kantischen Moralphilosophie eine große Rolle spielt durch den Begriff der „schönen Seele“ zu überwinden. Auf dem Konzept der schönen Seele gründet Schiller den Gedanken der wahren Humanität. Der Autor prüft, wie der Gegensatz von Pflicht und Neigung bei Kant aussieht um dann zu untersuchen, ob sich das Programm einer Verbindung der beiden durch die „schöne Seele“ von Schiller verwirklichen lässt. Der Begriff der Pflicht im Gegensatz zur Neigung bedeutet bei Kant im Gegensatz zu der Auffassung vieler Kritiker, keine formale Aufforderung eine Aufgabe zu erfüllen, gleich welchen Rang diese Aufgabe hat. Kant vertritt keinen rein funktionalen oder gar autoritären Pflichtbegriff. Pflicht ist bei Kant eine Beschreibung des moralisch Guten. Der Pflichtcharakter kommt deshalb zustande, weil das moralisch Gute aus verschiedenen Gründen, wegen sinnlichen Antrieben (den Neigungen), nicht anerkannt oder befolgt wird. Aus diesem Grund muss auch genauer von moralischer Pflicht gesprochen werden, um die Pflicht von anderen Verbindlichkeiten abzugrenzen. Eine zweite Unterscheidung innerhalb der Kantischen Moralphilosophie ist die Unterscheidung zwischen Legalität und Moralität. Wer nach dem moralisch richtigen Handelt handelt zunächst nur legal, erst wenn das Motiv des Handelnden es auch ist sich nach dem moralischen Gesetz zu richten, dann kann man dem Menschen auch die volle Moralität zusprechen.“

<sup>95</sup> “I argue for a new reading of Kant's claim that respect is the moral incentive; this reading accommodates the central insights of the affectivist and intellectualist readings of respect, while avoiding shortcomings of

- 1998 [650] Holmes, Robert L. (1998): *Basic Moral Philosophy*, Belmont, CA, 2. Auflage, S. 111–28 (“Kantianism”).
- 1995 [651] Holtman, Sarah (1995): Kant’s Formula of Humanity and the Pursuit of Subjective Ends, in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Band 2, S. 697–704.
- 2009 [652] Holtman, Sarah (2009): Autonomy and the Kingdom of Ends, in *The Blackwell Guide to Kant’s Ethics*, hrsg. von Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Malden, MA, S. 102–17.
- 2002 [653] Horn, Christoph (2002): Wille, Willensbestimmung, Begehrungsvermögen (§§ 1–3, 19–26), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 43–61.
- 2004 [654] Horn, Christoph (2004): Die Menschheit als objektiver Zweck – Kants Selbstzweckformel des kategorischen Imperativs, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn 2004, S. 195–212.
- 2006 [655] Horn, Christoph (2006): Kant on Ends in Nature and in Human Agency. The Teleological Argument (GMS, 394–396), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 45–71.
- 2008 [656] Horn, Christoph (2008): The Concept of Love in Kant’s Virtue Ethics, in *Kant’s Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 147–73.
- 2015 [657] Horn, Christoph (2015): Das Bewusstsein, unter dem moralischen Gesetz zu stehen – Kants Freiheitsargument in GMS III, in *Kants Begründung von Freiheit und Moral in Grundlegung III. Neue Interpretationen*, hrsg. von Dieter Schönecker, Münster, S. 137–56.
- 2015 [658] Horn, Christoph (2015): What is Kant’s Precise Answer to the Question “Why Be Moral”? In *Why Be Moral?* Hrsg. von Beatrix Himmelmann und Robert B. Louden. Berlin/Boston, S. 141–57.
- 2007 [659] Horn, Christoph/Mieth, Corinna/Scarano, Nico (2007): Kommentar, in *Immanuel Kant: Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Kommentar von Christoph Horn, Corinna Mieth und Nico Scarano*, Frankfurt a. M., S. 107–343.
- 2006 [660] Horn, Christoph/Schönecker, Dieter (Hrsg.) (2006): *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, Berlin.
- 1990 [661] Höhle, Vittorio (1990): The Greatness and Limits of Kant’s Practical Philosophy, *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 13, S. 133–57. – Größe und Grenzen von Kants praktischer Philosophie, in *Wissenschaftsethik unter philosophischen Aspekten*, hrsg. von Klaus Giel und Renate Breuninger, Ulm 1991, S. 9–39.

---

each. I show that within Kant’s ethical system, the feeling of respect should be understood as paradigmatic of a kind of pleasure, pleasure in the moral. The motivational power of respect arises from its nature as pleasurable feeling, but the feeling does not directly motivate individual dutiful actions. Rather, the feeling is motivational in the sense that, after an agent has acted in a morally good way, the pleasure that results from that action contributes to the cultivation of virtue in the agent and, consequently, morally good actions in the future. Understanding the feeling of respect to be moral pleasure not only gives us insight into how finite rational beings develop virtue, but also a new way of understanding respect as an incentive.”

- 1982 [662] Hospers, John (1982): *Human Conduct. Problems of Ethics*, San Diego, 2. Aufl., S. 176–204 (“Kantian Ethics”).
- 1988 [663] Hossenfelder, Malte (1988): Überlegungen zu einer transzendentalen Deduktion des kategorischen Imperativs, in *Kants transzendente Deduktion und die Möglichkeit von Transzendentalphilosophie*, hrsg. vom Forum für Philosophie Bad Homburg, Frankfurt a. M., S. 280–302.
- 2004 [664] Howard, Jason J. (2004): Kant and Moral Imputation: Conscience and the Riddle of the Given, *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 78, S. 609–29.
- 2013 [665] Höwing, Thomas (2013): Das Verhältnis der Vermögen des menschlichen Gemüts zu den Sittengesetzen (MS 6: 211–214), in *Kant’s “Tugendlehre”. A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 25–58.
- 1989 [666] Hoy, David (1989): Hegel’s Critique of Kantian Morality, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 6, S. 207–32.
- 1987 [667] Hruschka, Joachim (1987): Die Konkurrenz von Goldener Regel und Prinzip der Verallgemeinerung in der juristischen Diskussion des 17./18. Jahrhunderts als geschichtliche Wurzel von Kants kategorischem Imperativ, *Juristen-Zeitung* 42, S. 941–52.
- 1990 [668] Hruschka, Joachim (1990): Die Person als ein Zweck an sich selbst. Zur Grundlegung von Ethik und Recht bei August Friedrich Müller (1733) und Immanuel Kant (1785), *Juristen-Zeitung* 45, S. 1–15.
- 1993 [669] Hruschka, Joachim (1993): Kants Bearbeitung der Goldenen Regel im Kontext der vorangegangenen und der zeitgenössischen Diskussion, in *Strafgerechtigkeit. Festschrift für Arthur Kaufmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Fritjof Haft, Winfried Hassemer, Ulfrid Neumann, Wolfgang Schild und Ulrich Schroth, Heidelberg, S. 129–40.
- 2004 [670] Hruschka, Joachim (2004): Auf dem Wege zum Kategorischen Imperativ, in *Metaphysik und Kritik. Festschrift für Manfred Baum zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Sabine Doyé, Marion Heinz und Udo Rameil, Berlin, New York, S. 167–81.
- 2004 [671] Hruschka, Joachim (2004): The Permissive Law of Practical Reason in Kant’s *Metaphysics of Morals*, *Law and Philosophy* 23, S. 45–72.
- 1991 [672] Hudson, Hud (1991): Wille, Willkür, and the Imputability of Immoral Actions, *Kant-Studien* 82, S. 179–96.
- 1972 [673] Hutchings, Patrick Æ. (1972): *Kant on Absolute Value. A Critical Examination of Certain Key Notions in Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals and of his Ontology of Personal Value*, London.
- 2001 [674] Illies, Christian (2001): Die vermeintliche Leere des Kategorischen Imperativs. Zur Anwendbarkeit von Kants Moralprinzip, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 47–54.
- 2007 [675] Illies, Christian (2007): Orientierung durch Universalisierung: Der Kategorische Imperativ als Test für die Moralität von Maximen, *Kant-Studien* 98, S. 306–28.

- 1972 [676] Iltig, Karl-Heinz (1972): Der naturalistische Fehlschluß bei Kant, in *Rehabilitierung der praktischen Philosophie* Bd. I, hrsg. von Manfred Riedel, Freiburg, S. 113–30.
- 2003 [677] Irlenborn, Bernd (2003): Die Bedeutung des Bösen für Kants praktische Philosophie. Zur Grundlegung der Religionsschrift, *Prima Philosophia* (Cuxhaven) 16, S. 407–423.
- 1998 [678] Irrgang, Bernhard (1998): *Praktische Ethik aus hermeneutischer Sicht*, Paderborn, S. 64–70 („Kants metaethische Begründung der Autonomie des Sittlichen“).
- 1996 [679] Irwin, T. H. (1996): Kant’s Criticisms of Eudaemonism, in *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics. Rethinking Happiness and Duty*, hrsg. von Stephen Engstrom und Jennifer Whiting, Cambridge, S. 63–101.
- 2009 [680] Irwin, Terence (2009): *The Development of Ethics*. Volume III: *From Kant to Rawls*, Oxford, S. 1–172 (66. Kant: Practical Laws. 67. Kant: From Practical Laws to Morality. 68. Kant: Some Objections and Replies. 69. Kant: Freedom. 70. Kant: From Freedom to Morality. 71. Kant: Morality and the Good. 72. Kant: Meta-Ethical Questions.).
- 1993 [681] Jacobson, Mogens Chrom (1993): Über das Verhältnis zwischen Immanuel Kants Rechts- und Moralphilosophie, *Danish Yearbook of Philosophy* 27, S. 72–92.
- 1991 [682] Jacquette, Dale (1991): Categorical Moral Maxims in Kant’s Categorical Imperative, in *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke, Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 313–22.
- 1992 [683] James, David N. (1992): Twenty Questions: Kant’s Applied Ethics, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 30, S. 67–87.
- 1995 [684] James, David (1995): Kant on Ideal Friendship in the “Doctrine of Virtue”, in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Band 2, S. 557–66.
- 1999 [685] James, David N. (1999): Suicide and Stoic Ethics in the *Doctrine of Virtue*, *Kant-Studien* 90, S. 40–58.
- 1996 [686] Jeske, Diane (1996): Perfection, Happiness, and Duties to Self, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 33, S. 263–76. – Vgl. dazu [188].
- 1998 [687] Jeske, Diane (1998): A Defense of Acting from Duty, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 32, S. 61–74.
- 1993 [688] Joerden, Jan C. (1993): Was leisten Kants Beispiele bei der Anwendung des Kategorischen Imperativs? Zugleich eine Besprechung von: Christian Schnoor, *Kants Kategorischer Imperativ als Kriterium der Richtigkeit des Handelns*, *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie* 79, S. 247–58. – Zu [1251].
- 1997 [689] Joerden, Jan C. (1997): Der Widerstreit zweier Gründe der Verbindlichkeit. Konsequenzen einer These Kants für die strafrechtliche Lehre von der „Pflichtenkollision“, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 5, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 43–52.
- 2005 [690] Joerden, Jan C. (2005): Über ein vermeintes Recht (des Staates) aus Menschenliebe zu foltern, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik 13: Philosophia Practica Universalis. Festschrift für Joachim Hruschka zum 70. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 495–525.

- 2005 [691] Johnson, Andrew B. (2005): Kant's Empirical Hedonism, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 86, S. 50–63.<sup>96</sup> – Zu [1132].
- 1995 [692] Johnson, Darrell (1995): Analytic and Synthetic Method and the Structure of Kant's *Grounding*, in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress (Memphis)*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Vol. 2, Part 2, S. 613–20.
- 1993 [693] Johnson, Mark (1993): *Moral Imagination. Implications of Cognitive Science for Ethics*, Chicago, S. 65–76 ("Kant's Metaphoric Morality").
- 1996 [694] Johnson, Robert N. (1996): Expressing a Good Will: Kant on the Motive of Duty, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 34, S. 147–168.
- 1996 [695] Johnson, Robert N. (1996): Kant's Conception of Merit, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 77, S. 313–337.
- 1997 [696] Johnson, Robert N. (1997): Kant's Conception of Virtue, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* Band 5: Themenschwerpunkt: 200 Jahre Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 365–87.
- 2002 [697] Johnson, Robert N. (2002): Happiness as a Natural End, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 317–30.
- 2004 [698] Johnson, Robert N. (2004): Kant's Moral Philosophy, in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, hrsg. von Edward N. Zalta, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/>.
- 2007 [699] Johnson, Robert N. (2007): Value and Autonomy in Kantian Ethics, in *Oxford Studies in Metaethics* Vol. 2, hrsg. von Russ Shafer-Landau, Oxford, S. 133–48
- 2008 [700] Johnson, Robert N. (2008): Was Kant a Virtue Ethicist?, in *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 61–75.
- 2009 [701] Johnson, Robert N. (2009): Good Will and the Moral Worth of Acting from Duty, in *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*, hrsg. von Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Malden, MA, S. 19–51.
- 2009 [702] Johnson, Robert N. (2009): The Moral Law as Causal Law, in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 82–101.
- 2010 [703] Johnson, Robert N. (2010): Duties to and Regarding to Others, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 192–209.
- 2006 [704] Johnston, James Scott (2006): The Education of the Categorical Imperative, *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 25, S. 385–402.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> "According to the long orthodox interpretation of Kant's theory of motivation, Kant recognized only two fundamental types of motives: moral motives and egoistic, hedonistic motives. Seeking to defend Kant against the ensuing charges of psychological simplism, Andrews Reath formulated a forceful and seminal repudiation of this interpretation in his 1989 essay "Hedonism, Heteronomy and Kant's Principle of Happiness." The current paper aims to show that Reath's popular exegetical alternative is untenable. His arguments against the traditional view miss the mark, and his revisionist interpretation of Kant's theory of motivation cannot bear the considerable weight of the countervailing evidence."

- 2002 [705] Jokic, Aleksandar (2002): Supererogation and Moral Luck: Two Problems for Kant, One Solution, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 221–233.
- 1971 [706] Jones, Hardy E. (1971): *Kant's Principle of Personality*, Madison, London.
- 1940 [707] Jones, W. T. (1940): *Morality and Freedom in the Philosophy of Kant*, Oxford.
- 1973 [708] Jordan, James N. (1973): Socrates' Wisdom and Kant's Virtue, *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 4, S. 7–24.
- 2014 [709] Josifović, Saša (2014): *Willensstruktur und Handlungsorganisation in Kants Theorie der praktischen Freiheit*, Leiden.
- 2011 [710] Jost, Lawrence/Wuerth, Julian (Hrsg.) (2011): *Perfecting Virtue. New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, Cambridge.
- 1966 [711] Kadowaki, Takuji (1966): Das Faktum der reinen praktischen Vernunft, *Kant-Studien* 56, S. 385–95.
- 2002 [712] Kagan, Shelly (2002): Kantianism for Consequentialists, in Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, edited and translated by Allen W. Wood. With Essays by J. B. Schneewind, Marica Baron, Shelly Kagan, Allen W. Wood, New Haven 2002, S. 111–56.
- 2004 [713] Kain, Patrick (2004): Self-Legislation in Kant's Moral Philosophy, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 86, S. 257–306.<sup>98</sup>
- 2006 [714] Kain, Patrick (2006): Constructivism, Intrinsic Normativity, and the Motivational Analysis Argument, in *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, hrsg. von Heiner F. Klemme, Manfred Kühn und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. 59–78.
- 2006 [715] Kain, Patrick (2006): Realism and Anti-Realism in Kant's Second Critique, *Philosophy Compass* 1, S. 449–65.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> "In this article, I examine anew the moral philosophy of Immanuel Kant and its contributions to educational theory. I make four claims. First, that Kant should be read as having the Categorical Imperative develop out of subjective maxims. Second, that moral self-perfection is the aim of moral education. Third, that moral self-perfection develops by children habituating the results of their moral maxims in scenarios and cases. Fourth, that character and culture, Kant's highest aims for humanity, are the ultimate beneficiaries of this process."

<sup>98</sup> "Kant famously insisted that "the idea of the will of every rational being as a universally legislative will" is the supreme principle of morality. Recent interpreters have taken this emphasis on the self-legislation of the moral law as evidence that Kant endorsed a distinctively constructivist conception of morality according to which the moral law is a positive law, created by us. But a closer historical examination suggests otherwise. Kant developed his conception of legislation in the context of his opposition to theological voluntarist accounts of morality and his engagement with conceptions of obligation found in his Wolffian predecessors. In order to defend important claims about the necessity and immediacy of moral obligation, Kant drew and refined a distinction between the legislation and authorship of the moral law in a way that precludes standard theological voluntarist theories and presents an obstacle to recent constructivist interpretations. A correct understanding of Kant's development and use of this distinction reveals that his conception of legislation leaves little room for constructivist moral anti-realism."

- 2009 [716] Kain, Patrick (2009): Kant's Defense of Human Moral Status, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 47, S. 59–101.<sup>100</sup>
- 2010 [717] Kain, Patrick (2010): Duties Regarding Animals, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 210–33.
- 2010 [718] Kain, Patrick (2010): Practical Cognition, Intuition, and the Fact of Reason, in *Kant's Moral Metaphysics. God, Freedom, and Immortality*, hrsg. von Benjamin J. Bruxvoort Lipscomb und James Krueger, Berlin, S. 211–30.
- 1998 [719] Kain, Philip J. (1998): Hegel's Critique of Kantian Practical Reason, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 28, S. 367–412.
- 2008 [720] Kalderon, Mark Eli (2008): Respecting Value, *European Journal of Philosophy* 16, S. 341–65.
- 2014 [721] Kalscheuer, Fiete (2014): *Autonomie als Grund und Grenze des Rechts*, Berlin. (*Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte* 179)<sup>101</sup>
- 2015 [722] Kang, Ji Young (2015): *Die allgemeine Glückseligkeit. Zur systematischen Stellung und Funktionen der Glückseligkeit bei Kant*, Berlin. (*Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte* 184)
- 2005 [723] Kaplan, Shawn D. (2005): A Critique of the Practical Contradiction Procedure for Testing Maxims, *Kantian Review* 10, S. 112–27.
- 2008 [724] Kaplan, Shawn D. (2008): Bringing the Moral Law Closer to Intuition and Feeling: An Interpretive Framework for Kant's *Groundwork* II, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 161–71.
- 2007 [725] Kaufmann, Matthias (2007): Autonomie und das Faktum der Vernunft, in *Kant in der Gegenwart*, hrsg. von Jürgen Stolzenberg, Berlin, S. 227–46.
- 1982 [726] Kaulbach, Friedrich (1982): *Immanuel Kant*, Berlin, 2., durchgesehene Aufl., S. 207–64 („Prak-

---

<sup>99</sup> “This article surveys recent work on Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason*, with a particular focus on his doctrine of the fact of reason and his doctrine of the practical postulates, assessing the implications of such work for the debate about realism and antirealism in Kant's moral philosophy. Section 1 briefly surveys some salient considerations raised by Kant's first Critique and Groundwork. In section 2, I survey recent work on the Kant's doctrine of the fact of reason and argue that it does not support an anti-realist interpretation of Kant's ethics. In section 3, I argue that recent work on Kant's doctrine of the practical postulates does not support an anti-realist interpretation of Kant's ethics.”

<sup>100</sup> “The determination of individual moral status is a central factor in the ethical evaluation of controversial practices such as elective abortion, human embryo-destructive research, and the care of the severely disabled and those in persistent vegetative states. A review of recent work on Kant reveals the need for a careful examination of the content of Kant's biological and psychological theories and their relation to his views about moral status. Such an examination, in conjunction with Kant's practical-metaphysical analysis of the origins of freedom, reveals Kant's principled basis for his contention that all human beings possess moral status.”

<sup>101</sup> Inhalt: Siglenverzeichnis. Einleitung. Erster Teil: Kategorischer Imperativ. Zweiter Teil: Allgemeines Rechtsgesetz. Dritter Teil: Verhältnis der beiden Grundbegriffe zueinander. Fazit. Literaturverzeichnis. Sachregister.

tische Philosophie“).

- 1988 [727] Kaulbach, Friedrich (1988): *Immanuel Kants 'Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten'. Interpretation und Kommentar*, Darmstadt.
- 2005 [728] Kawamura, Katsutoshi (2005): Kants Kritik an der Goldenen Regel, in *Kant zwischen West und Ost. Zum Gedenken an Kants 200. Todestag und 280. Geburtstag*, Band 2, hrsg. von Wladimir Bryuschinkin, Kaliningrad, S. 179–86. <http://www.kant-online.ru/en/?p=635>.
- 2008 [729] Keinert, Maurício Cardoso (2008): Critique of Practical Reason: Moral Law and Autonomy, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 183–88.
- 1990 [730] Kekes, John (1990): *Facing Evil*, Princeton, NJ., S. 128–42.
- 1987 [731] Kelkar, Meena A. (1987): Formulations of the Categorical Imperative (Kant), *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* 14, S. 389–414.
- 2010 [732] Keller, Pierre (2010): Two Conceptions of Compatibilism in the Critical Elucidation, in *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 119–45.
- 1958 [733] Kemp, J. (1958): Kant's Examples of the Categorical Imperative, *Philosophical Quarterly* 8, S. 63–71.
- 2012 [734] Kendrick, Heather M. (2012): A Place for Animals in the Kingdom of Ends, in *Strangers to Nature. Animal Lives and Human Ethics*, hrsg. von Gregory R. Smulewicz-Zucker, Lanham, S. 35–65.
- 1990 [735] Kerner, George C. (1990): *Three Philosophical Moralists: Mill, Kant, and Sartre. An Introduction to Ethics*, Oxford, S. 75–141 (“Kant and the Ethics of Duty”).
- 1999 [736] Kerstein, Samuel J. (1999): The Kantian Moral Worth of Actions Contrary to Duty, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 53, S. 530–52.
- 2001 [737] Kerstein, Samuel J. (2001): Kant's (Not so Radical?) Hedonism, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 247–55.
- 2002 [738] Kerstein, Samuel J. (2002): *Kant's Search for the Supreme Principle of Morality*, Cambridge.
- 2006 [739] Kerstein, Samuel J. (2006): Deriving the Formula of Humanity (GMS, 427–437), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 200–221.
- 2006 [740] Kerstein, Samuel J. (2006): Deriving the Formula of Universal Law, in *A Companion to Kant*, hrsg. von Graham Bird, Oxford, S. 308–21.
- 2008 [741] Kerstein, Samuel J. (2008): Autonomy and Practical Law, *Philosophical Books* 49, S. 107–13. – Zu [1147].
- 2008 [742] Kerstein, Samuel J. (2008): Treating Oneself Merely as a Means, in *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 201–18.

- 2009 [743] Kerstein, Samuel J. (2009): Deriving the Supreme Moral Principle from Common Moral Ideas, in *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*, hrsg. von Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Malden, MA, S. 121–37.
- 2009 [744] Kerstein, Samuel (2009): Treating Others Merely as Means, *Utilitas* 21, S. 163–80.<sup>102</sup>
- 2019 [745] Kerstein, Samuel (2019): Treating Persons as Means, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, hrsg. von Ed Zalta, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/persons-means/>.
- 1983 [746] Kersting, Wolfgang (1983): Der kategorische Imperativ, die vollkommenen und die unvollkommenen Pflichten, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 37, 404–21.
- 1983 [747] Kersting, Wolfgang (1983): Kann die Kritik der praktischen Vernunft populär sein? Über Kants Moralphilosophie und pragmatische Anthropologie, *Studia Leibnitiana* 15, S. 82–93.
- 1984 [748] Kersting, Wolfgang (1984): *Wohlgeordnete Freiheit. Immanuel Kants Rechts- und Staatsphilosophie*, Frankfurt a. M. 1993, S. 97–222 („Teil A: Die Begründung des Rechts“)
- 2004 [749] Kersting, Wolfgang (2004): Vernunft, Verbindlichkeit und Recht bei Kant, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn, S. 269–90.
- 2007 [750] Kienzle, Bertram (2007): Macht das Sittengesetz unglücklich?, in *Was ist und was sein soll. Natur und Freiheit bei Immanuel Kant*, hrsg. von Udo Kern, Berlin, S. 267–84.
- 2008 [751] Kim, Halla (2008): The Unity of Pure Practical Reason: Towards a Unified Interpretation of the Three Formulas of Kant's Categorical Imperative, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 197–207.
- 2015 [752] Kim, Halla (2015): *Kant and the Foundations of Morality*, Lanham.<sup>103</sup>
- 2008 [753] Kim, Jong-Gook (2008): Moral zum ewigen Frieden. Eine teleologische Lektüre von praktischer Philosophie Kants, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 209–14.

---

<sup>102</sup> “In the Formula of Humanity, Kant embraces the principle that it is wrong for us to treat others merely as means. For contemporary Kantian ethicists, this Mere Means Principle plays the role of a moral constraint: it limits what we may do, even in the service of promoting the overall good. But substantive interpretations of the principle generate implausible results in relatively ordinary cases. On one interpretation, for example, you treat your opponent in a tennis tournament merely as a means and thus wrongly when you try, through defeating him, to win first place. The article aims to develop a reconstruction of the Mere Means Principle that has more plausible implications than do rival reconstructions. It sets out a sufficient condition for an agent's treating another merely as a means. This condition is intended to be Kantian, but not necessarily one that Kant endorses.”

<sup>103</sup> Dedication. Contents. Figures. Abbreviations and Citations. Preface. Introduction. 1. The Purpose, the Method, and the Structure of the Groundwork. 2. The Search for the Supreme Principle of Morality. 3. Prudence and Morality. 4. The Formulation of the Categorical Imperative. 5. The Unity of the Categorical Imperative. 6. The Authentication of Morality. 7. The Metaphysical Foundation of Morality. Glossary. Bibliography. Index.

- 1991 [754] Kitaoka, Takeshi (1991): Eine These über das Faktum der reinen Vernunft, in *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 323–32.
- 2004 [755] Kim, Jong-Gook (2004): Kants Lügenverbot in sozialetischer Perspektive, *Kant-Studien* 95, S. 226–34.
- 1968 [756] King, J. Ch. (1968): Bradley’s “Duty for Duty’s Sake” and Kant’s Ethics, *Kant-Studien* 59, S. 309–17.
- 1992 [757] King, James (1992): The Moral Theories of Kant and Hume: Comparisons and Polemics, *Hume Studies* 18, S. 441–65.
- 2004 [758] Kitcher, Patricia (2004): Kant’s Argument for the Categorical Imperative, *Nous* 38, S. 555–84.
- 2017 [759] Kitcher, Patricia (2017): A Kantian Argument for the Formula of Humanity, *Kant-Studien* 108, S. 218–46.<sup>104</sup>
- 2007 [760] Klar, Samuel (2007): *Moral und Politik bei Kant. Eine Untersuchung zu Kants praktischer und politischer Philosophie im Ausgang der „Religion innerhalb der Grenzen bloßer Vernunft“*, Würzburg.<sup>105</sup>
- 1954 [761] Klausen, Sverre (1954): *Kants Ethik und ihre Kritiker*, Oslo.
- 1969 [762] Klein, Hans-Dieter (1969): Formale und materiale Prinzipien in Kants Ethik, *Kant-Studien* 60, S. 183–97.
- 2008 [763] Klein, Patrick (2008): *Gibt es ein Moralgesetz, das für alle Menschen gültig ist? Eine Untersuchung zum Faktum der Vernunft bei Immanuel Kant*, Würzburg 2008.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> “Although many take the formula of humanity to be Kant’s best formulation of the CI, there is no agreement on his argument for it. Kant says that the argument comes in GMM3, but that section is difficult to interpret. I draw on his remarks about cognizing other minds in the Paralogisms to interpret the argument of sub-section 2 of GMM3, the argument that rational beings must “lend” the idea of freedom to all rational beings. Kant later rejects his attempt to establish the CI in GMM3 and tries again in the fact of reason passages of the Second Critique. I follow Willaschek’s reading of these texts: Humans can cognize their freedom by performing a Gedankenexperiment where they experience their wills being moved through the moral law.” Kant tries to move from that demonstration to the claim that pure reason gives the moral law to all humans, but his argument fails. Appealing again to his theory of other minds, I argue that he could have offered a cogent argument that all humans have an efficacious moral law within.”

<sup>105</sup> „Diese Arbeit bietet eine umfassende kritische Analyse und Interpretation der praktischen – moralischen wie politischen – Philosophie Kants vom systematischen Standpunkt der *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft* aus. Erstmals wird der in seiner Bedeutung nach wie vor zu Unrecht unterschätzte Beitrag der *Religionsschrift* zur politischen Philosophie kritisch herausgearbeitet, im Kontext der gesamten praktischen Philosophie Kants gedeutet und systematisch dargestellt.“ (Klappentext)

<sup>106</sup> „Die Frage, ob wir von allen Menschen verlangen dürfen, denselben Moralstandards zu gehorchen, entscheidet darüber, ob es überhaupt legitim ist, globale Moralmaßstäbe, z.B. als Menschenrechte, juristisch fixieren und Verstöße entsprechend sanktionieren zu wollen. Der ethische Relativismus liefert gewichtige Argumente gegen eine affirmative Haltung dieser Frage gegenüber. Kant hat für die präskriptive Gültigkeit seines kategorischen Imperativs für alle Menschen durch das viel diskutierte Faktum-Theorem argumentiert. Die Studie sucht die Frage zu beantworten, wie dieses von Kant

- 1988 [764] Klein, Sherwin (1988): Kant's Methodology in *Grundlegung*, Section One, *Modern Schoolman* 65, S. 227–44.
- 2010 [765] Kleingeld, Pauline (2010): Moral Consciousness and the 'Fact of Reason', in *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 55–72.
- 2014 [766] Kleingeld, Pauline (2014): Debunking Confabulation: Emotions and the Significance of Empirical Psychology for Kantian Ethics, in *Kant on Emotion and Value*, hrsg. von Alix Cohen, Houndmills, S. 146–65.
- 2017 [767] Kleingeld, Pauline (2017): Contradiction and Kant's Formula of Universal Law, *Kant-Studien* 108, S. 89–115.<sup>107</sup> – Dazu: [1477].
- 2019 [768] Kleingeld, Pauline/Willaschek, Marcus (2019): Autonomy Without Paradox: Kant, Self-Legislation and the Moral Law, *Philosophers' Imprint* 19 (6), S. 1–18.<sup>108</sup>
- 1995 [769] Klemme Heiner (1995): Beobachtungen zur Kantischen Vermittlung von Theorie und Praxis in der praktischen Philosophie, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress*,

---

nachgerade beiläufig vorgetragene Theorem überhaupt zu verstehen ist. Dabei ist es die zentrale These des Autors, dass man nicht verstehen kann, was Kant mit dem Faktum der Vernunft meint, wenn man nicht weiß, was Vernunft (nach Kant) überhaupt ist. Aus diesem Grund geht der semantischen Analyse des Faktum-Theorems eine elaborierte Darstellung des Kantischen Vernunftbegriffs voraus. Mithilfe dieser Strategie kann die Bedeutung des Faktum-Theorems erfasst und das Theorem selbst auf seine Plausibilität hin überprüft werden.

Trotz einiger systematischer Defizite des Theorems, zeigt die Studie, dass sowohl Kants Vernunftbegriff als auch das Faktum der Vernunft unserem Alltagsbewusstsein viel vertrauter ist als es auf den ersten Blick scheinen mag.“

<sup>107</sup> “Kant's most prominent formulation of the Categorical Imperative, known as the Formula of Universal Law (FUL), is generally thought to demand that one act only on maxims that one can will as universal laws without this generating a contradiction. Kant's view is standardly summarized as requiring the 'universalizability' of one's maxims and described in terms of the distinction between 'contradictions in conception' and 'contradictions in the will'. Focusing on the underappreciated significance of the simultaneity condition included in the FUL, I argue, by contrast, that the principle is better read as requiring that one be able to will two things simultaneously without self-contradiction, namely, that a maxim be one's own and that it be a universal law. This amounts to a new interpretation of the FUL with significant interpretive and philosophical advantages.”

<sup>108</sup> “Within Kantian ethics and Kant scholarship, it is widely assumed that autonomy consists in the self-legislation of the principle of morality (the Moral Law). In this paper, we challenge this view on both textual and philosophical grounds. We argue that Kant never unequivocally claims that the Moral Law is self-legislated and that he is not philosophically committed to this claim by his overall conception of morality. Instead, the idea of autonomy concerns only substantive moral laws (in the plural), such as the law that one ought not to lie. We argue that autonomy, thus understood, does not have the paradoxical features widely associated with it. Rather, our account highlights a theoretical option that has been neglected in the current debate on whether Kant is best interpreted as a realist or a constructivist, namely that the Moral Law is an a priori principle of pure practical reason that neither requires nor admits of being grounded in anything else.”

*Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Band 2, S. 521–32.

- 2001 [770] Klemme, Heiner F. (2001): Perspektiven der Interpretation: Kant und das Verbot der Lüge, in *Kant verstehen - Understanding Kant. Über die Interpretation philosophischer Texte*, hrsg. von D. Schönecker und Th. Zwenger, Darmstadt, S. 85–105.
- 2003 [771] Klemme, Heiner F. (2003): Einleitung, in Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, mit einer Einleitung, Sachanmerkungen und einer Bibliographie von Heiner Klemme, herausgegeben von Horst D. Brandt und Heiner F. Klemme, Hamburg, S. IX–LXIII.
- 2006 [772] Klemme, Heiner F. (2006): Praktische Gründe und moralische Motivation. Eine deontologische Perspektive, in *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, hrsg. von Heiner F. Klemme, Manfred Kühn und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. 113–53.
- 2008 [773] Klemme, Heiner F. (2008): Moralisches Sollen, Autonomie and Achtung. Kants Konzeption der „libertas indifferentiae“ zwischen Wolff and Crusius, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 215–28.
- 2010 [774] Klemme, Heiner F. (2010): The Origin and Aim of Kant’s *Critique of Practical Reason*, in *Kant’s Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 11–30.
- 2013 [775] Klemme, Heiner F. (2013): Der Transzendente Idealismus und die *Rechtslehre*. Kant über den Zusammenhang von moralischer Verbindlichkeit, Recht und Ethik, in *Kants »Metaphysik der Sitten« in der Diskussion. Ein Arbeitsgespräch an der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel 2009*, hrsg. von Werner Euler und Burkhard Tuschling, Berlin, S. 43–56.
- 2014 [776] Klemme, Heiner F. (2014): Erkennen, Fühlen, Begehren – Selbstbesitz. Reflexionen über die Verbindung der Vermögen in Kants Lehre vom Kategorischen Imperativ, in *Affektivität und Ethik bei Kant und in der Phänomenologie*, hrsg. von Inga Römer, Berlin, S. 79–100.
- 2014 [777] Klemme, Heiner F. (2014): Freiheit oder Fatalismus? Kants positive und negative Deduktion der Idee der Freiheit in der *Grundlegung* (und seine Kritik an Christian Garves Antithetik von Freiheit und Notwendigkeit), in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 59–102.
- 2015 [778] Klemme, Heiner F. (2015): „die vernünftige Natur existiert als Zweck an sich selbst.“ Überlegungen zu Oliver Sensens Interpretation der Menschheitsformel in der *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*, *Kant-Studien* 106, S. 88–96. – Zu [1313].
- 2017 [779] Klemme, Heiner F. (2017): *Kants »Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten«*. Ein systematischer Kommentar, Stuttgart.
- 2018 [780] Klemme, Heiner F. (2018): Der Grund der Verbindlichkeit. Mendelssohn und Kant über Evidenz in der Moralphilosophie (1762/64), *Kant-Studien* 109, S. 286–308.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> “The paper discusses the concepts of obligation and moral evidence in Mendelssohn’s and Kant’s prize essays. I argue that Mendelssohn departs in significant ways from Christian Wolff’s position, and that Kant

- 2006 [781] Klemme, Heiner F./Kühn, Manfred/Schönecker, Dieter (Hrsg.) (2006): *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, Hamburg.
- 2004 [782] Klimchuk, Dennis (2004): Three Accounts of Respect for Persons in Kant's Ethics, *Kantian Review* 8, S. 38–61.
- 2001 [783] Klotz, Christian (2001): Gesetzesbegriffe in Kants Ethik, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 55–62.
- 2002 [784] Kneller, Jane (2002): Aesthetic Value and the Primacy of the Practical in Kant's Philosophy, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 369–82.
- 1958 [785] Knox, T. M. (1957/58): Hegel's Attitude to Kant's Ethics, *Kant-Studien* 49, S. 70–81.
- 2019 [786] Kobusch, Theo (2019): Das Moralische: Der absolute Standpunkt. Kants Metaphysik der Sitten und ihre Herausforderung für das moderne Denken, in *Freiheit nach Kant. Tradition, Rezeption, Transformation, Aktualität*, hrsg. von Saša Josifović und Jörg Noller, Leiden, Boston, S. 54–92.
- 2015 [787] Kohl, Markus (2015): Kant and 'Ought Implies Can', *Philosophical Quarterly* 65, S. 690–710.
- 2017 [788] Kohl, Markus (2017): The Normativity of Prudence, *Kant-Studien* 108, S. 517–42.<sup>110</sup>
- 2018 [789] Kohl, Markus (2018): Kant's Critique of Instrumental Reason, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 99, S. 489–516.<sup>111</sup>
- 1990 [790] Köhl, Harald (1990): *Kants Gesinnungsethik*, Berlin.
- 1993 [791] Köhl, Harald (1993): Die Theorie des moralischen Gefühls bei Kant und Schopenhauer, in *Zur Philosophie der Gefühle*, hrsg von Hinrich Fink-Eitel und Georg Lohmann, Frankfurt a.

---

intends to overcome Wolffian philosophy with Newtonian methodology while still owing a lot to Wolff and to the project of an ethics within the limits of metaphysics. Although quite akin to Francis Hutcheson's philosophy, it becomes clear that Kant intended to lay the foundation of an innovative concept of obligation, which shares some similarities with Christian August Crusius's interpretation of it."

<sup>110</sup> "Kant's account of "precepts of prudence" raises a striking interpretive puzzle. On the one hand, he presents such precepts as normative-practical rules; on the other hand, he relegates them to theoretical philosophy. I argue that to render these two strands coherent, we must assume that our empirical nature is a "source of normativity" for us: prudence is normative for us just because we have an "unconditional" empirical desire for obtaining happiness, a maximum of pleasant sensations. Since rules of prudence cognize the means for causing a state of affairs that we desire and value insofar as we are receptive natural beings, these rules do not presuppose the active self-legislation of practical reason. Hence they belong to the theoretical cognition of nature."

<sup>111</sup> "I argue against the prevalent view that in addition to the categorical imperative of morality, Kant accepts a further law of practical reason, 'the' Hypothetical Imperative. Kant rejects the idea that instrumental reason can be a source of *a priori*, objectively necessary normative requirements. His critique of instrumental reason is a central component of his argument for the supreme rational authority of morality: only moral reason can provide genuine, objective normative-practical necessities. There are no objective practical necessities in our pursuit of empirical ends and desires. Hence, non-moral agency is a rationally impoverished form of agency."

M., 2. Aufl. 1994, S. 136–56.

- 2006 [792] Köhl, Harald (2006): *Abschied vom Unbedingten. Über den heterogenen Charakter moralischer Forderungen*, Freiburg.
- 2006 [793] Köhler, Michael (2006): The Derivation of the Moral Law (GMS, 402, 420f.), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 93–117.
- 1989 [794] Koller, Peter (1989): Zur Kritik der Kantischen Konzeption von Freiheit und Gerechtigkeit, in *Traditionen und Perspektiven der analytischen Philosophie. Festschrift für Rudolf Haller*, hrsg. von Wolfgang L. Gombocz, Heiner Rutte und Werner Sauer, Wien, S. 54–69.
- 1994 [795] König, Peter (1994): *Autonomie und Autokratie. Über Kants Metaphysik der Sitten*, Berlin.
- 2011 [796] Kontos, Pavlos (2011): Kant's Categories of Freedom as Rules of Moral Salience, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 65, S. 218–40.<sup>112</sup>
- 1955 [797] Körner, Stephan (1955): *Kant*, Göttingen 1967, S. 104–46 („Kants Darstellung der moralischen Erfahrung“, „Die Möglichkeit moralischer Erfahrung und ihre Beziehung zu Wissenschaft und Religion“).
- 1975 [798] Körner, Stephan (1975): Über das wechselseitige Verhältnis der theoretischen und der praktischen Vernunft, in *Akten des 4. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz, 6.-10. April 1974*, Teil III: *Vorträge*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke, Berlin, New York, S. 84–95.
- 1985 [799] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1985): Kant's Formula of Universal Law, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 66, S. 24–47. Wiederabgedruckt in Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, Cambridge 1996, S. 77–105.
- 1986 [800] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1986): Kant's Formula of Humanity, *Kant-Studien* 77, S. 183–202. Wiederabgedruckt in Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, Cambridge 1996, S. 106–32.
- 1986 [801] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1986): The Right to Lie: Kant on Dealing with Evil, *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 15, S. 325–49. Wiederabgedruckt in Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, Cambridge 1996, S. 133–58 sowie in *Deontology*, hrsg. von Stephen Darwall, Oxford 2002, S. 212–35.
- 1986 [802] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1986): Aristotle and Kant on the Source of Value, *Ethics* 96, S. 486–505. Wiederabgedruckt in Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, Cambridge 1996, S. 225–248.
- 1989 [803] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1989): Kant, in *Ethics in the History of Western Philosophy*, hrsg. von Robert J. Cavalier, James Gouinlock und James P. Sterba, New York, S. 201–43. Wiederabgedruckt als “An Introduction to the Ethical, Political, and Religious Thought

---

<sup>112</sup> “This paper attempts to bring to light and to justify the double task that Kant confers on the categories of freedom. It will be maintained that the categories of freedom do not only function as the ratio cognoscendi of free actions within the sensible world but they are also well appropriated to ground the concepts of the good and the evil as genuine rules of moral salience (according to Herman's well-known label), that is to say, as rules of how to detect and appraise circumstances and deeds bestowed with moral significance.”

of Kant" in Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, Cambridge, S. 3–42.

- 1989 [804] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1989): Kant's Analysis of Obligation: The Argument of *Foundations I*, *Monist* 72, S. 311–40. Wiederabgedruckt als "Kant's Analysis of Obligation: The Argument of *Groundwork I*" in Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, Cambridge 1996, S. 43–76 sowie in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa 1998, S. 51–79.
- 1989 [805] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1989): Morality as Freedom, in *Kant's Practical Philosophy Reconsidered*, hrsg. von Yirmiyahu Yovel, Dordrecht, S. 23–48. Wiederabgedruckt in Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, Cambridge 1996, S. 159–87.
- 1991 [806] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1991): Holding People Responsible, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 535–62.
- 1992 [807] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1992): Creating the Kingdom of Ends: Reciprocity and Responsibility in Personal Relations, in *Philosophical Perspectives, 6, Ethics, 1992*, hrsg. von James E. Tomberlin, Atascadero, Cal., S. 305–32. Wiederabgedruckt in Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, Cambridge 1996, S. 188–221. – Die Konstruktion des Reichs der Zwecke – Gegenseitigkeit und Verantwortung in persönlichen Beziehungen, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn 2004, S. 213–44.
- 1995 [808] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1995): Rawls and Kant: On the Primacy of the Practical, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Band 1, S. 1165–74.
- 1996 [809] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1996): *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, Cambridge.
- 1996 [810] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1996): From Duty and for the Sake of the Noble: Kant and Aristotle on Morally Good Action, in *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics. Rethinking Happiness and Duty*, hrsg. von Stephen Engstrom und Jennifer Whiting, Cambridge, S. 203–36. Wiederabgedruckt in Korsgaard, *The Constitution of Agency*, Oxford 2008, S. 174–206.
- 1997 [811] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1997): Taking the Law into Our Own Hands: Kant on the Right to Revolution, in *Reclaiming the History of Ethics. Essays for John Rawls*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath, Barbara Herman und Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge, S. 297–328.
- 1998 [812] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1998): Introduction, in Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, translated and edited by Mary Gregor, Cambridge, S. vii–xxx.
- 1999 [813] Korsgaard, Christine M. (1999): Self-Constitution in the Ethics of Plato and Kant, *Journal of Ethics* 3, S. 1–29. Wiederabgedruckt in Korsgaard, *The Constitution of Agency*, Oxford 2008, S. 100–126.
- 2014 [814] Korsgaard, Christine M. (2014): From Duty and for the Sake of the Noble: Kant and Aristotle on Morally Good Action, in *Kant on Emotion and Value*, hrsg. von Alix Cohen, Houndmills, S.33–68.
- 2016 [815] Korsgaard, Christine M. (2016): A Kantian Case for Animal Rights, in *The Ethics of Killing Animals*, hrsg. von Tatjana Višak und Robert Garner, Oxford, S. 154–77.
- 1999 [816] Kraft, Bernd/Schönecker, Dieter (1999): Einleitung, in Immanuel Kant, *Grundlegung zur Meta-*

*physik der Sitten*, mit einer Einleitung hrsg. von Bernd Kraft und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. VII–XXXIX.

- 1999 [817] Krasnoff, Larry (1999): How Kantian is Constructivism?, *Kant-Studien* 90, S. 385–409.
- 2004 [818] Krasnoff, Larry (2004): Pythagoras Enlightened: Kant on the Effect of Moral Philosophy, in *New Essays on the History of Autonomy. A Collection Honoring J. B. Schneewind*, hrsg. von Natalie Brender und Larry Krasnoff, Cambridge, S. 133–53.
- 2013 [819] Krasnoff, Larry (2013): Constructing Practical Justification: How Can the Categorical Imperative Justify Desire-based Actions?, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 87–109.
- 1968 [820] Krausser, P. (1968): Über eine unvermerkte Doppelrolle des kategorischen Imperativs in Kants *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*, *Kant-Studien* 59, S. 318–32.
- 1931 [821] Krüger, Gerhard (1931): *Philosophie und Moral in der Kantischen Kritik*, Tübingen, S. 58–128 („Die Analyse der Moralität im Kategorischen Imperativ“).
- 2006 [822] Kühl, Kristian (2006): Zur Abgrenzung des Rechts von Sittlichkeit, guten Sitten und Tugend, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 243–58.
- 2009 [823] Kuehn, Manfred (2009): Ethics and Anthropology in the Development of Kant’s Moral Philosophy, in *Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 7–28.
- 2010 [824] Kuehn, Manfred (2010): Kant’s *Metaphysics of Morals*: The History and Significance of Its Deferral, in *Kant’s Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Lara Denis, Cambridge, S. 9–27.
- 1990 [825] Kuhlmann, Wolfgang (1990): Solipsismus in Kants praktischer Philosophie und die Diskursethik, in *Zur Rekonstruktion der praktischen Philosophie. Gedenkschrift für Karl-Heinz Ilting*, hrsg. von Karl-Otto Apel in Verbindung mit Riccardo Pozzo, Stuttgart 1990, S. 246–82.
- 2004 [826] Kulenkampff, Jens (2004): Moralisches Gefühl oder *moral sense*: wie berechtigt ist Kants Kritik?, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik*, Band 12, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 233–51.
- 2005 [827] Kulenkampff, Jens (2005): Kant und der „unparteiische Zuschauer“, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 13: *Philosophia Practica Universalis. Festschrift für Joachim Hruschka zum 70. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 237–55.
- 1991 [828] Kupperman, Joel J. (1991): *Character*, New York, S. 73–89.
- 2002 [829] Kupperman, Joel J. (2002): A Messy Derivation of the Categorical Imperative, *Philosophy* 77, S. 485–502.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> “Here are two widespread responses to Kant’s categorical imperative. On one hand, one might note the absence of detailed rational derivation. On the other hand, even someone who maintains some skepticism is likely to have a sense that (nevertheless) there is something to Kant’s central ideas. The recommended solution is analysis of elements of the categorical imperative. Their appeal turns out to have different

- 1999 [830] Kutschera, Franz von (1999): *Grundlagen der Ethik*, 2., völlig neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage, Berlin, New York, S. 325–35 („Kants Ethik“).
- 1928 [831] Kynast, Reinhard (1928): *Kant. Sein System als Theorie des Kulturbewußtseins*, München. S. 106–38.<sup>114</sup>
- 2013 [832] Lahat, Golan Moshe (2013): *The Political Implications of Kant’s Theory of Knowledge. Rethinking Progress*, Houndmills, S. 95–153 (“Part II: What Ought We Do? 4 The Primacy of Practical Reason. 5 Setting the Moral Principle as a Categorical Imperative. 6 The Essence of the Moral Imperative”).
- 1998 [833] Lai, Shen-chon (1998): *Gesinnung und Normenbegründung. Kants Gesinnungsethik in der modernen Diskussion*, Neuried. (Dissertation)
- 1998 [834] Lango, John W. (1998): Does Kant’s Ethics Ignore Relations between Persons, in *Norms and Values. Essays on the Work of Virginia Held*, hrsg. von Joram G. Haber und Mark S. Halfon, Lanham 1998, S. 251–66.
- 1991 [835] Langthaler, Rudolf (1991): *Kants Ethik als „System der Zwecke“. Perspektiven einer modifizierten Idee der „moralischen Teleologie“ und Ethiktheologie*, Berlin (Kant-Studien Ergänzungshefte).
- 2013 [836] La Rocca, Claudio (2013): Kant on Self-Knowledge and Conscience, in *Das Leben der Vernunft. Beiträge zur Philosophie Kants*, hrsg. von Dieter Hüning, Stefan Klingner und Carsten Olk, Berlin, S. 364–85.
- 2011 [837] Laschet, Oliver (2011): *Metaphysik und Erfahrung in Kants praktischer Philosophie*, Freiburg/München.
- 1981 [838] Lauener, Henri (1981): Der systematische Stellenwert des Gefühls der Achtung in Kants Ethik, *Dialectica* 35, S. 243–64.
- 2000 [839] Lauxtermann, Paul F. H. (2000): *Schopenhauer’s Broken World-View: Colours and Ethics between Kant and Goethe*, Dordrecht, S. 135–96.
- 2002 [840] Lawrence, Joseph P. (2002): Radical Evil and Kant’s Turn to Religion, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 319–35.
- 2005 [841] LeBar, Mark (2005): Eudaimonist Autonomy, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 42, S. 171–83.
- 2008 [842] Lee, Seung-Kee (2008): Why Are Kant’s Hypothetical and Categorical Imperatives Analytic and Synthetic A Priori Practical Propositions?, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 229–39.
- 2001 [843] Lege, Joachim (2001): Der Kategorische Imperativ im Lichte der Jurisprudenz. Kants *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* und die Autonomie des Rechts, in *Systematische Ethik*

---

sources. One aspect of the first formulation rests on the logic of normative utterances. But others can be justified only in terms of their contributions to desirable functionings of a moral order.”

<sup>114</sup> 8. Der ethische Wert und seine Begründung. 9. Die allgemeine Gültigkeit des Sittengesetzes und der Kulturbegriff. 10. Die Einzigkeit der Handlung und die Allgemeinheit des Sittengesetzes. 11. Sittlichkeit und Glück.

mit Kant, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 262–85.

- 2006 [844] Lege, Joachim (2006): Abscheu, Schaudern und Empörung. Die emotionale Seite von Recht und Sittlichkeit bei Kant, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 447–78.
- 1974 [845] Lehmann, Gerhard (1974): Zur Analyse des Gewissens in Kants Vorlesungen über Moralphilosophie, in Lehmann, *Kants Tugenden. Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Interpretation der Philosophie Kants*, Berlin 1980, S. 27–58. (Zuerst erschienen in *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 1971, Nr. 1).
- 1980 [846] Lehmann, Gerhard (1980): Kants Tugenden, in Lehmann, *Kants Tugenden. Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Interpretation der Philosophie Kants*, Berlin 1980, S. 59–95.
- 2000 [847] Leist, Anton (2000): *Die gute Handlung. Eine Einführung in die Ethik*, Berlin, S. 245–329 („Ethik mit Kant“).
- 2005 [848] Leist, Anton (2005): *Ethik der Beziehungen. Versuche über eine postkantianische Moralphilosophie*, Berlin, S. 15–22 („Kants Ethik, verwerfen oder retten?“), 23–45 („Kantische und Post-Kantische Moral“).
- 2002 [849] Leyva, Gustavo (2002): Notizen zur neueren Rezeption der kantischen Ethik in der angloamerikanischen Philosophie, *Philosophische Rundschau* 49, S. 290–304.
- 2003 [850] Leyva, Gustavo (2003): Notizen zur neueren Rezeption der kantischen Ethik in der angloamerikanischen Philosophie, *Philosophische Rundschau* 50, S. 43–61.
- 2019 [851] Lin, Zi (2019): Bodily Violence, Agency, and Animals, *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 36, 233–47.<sup>115</sup>
- 1934 [852] Lindsay, A. D. (1934): *Kant*, London. Reprint: Westport, Connecticut 1970, S. 162–203 (“Ethical Theory”).
- 1991 [853] Linneweber-Lammerskitten, Helmut (1991): Versuch einer nachsatztheoretischen Interpretation hypothetischer Imperative, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 333–42.
- 2010 [854] Lipscomb, Benjamin J. Bruxvoort/Krueger, James (Hrsg.) (2010): *Kant’s Moral Metaphysics. God, Freedom, and Immortality*, Berlin.
- 2010 [855] Lipscomb, Benjamin (2010): Moral Imperfection and Moral Phenomenology in Kant, in *Kant’s Moral Metaphysics. God, Freedom, and Immortality*, hrsg. von Benjamin J. Bruxvoort Lipscomb und James Krueger, Berlin, S. 49–80.

---

<sup>115</sup> “Ethical theories in the Kantian tradition tend to centre heavily on rational agency, so it may appear challenging for such theories to account for the wrongness of bodily violence, especially the wrongness of bodily violence to animals who lack rationality. This article develops a Kantian explanation for the *pro tanto* wrongness of killing or injuring animals who have agency and lack rationality, based on a Kantian explanation for the *pro tanto* wrongness of killing or injuring people. Even though morality is grounded in the will of rational agents or the value of rational agency, one does not have to be a rational agent to be morally considerable.”

- 1984 [856] Lo, P. C. (1984): *Treating Persons as Ends. An Essay on Kant's Moral Philosophy*, Lanham.
- 2015 [857] Lockhart, Jennifer Ryan (2015): Kant and Kierkegaard on Inwardness and Moral Luck, *Philosophical Investigations* 38, S. 251–75.<sup>116</sup>
- 2005 [858] Lohmar, Achim (2005): Gibt es Pflichten gegen sich selbst?, *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 30, S. 47–65: S. 55–60 („2. Kant über den Primat von Pflichten gegen sich selbst“).
- 2006 [859] Lohmar, Achim (2006): Suizid und Moral, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 60, S. 59–84: S. 67–79.<sup>117</sup>
- 1991 [860] Lohmar, Dieter (1991): Zum Aufbau des Beweises von Lehrsatz I in Kants „Kritik der praktischen Vernunft“, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 343–52.
- 1995 [861] Löhner, Guido (1995): *Menschliche Würde. Wissenschaftliche Geltung und metaphorische Grenze der praktischen Philosophie Kants*, Freiburg, München.
- 2001 [862] Loparic, Zeljko (2001): Das Faktum der Vernunft – eine semantische Auslegung, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 63–71.
- 1986 [863] Louden, Robert B. (1986): Kant's Virtue Ethics, *Philosophy* 61, S. 473–89. Wiederabgedruckt in Louden, *Kant's Human Being. Essays on His Theory of Human Nature*, Oxford 2011, S. 3–15.
- 2000 [864] Louden, Robert B. (2000): *Kant's Impure Ethics. From Rational Beings to Human Beings*, Oxford.
- 2006 [865] Louden, Robert B. (2006): Applying Kant's Ethics: The Role of Anthropology, in *A Companion to Kant*, hrsg. von Graham Bird, Oxford, S. 350–63.

---

<sup>116</sup> “The traditional understanding of Kant and Kierkegaard is that their views on the good will and inwardness, respectively, commit them to denying moral luck in an attempt to isolate an omnipotent moral subject from involvement with the external world. This leaves them vulnerable to the criticism that their ethical thought unrealistically insulates morality from anything that happens in the world. On the interpretation offered here, inwardness and the good will are not contrasted with worldly happenings, but are instead a matter of worldly happenings that exhibit a particular temporal structure. Kant and Kierkegaard should not be understood as denying moral luck.”

<sup>117</sup> „In diesem Aufsatz diskutiere ich die radikale und anspruchsvolle These, dass es intrinsisch unmoralisch und absolut verboten ist, sich selbst das Leben zu nehmen. Diese These verdient Interesse, insofern sie konstitutiv mit einer besonderen Auffassung über Wesen und Sinn der Moral verbunden ist. So behauptete Wittgenstein, dass alles erlaubt ist, wenn der Suizid erlaubt ist. Wie in der christlichen Tradition wird der Suizid damit als ein nihilistischer Akt interpretiert, welcher in Opposition zur Moral als solcher steht. Entsprechend gehört es dann zum Sinn der Moral selbst, dass niemand sich selbst das Leben nehmen darf. Zur Begründung des absoluten Verbotenseins des Suizids kann eine säkulare Ethik entweder zu zeigen versuchen, dass die Unverfügbarkeit des eigenen Lebens aus dem Begriff der Moral folgt; oder sie kann zu zeigen versuchen, dass sie aus dem Sinn der eigenen sittlichen Existenz folgt. Ich zeige im Detail, warum alle beide dieser von Kant beschrittenen Wege scheitern, und entwickle schließlich Konsequenzen, die sich aus dieser Zurückweisung für einige grundlegende Fragen der Ethik ergeben.“

- 2006 [866] Louden, Robert B. (2006): Moralische Stärke: Tugend als eine Pflicht gegen sich selbst, in *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, hrsg. von Heiner F. Klemme, Manfred Kühn und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. 79–95.
- 2009 [867] Louden, Robert B. (2009): Making the Law Visible: The Role of Examples in Kant’s Ethics, in *Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 63–81.
- 2015 [868] Louden, Robert B. (2015): ‘The end of all human action’/‘The final object of all my conduct’: Aristotle and Kant on the Highest Good, in *The Highest Good in Aristotle and Kant*, hrsg. von Joachim Aufderheide und Ralf M. Bader, Oxford, S. 112–28.
- 2018 [869] Louden, Robert B. (2018): The Moral Dimensions of Kant’s Anthropology, in *Knowledge, Morals and Practice in Kant’s Anthropology*, hrsg. von Gualtiero Lorini und Robert B. Louden, Cham, S. 101–16.
- 1990 [870] Ludwig, Bernd (1990): Einleitung, in Immanuel Kant, *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Tugendlehre. Metaphysik der Sitten, zweiter Teil*, neu herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Bernd Ludwig, Hamburg, S. XIII–XXVIII.
- 1997 [871] Ludwig, Bernd (1997): Die ‚praktische Vernunft‘ – ein hölzernes Eisen? Zum Verhältnis von Voluntarismus und Rationalismus in Kants Moralphilosophie, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 5, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 9–25.
- 2002 [872] Ludwig, Bernd (2002): Whence Public Right? The Role of Theoretical and Practical Reasoning in Kant’s *Doctrine of Right*, in *Kant’s Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 159–84.
- 2006 [873] Ludwig, Bernd (2006): Kant’s Hypothetical Imperatives (GMS, 417–419), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 139–57.
- 2007 [874] Ludwig, Bernd (2007): Kant, Garve, and the Motives of Moral Action, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 4, S. 183–93.<sup>118</sup>
- 2008 [875] Ludwig, Bernd (2008): Was wird in Kants *Grundlegung* eigentlich deduziert? Über einen Grund der vermeintlichen Dunkelheit des „Dritten Abschnitts“, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 16, S. 431–63.
- 2013 [876] Ludwig, Bernd (2013): Die Einteilungen der *Metaphysik der Sitten* im Allgemeinen und die der Tugendlehre im Besonderen (MS 6: 218–221 und RL 6: 239–242 und TL 6: 388–394, 410–413), in *Kant’s “Tugendlehre”. A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas

---

<sup>118</sup> “Kant’s comments ‘against Garve’ constitute his reaction to the latter’s remarks on Cicero’s *De Officiis*. Two related criticisms of Kant’s against Garve are discussed in brief in this paper. A closer look is then taken at Garve’s claim that ‘Kantian morality destroys all incentives that can move human beings to act at all’. I argue that Kant and Garve rely on two different models of human action for their analyses of moral motivation; these models differ in what each takes to be salient for the explanation of human action. I show that Samuel Clarke’s analogy of physical explanation in the framework of Newtonianism (in his *Discourse concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion*) usefully illuminates the difference between Kant and Garve in these respects.”

Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 59–84.

- 2014 [877] Ludwig, Bernd (2014): Die Freiheit des Willens und die Freiheit zum Bösen. Inhaltliche Inversionen und terminologische Ausdifferenzierungen in Kants Moralphilosophie zwischen 1781 und 1797, in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 227–68.
- 2014 [878] Ludwig, Bernd (2014): „Ohne alles moralische Gefühl ist kein Mensch...“ – lebendige, vernünftige und sittliche Weltwesen bei Kant, in *Affektivität und Ethik bei Kant und in der Phänomenologie*, hrsg. von Inga Römer, Berlin, S. 117–42.
- 2018 [879] Ludwig, Bernd (2018): Über drei Deduktionen in Kants Moralphilosophie – und über eine vierte, die man dort vergeblich sucht. Zur Rehabilitierung von *Grundlegung III*, *Kant-Studien* 109, S. 47–71.<sup>119</sup>
- 1992 [880] Ludwig, Ralf (1992): *Kategorischer Imperativ und Metaphysik der Sitten. Die Frage nach der Einheitlichkeit von Kants Ethik*, Frankfurt, Bern, New York, Paris.
- 1993 [881] Łuków, Paweł (1993): The Fact of Reason: Kant’s Passage to Ordinary Moral Knowledge, *Kant-Studien* 84, S. 204–21.
- 2003 [882] Łukow, Paweł (2003): Maxims, Moral Responsiveness, and Judgment, *Kant-Studien* 94, S. 405–425.
- 2003 [883] Lumer, Christoph (2002/2003): Kantischer Externalismus und Motive zu moralischem Handeln, *Conceptus* 35, S. 263–86.
- 1973 [884] MacBeath, Murray A. (1973): Kant on Moral Feeling, *Kant-Studien* 64, S. 283–324.
- 1976 [885] McCarthy, Michael H. (1976): Analytic Method and Analytic Propositions in Kant’s *Groundwork*, *Dialogue* 15, S. 565–82.
- 1979 [886] McCarthy, Michael H. (1979): Paton’s Suggestion that Kant’s Principle of Autonomy might be analytic, *Kant-Studien* 70, S. 206–24.
- 1982 [887] McCarthy, Michael H. (1982): Kant’s Rejection of the Argument of *Groundwork III*, *Kant-Studien* 73, S. 169–90.

---

<sup>119</sup> “Since H. J. Paton’s famous commentary from 1947, Kant’s interpreters have considered a ‘deduction of the categorical imperative’ a challenge. This is quite puzzling since Kant himself never talks about such a deduction – and the famous ‘deduction’ he does mention in *Groundwork III.4* is, as a close reading shows, not at all the deduction of a law but the deduction of a concept, of the idea of a pure lawgiving will: Only the reality of this idea can explain the possibility of – prima facie impossible – categorical imperatives and thus of morality as autonomy. The presupposition of the validity of the moral law, however, was already a cornerstone of Kant’s critical metaphysics in 1781: Moral theology (which replaces all speculative proofs of immortality and of God’s existence) depends on the moral law’s being an undisputed datum without any need for philosophical justification (‘deduction’). While in the *Groundwork* (1785) Kant tried to show the practical reality of the idea of a pure will with the help of a speculative deduction of freedom (which a reviewer described as being ‘uncritical’ in May 1786), in the second Critique (1787/88) the reality of that very idea, and with it the idea of freedom, depends (as did immortality and God’s existence in 1781) on the aforementioned practical datum, which, from that point on, Kant called a “Factum der reinen Vernunft” [fact of pure reason].”

- 1984 [888] McCarthy, Michael H. (1984): Kant's *Groundwork* Justification of Freedom, *Dialogue* (Kanada) 23, S. 457–73.
- 1985 [889] McCarthy, Michael H. (1985): The Objection of Circularity in *Groundwork* III, *Kant-Studien* 76, S. 28–42.
- 1989 [890] McCarty, Richard (1989): The Limits of Kantian Duty, and Beyond, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 26, S. 43–52.
- 1991 [891] McCarty, Richard (1991): Moral Conflicts in Kantian Ethics, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 8, S. 65–79.
- 1993 [892] McCarty, R. (1993): Kantian Moral Motivation and the Feeling of Respect, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 31, S. 421–35.
- 1994 [893] McCarty, R. (1994): Motivation and Moral Choice in Kant's Theory of Rational Agency, *Kant-Studien* 85, S. 15–31.
- 2006 [894] McCarty, Richard (2006): Maxims in Kant's Practical Philosophy, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 44, S. 65–83.<sup>120</sup>
- 2010 [895] McCarty, Richard (2010): Kant's Derivation of the Formula of Universal Law, *Dialogue* 49, S. 113–33.<sup>121</sup>
- 2012 [896] McCarty, Richard (2012): The Right to Lie. Kantian Ethics and the Inquiring Murderer, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 49, S. 331–43.
- 1969 [897] McCloskey, H. J. (1969): *Meta-Ethics and Normative Ethics*, Den Haag, S. 199–211.
- 2014 [898] McCumber, John (2014): *Understanding Hegel's Mature Critique of Kant*, Stanford, S. 147–72 ("Hegel's Critique of Kant's Moral Theory").
- 1966 [899] MacIntyre, Alasdair (1966): *A Short History of Ethics. A History of Moral Philosophy from the Homeric Age to the Twentieth Century*, Second Edition, Notre Dame 1998, S. 190–98 ("Kant"). – *Geschichte der Ethik im Überblick. Vom Zeitalter Homers bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, Meisenheim 1984, S. 177–84 („Kant“).
- 2000 [900] McNair, Ted (2000): Universal Necessity and Contradictions in Conception, *Kant-Studien* 91, S.

---

<sup>120</sup> "A standard interpretation of Kantian "maxims" sees them as expressing reasons for action, implying that we cannot act without a maxim. But recent challenges to this interpretation claim that Kant viewed acting on maxims as optional. Kant's understanding of maxims derives from Christian Wolff, who regarded maxims as major premises of the practical syllogism. This supports the standard interpretation. Yet Kant also viewed commitments to maxims as essential for virtue and character development, which supports challenges to the standard interpretation, and raises questions about the coherence of Kant's overall conception of the role of maxims in practical philosophy."

<sup>121</sup> "Critics have charged that there are gaps in the logic of Kant's derivation of the formula of universal law. Here I defend that derivation against these charges, partly by emphasizing a neglected teleological principle that Kant alluded to in his argument, and partly by clarifying what he meant by actions' "conformity to universal law." He meant that actions conform to universal law just when their maxims can belong to a unified system of principles. An analogy with objects' conformity to universal law in nature helps show how Kant was correct in deriving the formula of universal law from the premises of his argument."

- 2003 [901] Mahon, J. E. (2003): Kant on Lies, Candour and Reticece, *Kantian Review* 7, S. 102–33.
- 2006 [902] Mahon, James (2006): Kant and Maria von Herbert: Reticece vs. Deception, *Philosophy* 81, S. 417–44.<sup>122</sup>
- 2006 [903] Mahon, James Edwin (2006): Kant and the Perfect Duty to Others Not to Lie, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 14, S. 653–85.
- 2002 [904] Makkreel, Rudolf A. (2002): Reflective Judgment and the Problem of Assessing Virtue in Kant, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 205–20.
- 2012 [905] Makkreel, Rudolf A. (2012): Relating Aesthetic and Sociable Feelings to Moral and Participatory Feelings: Reassessing Kant on Sympathy and Honor, in *Kant's Observations and Remarks. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Susan Meld Shell und Richard Velkley, Cambridge 2012, S. 101–15.
- 1974 [906] Maliandi, Ricardo (1974): Bedeutung und Zweideutigkeit des „als-ob“ in der Naturgesetz-Formel des kategorischen Imperativs, in *Akten des 4. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke, Berlin, New York, S. 540–49.
- 2008 [907] Maliandi, Ricardo (2008): Categorical Imperative and Ethical Inflection, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 241–48.
- 2000 [908] Malibabo, Balimbanga (2000): *Kants Konzept einer kritischen Metaphysik der Sitten*, Würzburg.
- 2008 [909] Manninen, Bertha Alvarez (2008): Are Humen Embryos Kantian Persons?: Kantian Considerations in Favor of Embryonic Stem Cell Research, *Philosophy, Ethics, and Humanities in Medicine* 2008, 3:4: <http://peh-med.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1747-5341-3-4>.
- 2008 [910] Mannion, Gerard (2008): Kant and the Defeat of Egoism: Schopenhauerian Concerns and Some Reappraisals and Rejoinders, *Kant-Studien* 99, S. 220–28.
- 1999 [911] Marcucci, Silvestro (1999): “Moral Friendship” in Kant, *Kant-Studien* 90, S. 434–41.
- 1998 [912] Mariña, Jacqueline (1998): Kant's Derivation of the Formula of the Categorical Imperative: How to Get it Right, *Kant-Studien* 89, S. 167–78.
- 2000 [913] Mariña, Jacqueline (2000): Making Sense of Kant's Highest Good, *Kant-Studien* 91, S. 329–55.
- 2018 [914] Markovits, Julia (2018): Humanity as an End in Itself, in *The Many Moral Rationalisms*, hrsg. von Karen Jones und François Schroeter, Oxford, S. 27–47.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> “This article argues for a distinction between reticece and lying on the basis of what Kant says about reticece in his correspondence with Maria von Herbert and in his other ethical writings, and defends this distinction against the objections of Rae Langton (‘Duty and Desolation’, *Philosophy* 67, No. 262 (October 1992), 481–505). Lying is necessarily deceptive, whereas reticece is not necessarily deceptive. Allowing another person to remain ignorant of some matter is a form of reticece that is not deceptive. This form of reticece may be ethically permissible.”

- 2009 [915] Marks, Joel (2009): *Ought Implies Kant. A Reply to the Consequentialist Critique*, Lanham.
- 1982 [916] Marshall, John (1982): Hypothetical Imperatives, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 19, S. 105-14.
- 1985 [917] Marshall, John (1985): The Syntheticty of the Categorical Imperative, in *Proceedings of the Sixth International Kant Congress*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke und Thomas M. Seebohm, Vol. II/2, S. 185–200.
- 2000 [918] Marshall, Thomas (2006): The Ambiguity of Kant’s Concept of Happiness, *Reason Papers* 26, S. 21–28.
- 2006 [919] Martin, Adrienne M. (2006): How to Argue for the Value of Humanity, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 87, S. 96–125.<sup>124</sup>
- 1980 [920] Martin, Conor (1980): Emotion in Kant’s Moral Philosophy, *Philosophical Studies* 28, S. 16–28.
- 2008 [921] Martins, Clélia Aparecida (2008): Über die moralische Selbsterkenntnis, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 249–57.

---

<sup>123</sup> “This chapter develops an internalist defense of the claim that we all have most reason to be moral, drawing on Kant’s argument for his “formula of humanity,” which states: “so act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end and never merely as a means.” It argues that rational pressure to form maximally coherent, systematically justifiable sets of ends gives us all reason to respect others as ends in themselves—reason that cannot be outweighed by our reasons to promote our own optional ends. It defends the Kantian argument against some prominent objections.”

<sup>124</sup> “Significant effort has been devoted to locating a good argument for Kant’s Formula of Humanity. In this paper, I contrast two arguments, based on Kant’s text, for the Formula of Humanity. The first, which I call the ‘Valued Ends’ argument, is an influential and appealing argument developed most notably by Christine Korsgaard and Allen Wood. Notwithstanding the appeal and influence of this argument, it ultimately fails on several counts. I therefore present as an alternative the ‘Autonomy’ argument, which is largely inspired by the failings of the Valued Ends argument.”

- 2018 [922] Marwede, Florian (2018): *Das höchste Gut in Kants deontologischer Ethik*, Berlin.<sup>125</sup>
- 2006 [923] Mayer, Verena (2006): Das Paradox des Regelfolgens in Kants Moralphilosophie, *Kant-Studien* 97, S. 343–68.<sup>126</sup>
- 2002 [924] Melnick, Arthur (2002): Kant's Formulations of the Categorical Imperative, *Kant-Studien* 93, S. 291–308. Wiederabgedruckt in Melnick, *Themes in Kant's Metaphysics and Ethics*, Washington, D.C. 2004, S. 229–48.
- 1993 [925] Mendonça, W. P. (1993): Die Person als Zweck an sich, *Kant-Studien* 84, S. 167–84.
- 1899 [926] Menzer, Paul (1898): Die Entwicklung der Kantischen Ethik in den Jahren 1760 bis 1785. Erster Abschnitt, *Kant-Studien* 2, S. 290–322.
- 1898 [927] Menzer, Paul (1899): Die Entwicklung der Kantischen Ethik in den Jahren 1760 bis 1785. Zweiter Abschnitt, *Kant-Studien* 3, S. 41–104.
- 2008 [928] Merle, Jean-Christophe (2008): Freundschaft innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft. Freundschaft gegenüber der Menschheit bei Kant, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philo-*

---

<sup>125</sup> „Die vorliegende Studie erforscht den Zusammenhang zwischen den Konzepten des höchsten Gutes und des kategorischen Imperativs in Kants praktischer Philosophie. Nach einer originellen Lesart des Autors gebietet der kategorische Imperativ, das eigene Glück stets nur als Bestandteil allgemeinen Glücks zu verfolgen. Das höchste Gut ist nun derjenige Zustand der Welt, der erreicht würde, wenn alle Menschen diesem Prinzip gemäß handeln würden und ihrem gemeinsamen Streben nach allgemeiner Glückseligkeit auch Erfolg beschieden wäre. Dieser Zustand ist ein notwendiges Ziel vernünftigen Handelns, das sich aus dem kategorischen Imperativ ergibt, dessen Verfolgung aber trotzdem über das bloße Handeln nach verallgemeinerbaren Maximen hinausgeht. Durch eine Neuinterpretation von Kants These, im höchsten Gut sei das Glück stets proportional zur Tugend, gelingt es dem Autor, nicht nur diese These, sondern auch Kants Aussagen über Gerechtigkeit, Glückswürdigkeit und Hoffnung argumentativ an den kategorischen Imperativ zu binden und damit im Kontext des höchsten Guts zu rechtfertigen. Dem Autor zufolge hat das höchste Gut somit eine wichtige eigenständige Funktion in der kantischen Ethik, ohne ihren deontologischen Charakter in Frage zu stellen.“ (Verlagstext)

Inhalt: Vorwort. Inhalt. Einleitung. Teil I: Kants deontologische Ethik. 1. Der kategorische Imperativ und allgemeine Glückseligkeit. 2. Gegenstände praktischer Vernunft. 3. Kants Kritik an heteronomen Moralbegründungen. Teil II: Das höchste Gut. 4. Tugend als erstes Element des höchsten Guts. 5. Glückseligkeit als zweites Element des höchsten Guts. 6. Die Proportionalität zwischen Sittlichkeit und Glückseligkeit. 7. Die Pflicht zur Beförderung des höchsten Guts. Schluss. Zitierweise. Literatur. Personenregister. Sachregister.

<sup>126</sup> „Regeln im Sinne von Handlungsvorschriften setzen ihre Anwendbarkeit schon begrifflich voraus. Alle Regeln regeln mögliches Verhalten, seien es Verkehrsregeln, juristische Gesetze, mathematische und logische Verfahren, und selbst „Bedeutungspostulate“, die festlegen, wie ein Ausdruck verständlich zu verwenden ist. Regeln ohne irgendeinen möglichen Anwendungsspielraum sind sinnlos. Dabei werden durch Regeln nicht nur mögliche Anwendungen präsupponiert, sondern umgekehrt aus gegebenen Tatsachen oder Ereignissen Regelmäßigkeiten herausgelesen, die sich in der Regel ausdrücken. Die Regel bezeichnet in diesem Sinne das „Prinzip hinter den Tatsachen“, das sie diesen freilich in gewisser Weise erst andichtet. Zweck dieses Vorgehens ist nicht zuletzt, die mögliche Fortsetzung der Tatsachenreihe gleichzeitig zu bestimmen und zu begründen, jedenfalls aber eine gewisse Ordnung, Rechtfertigung und Voraussagbarkeit des Handelns zu gewährleisten. Regelanwendung verlangt deshalb eine komplexe geistige Kompetenz, die nicht nur Fähigkeiten der Abstraktion und Reflexion, sondern auch Können und Erfahrung voraussetzt.“

*sophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Band 3: Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 269–80.

- 2017 [929] Merritt, Melissa McBay (2017): Love, Respect, and Individuals: Murdoch as a Guide to Kantian Ethics, *European Journal of Philosophy* 25, S. 1844–63.<sup>127</sup>
- 2017 [930] Merritt, Melissa McBay (2017): Practical Reason and Respect for Persons, *Kantian Review* 22, S. 53–79.<sup>128</sup>
- 2018 [931] Merritt, Melissa (2018): *Kant on Reflection and Virtue*, Cambridge.<sup>129</sup> (Part II. Virtue: 4. Conceptions of Reason and Epistemic Normativity. 5. Cognitive and Moral Virtue. 6. Virtue as a Skill. 7. The Cognitive Basis of Moral Virtue)
- 2016 [932] Mertens, Thomas (2016): On Kant’s Duty to Speak the Truth, *Kantian Review* 21, 27–51<sup>130</sup>.

---

<sup>127</sup> “I reconsider the relation between love and respect in Kantian ethics, taking as my guide Iris Murdoch’s view of love as the fundamental moral attitude and a kind of attention to individuals. It is widely supposed that Kantian ethics disregards individuals, since we don’t respect individuals but the universal quality of personhood they instantiate. We need not draw this conclusion if we recognise that Kant and Murdoch share a view about the centrality of love to virtue. We can then see that respect in the virtuous person cannot be blind to the individual, as critics of Kantian ethics contend. My approach contrasts recent efforts (Velleman and Bagnoli) to assimilate Kantian respect to Murdochian love, which overlook Murdoch’s distinctive claims about the singularity of moral activity. This idea is not as un-Kantian as it seems, and it should inform any Kantian ethics that aims to address the charge about individuals.”

<sup>128</sup> “My project is to reconsider the Kantian conception of practical reason. Some Kantians take practical reasoning to be more active than theoretical reasoning, on the grounds that it need not contend with what is there anyway, independently of its exercise. Behind that claim stands the thesis that practical reason is essentially efficacious. I accept the efficacy principle, but deny that it underwrites this conception of practical reason. My inquiry takes place against the background of recent Kantian metaethical debate – each side of which, I argue, points to issues that need to be jointly accommodated in the account of practical reason. From the constructivist, I accept the essential efficacy of practical reason; from the realist, I accept that any genuinely cognitive exercise of practical reason owes allegiance to what is there anyway, independently of its exercise. I conclude that a Kantian account of recognition respect enables us to accommodate both claims.”

<sup>129</sup> “There can be no doubt that Kant thought we should be reflective: we ought to care to make up our own minds about how things are and what is worth doing. Philosophical objections to the Kantian reflective ideal have centred on concerns about the excessive control that the reflective person is supposed to exert over their own mental life, and Kantians who feel the force of these objections have recently drawn attention to Kant’s conception of moral virtue as it is developed in his later work, chiefly the *Metaphysics of Morals*. Melissa Merritt’s book is a distinctive contribution to this recent turn to virtue in Kant scholarship. Merritt argues that we need a clearer, and textually more comprehensive, account of what reflection is, in order not only to understand Kant’s account of virtue, but also to appreciate how it effectively rebuts long-standing objections to the Kantian reflective ideal.”

<sup>130</sup> “In ‘On the Supposed Right to Lie from Philanthropy’, Kant defends a position that cannot be salvaged. The essay is nonetheless important because it helps us understand his philosophy of law and, more specifically, his interpretation of the social contract. Kant considers truthfulness a strict legal duty because it is the necessary condition for the juridical state. As attested by Kant’s rejection of Beccaria’s arguments against

- 1904 [933] Messer, August (1904): *Kants Ethik. Eine Einführung in ihre Hauptprobleme und Beiträge zu deren Lösung*, Leipzig.
- 2008 [934] Meyers, C. D. (2008): The Virtue of Cold-Heartedness, *Philosophical Studies* 138, S. 233–44.<sup>131</sup>
- 1990 [935] Michalson, Gordon E. (1990): *Fallen Freedom: Kant on Radical Evil and Moral Regeneration*, Cambridge.
- 2006 [936] Mieth, Corinna/Rosenthal, Jacob (2006): “Freedom must be presupposed as a property of the will of all rational beings” (GMS III, 2), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 247–84.
- 2011 [937] Mikkola, Mari (2011): Kant on Moral Agency and Women’s Nature, *Kantian Review* 16, S. 89–111.<sup>132</sup>
- 1973 [938] Miller, F. D. (1973): Kant: Two Concepts of Moral Ends, *Personalist* 54, S. 376–90.
- 1993 [939] Miller, R. D. (1993): *An Interpretation of Kant’s Moral Philosophy*, Harrogate.
- 2003 [940] Miller, Sarah Clark (2003): Filial Obligation, Kant’s Duty of Beneficence, and Need, in *Care of the Aged: Biomedical Ethics Reviews*, hrsg. von James M. Humber, Totowa S. 169–198.
- 2003 [941] Millgram, Elijah (2003): Does the Categorical Imperative Give Rise to a Contradiction in the Will?, *Philosophical Review* 112, S. 525–560. Wiederabgedruckt mit einem Postscript in Millgram, *Ethics Done Right. Practical Reasoning as a Foundation for Moral Theory*, Cambridge 2005, S. 89–132.
- 1998 [942] Milz, Bernhard (1998): Zur Analytizität und Synthetizität der *Grundlegung*, *Kant-Studien* 89, S. 188–204.
- 2014 [943] Milz, Bernhard (2014): Kants Deduktion des kategorischen Imperativs in entwicklungsge-  
schichtlicher Perspektive, in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung*

---

the death penalty, not even the right to life has such strict unconditional status. Within the juridical state, established by the social contract, the (single) innate right to freedom is transformed into a bundle of merely positive rights, including the right to life. Understanding the reason for the rejection of ‘the right to lie from philanthropy’ thus helps us understand the, in a sense, ‘positivist’ character of Kant’s legal philosophy. In conclusion, some suggestions are made to bring his position closer to our common moral understanding.”

<sup>131</sup> “I defend a strong version of the Kantian claim that actions done solely from duty have moral worth by (1) considering pure cases of acting from duty, (2) showing that love and sympathy, unlike a sense of duty, can often lead us to do the wrong thing, (3) carefully distinguishing moral from non-moral virtues, and (4) by distinguishing pathological sympathy from practical sympathy. Not only is acting purely from a sense of duty superior to acting from love and sympathetic feelings, but the cold-heartedness found in Kant’s examples should be thought of as a virtue rather than a vice.”

<sup>132</sup> “Some commentators have condemned Kant’s moral project from a feminist perspective based on Kant’s apparently dim view of women as being innately morally deficient. Here I will argue that although his remarks concerning women are unsettling at first glance, a more detailed and closer examination shows that Kant’s view of women is actually far more complex and less unsettling than that attributed to him by various feminist critics. My argument, then, undercuts the justification for the severe feminist critique of Kant’s moral project.”

III. Deduktion oder Faktum?, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 133–66.

- 2000 [944] Moggach, Douglas (2000): The Construction of Juridical Space: Kant's Analogy of Relation in the *Metaphysics of Morals*, in *The Proceedings of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy*, Vol. 7: *Modern Philosophy*, hrsg. von Mark D. Gedney, Bowling Green, S. 201–209.
- 2012 [945] Moehler, Michael (2012): A Hobbesian Derivation of the Principle of Universalization, *Philosophical Studies* 158, S. 83–107.<sup>133</sup>
- 2007 [946] Mohr, Georg (2007): Ein „Wert, der keinen Preis hat“ – Philosophiegeschichtliche Grundlagen der Menschenwürde bei Kant und Fichte, in *Menschenwürde. Philosophische, theologische und juristische Analysen*, hrsg. von Hans Jörg Sandkühler, Frankfurt a. M., S. 13–39.
- 2003 [947] Moore, A. W. (2003): *Noble in Reason, Infinite in Faculty. Themes and Variations in Kant's Moral and Religious Philosophy*, London.
- 2006 [948] Moore, A. W. (2006): Maxims and Thick Ethical Concepts, *Ratio* 19, S. 129–47.<sup>134</sup>
- 1992 [949] Moore, Jennifer (1992): Kant's Ethical Community, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 26, S. 51–71.
- 2011 [950] Moran, Kate A. (2011): The Ethical Community as Ground of Moral Action: An Interpretation of the Highest Good, in *Rethinking Kant* Volume 3, Cambridge, S. 78–99.
- 2012 [951] Moran, Kate A. (2012): *Community and Progress in Kant's Moral Philosophy*, Washington, D. C.<sup>135</sup>
- 2017 [952] Moran, Kate (2017): Demandingness, Indebtedness, and Charity: Kant on Imperfect Duties to Others, in *The Palgrave Kant Handbook*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, London, S. 307–29.

---

<sup>133</sup> “In this article, I derive a weak version of Kant's categorical imperative within an informal game-theoretic framework. More specifically, I argue that Hobbesian agents would choose what I call the *weak principle of universalization*, if they had to decide on a rule of conflict resolution in an idealized but empirically defensible hypothetical decision situation. The discussion clarifies (i) the rationality requirements imposed on agents, (ii) the empirical conditions assumed to warrant the conclusion, and (iii) the political institutions that are necessary to implement the derived principle. The analysis demonstrates the moral significance of the weak principle of universalization and its epistemic advantage over the categorical imperative.”

<sup>134</sup> “I begin with Kant's notion of a maxim and consider the role which this notion plays in Kant's formulations of the fundamental categorical imperative. This raises the question of what a maxim is, and why there is not the same requirement for resolutions of other kinds to be universalizable. Drawing on Bernard Williams' notion of a thick ethical concept, I proffer an answer to this question which is intended neither in a spirit of simple exegesis nor as a straightforward exercise in moral philosophy but as something that is poised somewhere between the two. My aim is to provide a kind of rational reconstruction of Kant. In the final section of the essay, I argue that this reconstruction, while it manages to salvage something distinctively Kantian, also does justice to the relativism involved in what J. L. Mackie calls ‘people's adherence to and participation in different ways of life’.”

<sup>135</sup> Content: Acknowledgments. Introduction 1. Kant's Concept of the Highest Good 2. Moral Action and Moral Development: The Mechanisms of Progress. 3. Moral Education and Moral Progress. Friendship and Moral Improvement. Civil Society and the Highest Good. Concluding Remarks. Bibliography. Index.

- 1951 [953] Moritz, M. (1951): *Studien zum Pflichtbegriff in Kants Kritischer Ethik*, Lund.
- 1960 [954] Moritz, M. (1960): *Kants Einteilung der Imperative*, Lund.
- 1965 [955] Moritz, M. (1965): Pflicht und Moralität. Eine Antinomie in Kants Ethik, *Kant-Studien* 56, S. 412–29.
- 2008 [956] Morrisson, Iain P. D. (2008): *Kant and the Role of Pleasure in Moral Action*, Athens, OH.<sup>136</sup>
- 2013 [957] Mosayebi, Reza (2013): *Das Minimum der reinen praktischen Vernunft. Vom kategorischen Imperativ zum allgemeinen Rechtsprinzip bei Kant*, Berlin (Kantstudien-Ergänzungsheft 173).<sup>137</sup>
- 2009 [958] Moskopp, Werner (2009): *Struktur und Dynamik in Kants Kritiken*, Berlin, S. 169–202 („2.2 Die Grundlegung der Metaphysik der Sitten“), S. 203–82 („2. 3 Die Kritik der praktischen Vernunft“).<sup>138</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> “Kant scholars since the early nineteenth century have disagreed about how to interpret his theory of moral motivation. Kant tells us that the feeling of respect is the incentive to moral action, but he is notoriously ambiguous on the question of what exactly this means. In *Kant and the Role of Pleasure in Moral Action*, Iain Morrisson offers a new view on Kant’s theory of moral action.

In a clear, straightforward style, Morrisson responds to the ongoing interpretive stalemate by taking an original approach to the problem. Whereas previous commentators have attempted to understand Kant’s feeling of respect by studying the relevant textual evidence in isolation, Morrisson illuminates this evidence by determining what Kant’s more general theory of action commits him to regarding moral action. After looking at how Kant’s treatment of desire and feeling can be reconciled with his famous account of free maxim-based action, Morrisson argues that respect moves us to moral action in a way that is structurally parallel to the way in which nonmoral pleasure motivates nonmoral action.

In reconstructing a unified theory of action in Kant, Morrisson integrates a number of distinct elements in his practical philosophy. *Kant and the Role of Pleasure in Moral Action* is part of a new wave of interest in Kant’s anthropological (that is, psychological) works.” (Publisher’s (Ohio University Press) description)

<sup>137</sup> „Die normative Geltungsabhängigkeit des allgemeinen Rechtsprinzips aus der Rechtslehre vom kategorischen Imperativ aus den zwei ethischen Grundlagentexten Kants kann zweifach angezweifelt werden: Zum einen bleibt das allgemeine Rechtsprinzip dem Motiv der Adressaten gegenüber indifferent; dieses ist aber in der grundlegenden Theorie der Moralität der Grundlagentexten gerade ausschlaggebend. Zum anderen ist für Kant das allgemeine Rechtsprinzip analytisch mit einer äußerlichen Zwangsbefugnis verbunden; dies scheint sogar im Gegensatz zu dem auf Selbstverpflichtung gegründeten kategorischen Imperativ zu stehen. Wie ist nun das Verhältnis zwischen dem kategorischen Imperativ und dem allgemeinen Rechtsprinzip zu verstehen? Worin genau bestehen die Gemeinsamkeiten und die Unterschiede beider Prinzipien? Die Untersuchung macht deutlich, dass die Beantwortung dieser Fragen ohne das Heranziehen einiger Grundmomente des kritischen Idealismus unterbestimmt bleibt. Sie zeigt, dass das allgemeine Rechtsprinzip in aller Konsequenz aus der Moraltheorie der Grundlagentexten heraus entwickelt wird, und legt auf der Grundlage transzendental-kritischer Momente dar, warum und worin sich dieses Prinzip vom kategorischen Imperativ abhebt.“

Inhalt: Einleitung (1). Teil I: Die Grundzüge der Ethik Kants (13). Teil II: Das Vernunftrecht und die Metaphysik der Sitten (68). Teil III: Das allgemeine Rechtsprinzip und die Maximen (149). Teil IV: Das allgemeine Rechtsprinzip und die Transzendentalphilosophie (207). Bibliografie (252). Autorenregister (265). Sachregister (269).

- 2008 [959] Moyar, Dean (2008): Practical Apperception: Self-Imputation and Moral Judgment, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 281–90.
- 2008 [960] Moyar, Dean (2008): Unstable Autonomy: Conscience and Judgment in Kant’s Moral Philosophy, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 5, S. 327–60.<sup>139</sup>
- 2015 [961] Moyar, Dean (2015): The First Person and the Moral Law, *Kantian Review* 20, S. 289–300.<sup>140</sup> – Zu [468]. – Dazu: [470].
- 2008 [962] Muchnik, Pablo (2008): Kant on the Sources of Evil, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 291–301.
- 2014 [963] Muchnik, Pablo (2014): The Heart as Locus of Moral Struggle in the *Religion*, in *Kant on Emotion and Value*, hrsg. von Alix Cohen, Houndmills, S. 224–44.
- 1978 [964] Mulholland, Leslie A. (1978): Kant: On Willing Maxims to Become Laws of Nature, *Dialogue* 18, S. 92–105.
- 1990 [965] Mulholland, Leslie A. (1990): *Kant’s System of Rights*, New York, S. 1–198.

---

<sup>138</sup> „Ziel dieser Untersuchung ist es, den Zusammenhang der kantischen Kritiken unter Wahrung einer transzendental-kritischen Perspektive nachzuweisen. Dazu wird zunächst eine Paraphrasierung der einzelnen Kritiken entwickelt und aus einem gemeinsamen erkenntnistheoretischen Horizont heraus interpretiert, der anschließend jeweils mit einschlägigen Positionen der Forschungsliteratur diskutiert wird. Der inhaltliche Schwerpunkt der Arbeit zielt auf eine besondere Einordnung der Leistung Kants: Eine Differenzierung der Bereiche „Metaphysik“, „Transzendentalphilosophie“ und „transzendente Kritik“ lässt Kants Standpunkt einheitlich bestimmen und zeigt unter der Berücksichtigung der Notwendigkeit für das menschliche Denken die grundlegenden allgemeingültigen Strukturen des menschlichen Erkenntnisvermögens. Diese Akzentuierung der Betrachtung hat einige Verschiebungen des heute gelehrten Kant-Bildes zur Folge, die bes. den Kategorischen Imperativ und die sogenannte „Ästhetik“ der *Kritik der Urteilskraft* betreffen.“

<sup>139</sup> “In this paper I argue that Kant’s claims about conscience in his moral writings of the 1790s reveal a fundamental instability in his moral philosophy. The central issue is the relationship between the moral law as the form of universality and the judgment of individuals about specific cases. Against Thomas Hill’s claim that Kant has only a limited role for conscience, I argue that conscience has a comprehensive role in Kantian deliberation. I unpack the claims about conscience in the *Metaphysics of Morals* to show that they describe conscience as both a basic act of self-consciousness and as an all-things-considered judgment. I outline the role of conscience in moral motivation, and argue that taken together Kant’s writings about conscience reveal a way to rethink Kant’s conception of the Fact of Reason.”

<sup>140</sup> “In *Kant’s Defense of Common Moral Experience: A Phenomenological Account*, Jeanine Grenberg argues for the centrality to Kant’s ethics of the experience of the feeling of moral constraint, especially as that feeling is described in Kant’s fact of reason argument. She criticizes interpretations of the fact of reason that interpret it as primarily a certain kind of act. I defend my version of an act-based interpretation against Grenberg’s criticisms, flesh out the Fichtean background of that interpretation and raise some further questions about Grenberg’s account.”

- 1991 [966] Mulholland, Leslie (1991): Formalism in Kant's Ethical Theory, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 353–64.
- 1974 [967] Moritz, M. (1974): Über einige formale Strukturen des kategorischen Imperativs, in *Akten des 4. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1974*, Teil 1: *Symposien*, hrsg. von G. Funke und J. Kopper, Berlin, S. 201–8.
- 2009 [968] Muchnik, Pablo (2009): *Kant's Theory of Evil: An Essay on the Dangers of Self-Love and the Apriority of History*, Lanham.
- 1995 [969] Munzel, G. Felicitas (1995): 'The Beautiful Is the Symbol of the Morally-Good': Kant's Philosophical Basis of Proof for the Idea of the Morally-Good, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 33, S. 301–30.
- 1999 [970] Munzel, G. Felicitas (1999): *Kant's Conception of Moral Character. The "Critical" Link of Morality, Anthropology, and Reflective Judgment*, Chicago.
- 2002 [971] Munzel, G. Felicitas (2002): "Doctrine of Method" and "Closing" (151–163), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 203–17.
- 1964 [972] Murphy, Arthur E. (1964): *The Theory of Practical Reason*, La Salle, S. 285–301.
- 1965 [973] Murphy, Jeffrey G. (1964): The Highest Good as Content for Kant's Ethical Formalism. Beck vs. Silber, *Kant-Studien* 56, S. 102–10.
- 1967 [974] Murphy, Jeffrey G. (1967): Kant's Concept of a Right Action, *Monist* 51, S. 574–98.
- 1970 [975] Murphy, Jeffrey G. (1970): *Kant: The Philosophy of Right*, London, S. 55–86 ("Morality and Freedom"), 87–108 ("The Criterion of Moral Right").
- 1991 [976] Nagel, Thomas (1991): *Equality and Partiality*, New York, S. 41–52 ("Kant's Test"). – *Eine Abhandlung über Gleichheit und Parteilichkeit und andere Schriften zur politischen Philosophie*, Paderborn 1994, S. 62–77 („Kants Maximenprobe“).
- 1957 [977] Nahm, Milton C. (1956/57): "Sublimity" and the "Moral Law" in Kant's Philosophy, *Kant-Studien* 48, S. 502–24.
- 2008 [978] Nahra, Cinara (2008): Acting from the Motive of Duty and the Incorruptible Ideal Moral Agent, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 303–11.
- 1985 [979] Nakhnikian, George (1985): Kantian Universalizability and the Objectivity of Moral Judgments, in *Morality and Universality*, hrsg. von Nelson T. Potter und Mark Timmons, Dordrecht, S. 187–233.
- 1992 [980] Nakhnikian, George (1992): Kant's Theory of Hypothetical Imperatives, *Kant-Studien* 83, S. 21–49.
- 2003 [981] Nauckhoff, Josefine (2003): Incentives and Interests in Kant's Moral Psychology, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 20, S. 41–60.
- 1994 [982] Neiman, Susan (1994): *The Unity of Reason. Rereading Kant*, Oxford, S. 105–44 ("The Primacy of the Practical").

- 1975 [983] Nell [= O'Neill], Onora (1975): *Acting on Principle. An Essay on Kantian Ethics*, New York.
- 1914 [984] Nelson, Leonard (1914): Die kritische Ethik bei Kant, Schiller und Fries. Eine Revision ihrer Prinzipien, in ders., *Gesammelte Schriften in neun Bänden*, hrsg. von Paul Bernays, Willi Eichler, Arnold Gysin, Gustav Heckmann, Grete Henry-Hermann, Fritz von Hippel, Stephan Körner, Werner Kroebel, Gerhard Weisser, Band VIII, Hamburg 1971, S. 27–192: S. 41–99 („Erster Teil. Kant“).
- 1991 [985] Nelson, William N. (1991): *Morality: What's in It for Me? A Historical Introduction to Ethics*, Boulder, S. 39–58 (“The Moral Point of View: Immanuel Kant, 1724–1804”).
- 2008 [986] Nelson, William (2008): Kant's Formula of Humanity, *Mind* 117, S. 85–106.<sup>141</sup>
- 1997 [987] Nenon, Thomas (1997): The Highest Good and the Happiness of Others, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* Band 5: Themenschwerpunkt: 200 Jahre Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 419–35.
- 2000 [988] Neumann, Michael (2000): Did Kant Respect Persons?, *Res Publica* 6, S. 285–99.<sup>142</sup>
- 2017 [989] Newton, Andrea (2017): The Analytic Proposition Underlying Kantian Hypothetical Imperatives, *Kant-Studien* 108, S. 543–67.<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> “This paper is concerned with the normative content of Kant's formula of humanity (FH). More specifically, does FH, as some seem to think, imply the specific and rigid prescriptions in ‘standard’ deontological theories? To this latter question, I argue, the answer is ‘no’. I propose reading FH largely through the formula of autonomy and the formula of the kingdom of ends, where I understand FA to describe the nature of the capacity of humanity – a capacity for self-governance. The latter, I suggest, is akin to the capacity for planning and intentional action described in Michael Bratman's work. A significant part of what FH requires, I then propose, is that we exercise these capacities for planning in such a way that we accommodate and coordinate with the (permissible) plans and intentions of others. Kant himself, as do many commentators, emphasizes the idea that our human capacities give us a distinctive kind of value. On my interpretation, by contrast, what is fundamentally important is not the value of the capacities but rather what they make possible: distinctive ways of mistreating (using) persons, but also a distinctive kind of morally desirable relationship.”

<sup>142</sup> “The illusion that Kant respects persons comes from ascribing contemporary meanings to purely technical terms within his second formulation of the categorical imperative, “[A]ct so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only”. When we realize that “humanity” means rational nature and “person” means the supersensible self (*homo noumenon*), we find that we are to respect, not human selves in all their diversity (*homo phaenomenon*), but rational selves in all their sameness, in their unvarying conformity to the universal principles of pure practical reason. Contemporary individualism gets no support from Kant.”

<sup>143</sup> “Kant maintains that it is easy to see how hypothetical imperatives are possible, because the following proposition is analytic: “Whoever wills the end also wills (in so far as reason has decisive influence on his actions) the indispensably necessary means to it that is within his control” (GMS, AA 04: 417). I distinguish three readings of the analytic proposition, which correspond to three ways of understanding how it reveals hypothetical imperatives to be possible. The first reads it as a theoretical proposition about constitutive features of an ideal agent. I argue that this fails to do justice to the first-personal character of the analytic proposition, as a proposition about the general practical concept ‘I will’ (or more generally, ‘I intend’). The second reading extracts actual imperatives from the concept of ‘willing an end’ by means of analysis.

- 1989 [990] Nisters, Thomas (1989): *Kants Kategorischer Imperativ als Leitfaden humaner Praxis*, Freiburg.
- 2008 [991] Nodari, Paulo César (2008): The Moral Law as Expression of the Autonomy of Reason in the *Critique of the [!] Practical Reason*, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 313–22.
- 2008 [992] Noordraven, Andreas (2008): *Kants moralische Ontologie. Historischer Ursprung und systematische Bedeutung*, Würzburg.<sup>144</sup>
- 2001 [993] Nordenstam, Tore (2001): Kant and the Utilitarians, *Ethical Perspectives* 8, S. 29–36.
- 1998 [994] Norman, Richard (1998): *The Moral Philosophers. An Introduction to Ethics*, Oxford, 2. A., S. 70–91 (“Kant: Respect for Persons”).
- 2007 [995] Nortmann, Ulrich (2007): Kants Kategorischer Imperativ in der neueren Diskussion, in *Logik, Begriffe, Prinzipien des Handelns*, hrsg. von Thomas Müller und Albert Newen, Paderborn, S. 249–73.
- 1981 [996] Nusser, Karl-Heinz (1981): Das Kriterium der Moralität und die sittliche Allgemeinheit. Zur Bestimmung von Moralität und Rechtsbegründung bei Kant und Hegel, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 35, S. 552–63.
- 1995 [997] Nuyen, A. T. (1995): The Heart of the Kantian Moral Agent, *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 69, S. 51–62.
- 2014 [998] Nyholm, Sven (2014): On Kant’s Idea of Humanity as an End in Itself, *European Journal of Philosophy* 24, S. 358–74.<sup>145</sup>

---

Against this, I argue that the derivation of an imperative from an act of willing an end is an act of synthesis, and that analysis of the concept of ‘my willing an end’ merely yields the possibility of hypothetical imperatives.”

<sup>144</sup> „Gegenstand der vorliegenden Untersuchung ist das Verhältnis von Denken und Sein in den verschiedenen Phasen von Kants Denkentwicklung. Gezeigt wird, dass die vom Sein ausgehende Ontologie der vorkritischen Periode, die in Kants transzendental-kritischer Phase vorübergehend beiseite gedrängt wird, im Spätwerk erneut in den Vordergrund tritt. Diese Rehabilitierung der Ontologie im Nachlass, die jedoch keinen Bruch mit dem transzendentalen Denken bedeutet, sondern von Kant „eine Fortsetzung der Transzendentalphilosophie auf höherem Niveau“ genannt wird, ist für die Interpretation seiner Ethik von besonderem Interesse. Die von der heutigen Forschung immer noch als Standardinterpretation angenommene Auslegung, nach der die transzendentalphilosophisch begründete Lehre des kategorischen Imperativs das Herzstück der kantischen Ethik darstellt, kann aus der Sicht des „neuen Transzendentalismus“ der Spätphase nicht länger überzeugen. Der ethische Formalismus weicht hier dem Phänomen der konkreten sittlichen Erfahrung, das im Nachlasswerk als das eigentliche Grundphänomen der Moral angesehen werden kann. Der spezifisch praktische Charakter von Kants Moralphilosophie gewinnt damit einen systematischen Stellenwert, den die Kantforschung bis heute kaum beachtet hat.“

<sup>145</sup> “Writers like Christine Korsgaard and Allen Wood understand Kant’s idea of rational nature as an end in itself as a commitment to a substantive value. This makes it hard for them to explain the supposed equivalence between the universal law and humanity formulations of the categorical imperative, since the former does not appear to assert any substantive value. Nor is it easy for defenders of value-based readings

- 2017 [999] Nyholm, Sven (2017): Do we Always Act on Maxims, *Kantian Review* 22, S. 233–55.<sup>146</sup>
- 1992 [1000] Oakley, Justin (1992): *Morality and the Emotions*, London, S. 86–121 (“Kantian Arguments against Emotions as Moral Motives”).
- 1983 [1001] Oberer, Hariolf (1983): Kants praktische Philosophie, in *Zur Geschichte der Philosophie* Bd. 2: *Von Kant bis zur Gegenwart*, hrsg. von Karl Bärthlein, S. 15–30.
- 1986 [1002] Oberer, Hariolf (1986): Zur Vor- und Nachgeschichte der Lehre Kants vom Recht der Lüge, in *Kant und das Recht der Lüge*, hrsg. von Georg Geismann und Hariolf Oberer, Würzburg, S. 7–22.
- 1997 [1003] Oberer, Hariolf (1997): Sittengesetz und Rechtsgesetze a priori, in *Kant. Analysen – Probleme – Kritik*. Bd. III. *Hans Wagner zum 80. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Hariolf Oberer, Würzburg, S. 157–200.
- 2004 [1004] Oberer, Hariolf (2004): Honeste vive. Zu Immanuel Kant, Die Metaphysik der Sitten, AA 06, 236. 20–30, in *Metaphysik und Kritik. Festschrift für Manfred Baum zum 65. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Sabine Doyé, Marion Heinz und Udo Rameil, Berlin, New York, S. 203–13.
- 2006 [1005] Oberer, Hariolf (2006): Sittlichkeit, Ethik und Recht bei Kant, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 259–67.
- 2012 [1006] O’Connell, Eoin (2012): Happiness Proportioned to Virtue: Kant and the Highest Good, *Kantian Review* 17, S. 257–79.<sup>147</sup>
- 1982 [1007] O’Connor, Daniel (1982): Kant’s Conception of Happiness, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 16, S. 189–205.
- 1974 [1008] Oelmüller, Willi (1974): Kants Beitrag zur Grundlegung einer praktischen Philosophie der Moderne, in *Rehabilitierung der praktischen Philosophie* Bd. II, hrsg. von Manfred Riedel, Freiburg, S. 521–60.

---

to explain Kant’s claim that the law-giving nature of practical reason makes all beings with practical reason regard the idea of a rational nature as an end in itself. This article seeks to replace these value-based readings with a reading of the idea of rational nature as an end that fits better with the overall argument of the *Groundwork*.”

<sup>146</sup> “It is commonly thought that on Kant’s view of action, ‘everyone always acts on maxims’. Call this the ‘descriptive reading’. This reading faces two important problems. First, the idea that people always act on maxims offends against common sense: it clashes with our ordinary ideas about human agency. Second, there are various passages in which Kant says that it is ‘rare’ and ‘admirable’ to firmly adhere to a set of basic principles that we adopt for ourselves. This article offers an alternative: the ‘normative reading’. On this reading, it is a normative ideal to adopt and act on maxims: it is one of the things we would do if our reason were fully in control of our decision-making.”

<sup>147</sup> “This paper considers two contenders for the title of highest good in Kant’s theory of practical reason: happiness proportioned to virtue and the maximization of happiness and virtue. I defend the ‘proportionality thesis’ against criticisms made by Andrews Reath and others, and show how it resolves a dualism between prudential and moral practical reasoning. By distinguishing between the highest good as a principle of evaluation and an object of agency, I conclude that the maximization of happiness and virtue is a corollary of the instantiation of the proportionality thesis.”

- 2009 [1009] O'Hagan, Emer (2009): Moral Self-Knowledge in Kantian Ethics, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 12, S. 525–37.<sup>148</sup>
- 2001 [1010] Oliveira, Nythamar Fernandes (2001): Kant, Rawls, and the Foundations of a Theory of Justice, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 286–95.
- 1984 [1011] O'Neill, Onora (1984): Kant after Virtue, *Inquiry* 26, S. 387–405. Wiederabgedruckt in O'Neill, *Constructions of Reason. Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge 1989, S. 145–62.
- 1985 [1012] O'Neill, Onora (1985): Consistency in Action, in *Universality and Morality. Essays on Ethical Universalizability*, hrsg. von Nelson Potter und Mark Timmons, Dordrecht, S. 159–86. Wiederabgedruckt in O'Neill, *Constructions of Reason. Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge 1989, S. 81–104 sowie in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa 1998, S. 103–31.
- 1989 [1013] O'Neill, Onora (1989): Reason and Autonomy in *Grundlegung III*, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 282–98. Wiederabgedruckt in O'Neill, *Constructions of Reason. Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge 1989, S. 51–65.
- 1989 [1014] O'Neill, Onora (1989): Universal Laws and Ends-in-Themselves, *Monist* 72, S. 341–61. Wiederabgedruckt in O'Neill, *Constructions of Reason. Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge 1989, S. 126–44.
- 1989 [1015] O'Neill, Onora (1989): Action, Anthropology and Autonomy, in dies., *Constructions of Reason. Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge 1989, S. 66–77.
- 1991 [1016] O'Neill, Onora (1991): Kantian Ethics, in *A Companion to Ethics*, hrsg. von Peter Singer, Oxford, S. 175–85.
- 1996 [1017] O'Neill, Onora (1996): Kant's Virtues, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 77–97.
- 1997 [1018] O'Neill, Onora (1997): Instituting Principles: Between Duty and Action, in *Spindel Conference 1997 on Kant's Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Nelson Potter und Mark Timmons (*Southern Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 36, Supplement), Memphis, S. 79–96 (dazu: Sarah Williams Holtman, Comments: Instituting Principles).

---

<sup>148</sup> “Kant’s duty of self-knowledge demands that one know one’s heart – the quality of one’s will in relation to duty. Self-knowledge requires that an agent subvert feelings which fuel self-aggrandizing narratives and increase self-conceit; she must adopt the standpoint of the rational agent constrained by the requirements of reason in order to gain information about her moral constitution. This is not I argue, contra Nancy Sherman, in order to assess the moral goodness of her conduct. Insofar as sound moral practice requires moral self-knowledge and moral self-knowledge requires a theoretical commitment to a conception of the moral self, sound moral agency is for Kant crucially tied to theory. Kant plausibly holds that self-knowledge is a protection against moral confusion and self-deception. I conclude that although his account relies too heavily on the awareness of moral law to explain its connection to moral development, it is insightful and important in Kantian ethics.”

- 1998 [1019] O'Neill, Onora (1998): Kantian Ethics, in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, hrsg. von Edward Craig, Vol. 5, London, S. 200–204.
- 2000 [1020] O'Neill, Onora (2000): Kant's Justice and Kantian Justice, in dies., *Bounds of Justice*, Cambridge, S. 65–80. – Kantische Gerechtigkeit und kantianische Gerechtigkeit, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn 2004, S. 58–73.
- 2002 [1021] O'Neill, Onora (2002): Instituting Principles: Between Duty and Action, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 331–48.
- 2002 [1022] O'Neill, Onora (2002): Autonomy and the Fact of Reason in the *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (§§ 7–8, 30–41), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 81–97.
- 2004 [1023] O'Neill, Onora (2004): Autonomy, Plurality and Public Reason, in *New Essays on the History of Autonomy. A Collection Honoring J. B. Schneewind*, hrsg. von Natalie Brender und Larry Krasnoff, Cambridge, S. 181–94.
- 2004 [1024] O'Neill, Onora (2004): Rationality as Practical Reason, in *The Oxford Handbook of Rationality*, hrsg. von Alfred R. Mele und Piers Rawling, Oxford, S. 93–109.
- 2004 [1025] O'Neill, Onora (2004): Self-Legislation, Autonomy and the Form of Law, in *Recht – Geschichte – Religion. Die Bedeutung Kants für die Gegenwart*, hrsg. von Herta Nagl-Docekal und Rudolf Langthaler, Berlin, S. 13–26.
- 2007 [1026] O'Neill, Onora (2007): Experts, Practitioners, and Practical Judgement, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 4, S. 154–66.<sup>149</sup>
- 2015 [1027] O'Neill, Onora (2015): *Constructing Authorities. Reason, Politics and Interpretation in Kant's Philosophy*, Cambridge.<sup>150</sup>
- 2016 [1028] O'Neill, Onora (2016): Enactable and Enforceable: Kant's Criteria for Right and Virtue, *Kant-Studien* 107, S. 111–24.<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>149</sup> "In *Theory and Practice* Kant challenges the well-worn view that practitioners do not need to rely on theory. He acknowledges that experts with a deep knowledge of theory may fail as practitioners both in technical matters, and in matters of morality and justice. However, since action-guiding theories are intended to shape rather than to fit the world, practitioners have no point of reference other than the theories or principles that they seek to enact. If theories of duty appear to offer too little guidance for action, they should look for more rather than fewer principles, which will enable them to guide their practical judgement with greater, if still incomplete, specificity."

<sup>150</sup> Contents: Part I. Authority in Reasoning: 1. Vindicating reason. 2. Kant: rationality as practical reason. 3. Kant's conception of public reason. 4. Constructivism in Rawls and Kant. 5. Changing constructions. Part II. Authority, Autonomy and Public Reason: 6. Autonomy: the emperor's new clothes. 7. Self-legislation, autonomy and the form of law. 8. Autonomy and public reason in Kant, Habermas and Rawls. Part III. Authority in Politics: 9. Orientation in thinking: geographical problems, political solutions. 10. Kant and the social contract tradition. 11. Historical trends and human futures. 12. Cosmopolitanism then and now. Part IV. Authority in Interpretation: 13. Kant on reason and religion I: reasoned hope. 14. Kant on reason and religion II: reason and interpretation. Index.

<sup>151</sup> "Kant's distinction between duties of right and of virtue remains controversial, for a number of reasons. A close look at the distinctions he draws and the claims that he makes suggests that a distinction between the

- 1998 [1029] Onof, Christian J. (1998): A Framework for the Derivation and Reconstruction of the Categorical Imperative, *Kant-Studien* 89, S. 411–27.
- 2009 [1030] Onof, Christian (2009): Reconstructing the Grounding of Kant’s Ethics: A Critical Assessment, *Kant-Studien* 100, S. 496–517.<sup>152</sup>
- 2011 [1031] Onof, Christian (2011): Moral Worth and Inclinations in Kantian Ethics, *Kant Studies Online* (April 2011), S. 1–46, <http://www.kantstudiesonline.net>.
- 2008 [1032] Ortiz-Millán, Gustavo (2008): Kant on the Nature of Desires, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 323–33.
- 2010 [1033] Ostaric, Lara (2010): Works of Genius as Sensible Exhibitions of the Idea of the Highest Good, *Kant-Studien* 101, 22–39.<sup>153</sup>
- 2001 [1034] Ott, Konrad (2001): *Moralbegründungen zur Einführung*, Hamburg, S. 77–93 („Die Ethik Immanuel Kants“).

---

requirements of enforceable duties of right and of unenforceable duties of virtue is neither exclusive nor exhaustive. It is not exclusive because it is possible to fulfil duties of right as a matter of principle, in which case what is done is both right and virtuous. It is not exhaustive because certain duties, among them the duty to enter a civil condition and duties of equity, are not in principle enforceable, yet are duties of right.”

<sup>152</sup> “Kant’s attempts to provide a foundation for morality are examined, with particular focus upon the fact of reason proof in the second Critique. The reconstructions proposed by Allison and Korsgaard are analysed in detail. Although analogous in many ways, they ultimately differ in their understanding of the relation between this proof and that presented in the Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A synthesis of the two reconstructions is proposed which amounts to combining Korsgaard’s awareness of the issue of agent-situatedness, with Allison’s emphasis upon the pivotal role of the notion of transcendental freedom. The reconstructed proof relies upon a teleological assumption about human agency, and thus does not provide an unconditional grounding for the moral law. After a brief examination of contemporary approaches to the grounding of a universal morality in the broadly Kantian tradition, the paper concludes with a suggestion as to how the value of freedom can form the core of an adequate response to reason’s demand for such a ground.”

<sup>153</sup> “In this paper I argue that, on Kant’s view, the work of genius serves as a sensible exhibition of the Idea of the highest good. In other words, the work of genius serves as a special sign that the world is hospitable to our moral ends and that the realization of our moral vocation in such a world may indeed be possible. In the first part of the paper, I demonstrate that the purpose of the highest good is not to strengthen our motivation to accept the moral law as binding for us but, rather, to strengthen our motivation to persist in our already existent moral dispositions. In the second part, I show that the works of genius exhibit the Idea of the highest good and, consequently, strengthen our hope in its realization. Drawing on the results of the second part, the third part of the paper demonstrates that beauty, of both art and nature, symbolizes morality in a more substantive sense than that suggested by Henry Allison’s “formalistic” interpretation. Since, on my view, fine art in Kant serves as a sensible representation of an undetermined conceptual content, or the Idea of the highest good, the fourth part of the paper addresses the vexed question of whether Kant’s account of fine art already anticipates the cognitive role later attributed to it by the German Idealists.”

- 1979 [1035] Packer, M. N. (1979): *The Completion of Reason in Kant's Ethical Theory*, Evanston.
- 1989 [1036] Packer, Mark (1989): Kant on Desire and Moral Pleasure, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50, S. 429–42.
- 2018 [1037] Palatnik, Nataliya (2018): Kantian Agents and their Significant Others, *Kantian Review* 23, S. 285–306.<sup>154</sup>
- 2002 [1038] Paley, John (2002): Virtues of Autonomy: The Kantian Ethics of Care, *Nursing Philosophy: An International Journal for Healthcare Professionals* 3, S. 133–143.
- 2010 [1039] Pallikkathayil, Japa (2010): Deriving Morality from Politics: Rethinking the Formula of Humanity, *Ethics* 121, S. 116–47.<sup>155</sup>
- 2010 [1040] Palmquist, Stephen (2010): Kant's Ethics of Grace: Perspectival Solutions to the Moral Difficulties with Divine Assistance, *Journal of Religion* 90, S. 530–53.
- 2007 [1041] Papish, Laura (2007): The Cultivation of Sensibility in Kant's Moral Philosophy, *Kantian Review* 12, S. 128–46.
- 2015 [1042] Papish, Laura (2015): Kant on the Independence of the Moral Law from Sensibility, *Kantian Review* 20, S. 77–98.<sup>156</sup>
- 2018 [1043] Papish, Laura (2018): *Kant on Evil, Self-Deception, and Moral Reform*, Oxford.<sup>157</sup>
- 2006 [1044] Parfit, Derek (2006): Kant's Arguments for His Formula of Universal Law, in *The Egalitarian Conscience. Essays in Honour of G. A. Cohen*, hrsg. von Christine Sypnowich, Oxford, S.

---

<sup>154</sup> “Critics of Kant’s moral philosophy often object that his emphasis on individual autonomy makes him unable to account for our ‘second-personal’ or ‘bipolar’ duties. These are duties we owe to other people rather than duties we have with respect to them – as we might have duties with respect to the environment or works of art. With a recent and novel formulation of this objection as my foil, I argue that the apparent force of the ‘bipolarity’ objections rests on a failure to appreciate Kant’s inherently practical approach to ethics. On the positive side, reflection on criticisms of Kant’s treatment of ‘bipolar’ normativity helps to shed new light on his conception of practical agency and its place in his system of morals.”

<sup>155</sup> “Kant’s Formula of Humanity famously forbids treating others merely as a means. It is unclear, however, what exactly treating someone merely as a means comes to. This essay argues against an interpretation of this idea advanced by Christine Korsgaard and Onora O’Neill. The essay then develops a new interpretation that suggests an important connection between the Formula of Humanity and Kant’s political philosophy: the content of many of our moral duties depends on the results of political philosophy and, indeed, on the results of actual political decision making.”

<sup>156</sup> “There are several senses in which Kant’s moral law is independent of sensibility. This paper is devoted mainly to Kant’s account of ‘physical conditions independence’, or the idea that the moral law can compel us to pursue ends that might be impossible to realize empirically. Since this idea has received little attention from commentators, this paper addresses both its textual basis in Kant’s writings and its overall philosophical viability.”

<sup>157</sup> Introduction. Chapter One: The Self of Self-Love. Chapter Two: Evil and the Subordination of the Moral Law. Chapter Three: Kantian Self-Deception. Chapter Four: Self-Deception, the Necessary Conditions of Evil, and the Entrenchment of Evil. Chapter Five: Self-Deception, Dissimulation, and the Universality of Evil in Human Nature. Chapter Six: Kantian Self-Cognition. Chapter Seven: Kant’s Two-Stage Model of Moral Reform. Chapter Eight: Moral Misunderstandings and the Ethical Community. Conclusion. Bibliography.

56–69.

- 2011 [1045] Parfit, Derek (2011): *On What Matters* Volume 1, Oxford, S. 177–342 (8. Possible Consent. 9. Merely as a Means. 10. Respect and Value. 11. Free Will and Desert. 12. Universal Laws. 13. What If Everyone Did That? 14. Impartiality).
- 2011 [1046] Parfit, Derek (2011): *On What Matters* Volume 2, Oxford, S. 156–68 (19. On Humanity as an End in itself, 169–90 (20. On a Mismatch of Methods), 652–71 (Appendix F: Some of Kant’s Arguments for his Formula of Universal Law), 672–77 (Appendix G: Kant’s Claims about the Good), 678–789 (Appendix H: Autonomy and Categorical Imperatives), 690–718 (Kant’s Motivational Argument).
- 2002 [1047] Pasternack, Lawrence (2002): Intrinsic Value and Moral Overridingness in Kant’s Groundwork, *Southwest Philosophy Review* 18, S. 113–121.
- 1944 [1048] Paton, H. J. (1944): Kant’s Idea of the Good, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, S. 1–25. Wiederabgedruckt in Paton, *In Defence of Reason*, London 1951, S. 157–77.
- 1947 [1049] Paton, H. J. (1947): *The Categorical Imperative. A Study in Kant’s Moral Philosophy*, London. – *Der kategorische Imperativ. Eine Untersuchung über Kants Moralphilosophie*, Berlin 1962.
- 1948 [1050] Paton, H. J. (1948): Analysis of the Argument, in Immanuel Kant, *The Moral Law. Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. und übersetzt von H. J. Paton, London 1991, S. 13–49.
- 1953 [1051] Paton, H. J. (1953/54): An Alleged Right to Lie: A Problem in Kantian Ethics, *Kant-Studien* 45, S. 190–203.
- 1958 [1052] Paton, H. J. (1958): The Aim and Structure of Kant’s *Grundlegung*, *Philosophical Quarterly* 8, S. 121–25.
- 1997 [1053] Patt, Walter (1997): The Synthetic Character of the Moral Law According to Kant, in *Kant. Analysen – Probleme – Kritik*. Bd. III. *Hans Wagner zum 80. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Hariolf Oberer, Würzburg, S. 21–39.
- 2004 [1054] Patt, Walter (2004): *Kants Kritik der praktischen Vernunft. Eine Einführung*, London 2004.
- 1966 [1055] Patzig, Günther (1966): Die logischen Formen praktischer Sätze in Kants Ethik, in ders., *Ethik ohne Metaphysik*, 2., durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage, Göttingen 1983, S. 101–26. Wiederabgedruckt in Patzig, *Gesammelte Schriften I: Grundlagen der Ethik*, Göttingen, S. 209–33.
- 1978 [1056] Patzig, Günther (1978): Der Kategorische Imperativ in der Ethik-Diskussion der Gegenwart, in ders., *Ethik ohne Metaphysik*, 2., durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage, Göttingen 1983, S. 148–71. Wiederabgedruckt in Patzig, *Gesammelte Schriften I: Grundlagen der Ethik*, Göttingen, S. 234–54.
- 1986 [1057] Patzig, Günther (1986): „Principium diiudicationis“ und „Principium executionis“: Über transzendentalpragmatische Begründungsansätze für Verhaltensnormen, in *Handlungstheorie und Transzendentalphilosophie*, hrsg. von Gerold Prauss, Frankfurt a. M., S. 204–18. Wiederabgedruckt in Patzig, *Gesammelte Schriften I: Grundlagen der Ethik*, Göttingen, S. 255–74.

- 1996 [1058] Pauer-Studer, Herlinde (1996): *Das Andere der Gerechtigkeit. Moraltheorie im Kontext der Geschlechterdifferenz*, Berlin, S. 169–89 („Pflichten, Imperative und die Achtung für das moralische Gesetz: Die Moraltheorie Immanuel Kants“).
- 1998 [1059] Pauer-Studer, Herlinde (1998): Maximen, Identität und praktische Deliberation. Die Rehabilitierung von Kants Moralphilosophie, *Philosophische Rundschau* 45, S. 70–82.
- 1899 [1060] Paulsen, Friedrich (1899): *Immanuel Kant. Sein Leben und seine Lehre*, zweite und dritte Auflage, Stuttgart (1. Auflage: 1898), S. 300–48 („Die Moralphilosophie“).
- 2006 [1061] Pawlik, Michael (2006): Kants Volk von Teufeln und sein Staat, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 269–93.
- 1980 [1062] Pelegrinis, T. N. (1980): *Kant's Conceptions of the Categorical Imperative and the Will*, London.
- 2007 [1063] Peucker, Henning (2007): Husserl's Critique of Kant's Ethics, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 45, S. 309–19.<sup>158</sup>
- 2000 [1064] Pfannkuche, Walter (2000): *Die Moral der Optimierung des Wohls. Begründung und Anwendung eines modernen Moralprinzips*, Freiburg, S. 140–74.
- 2006 [1065] von der Pfordten, Dietmar (2006): Zur Würde des Menschen bei Kant, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 501–17. Wiederabgedruckt in Dietmar von der Pfordten, *Menschenwürde, Recht und Staat bei Kant. Fünf Untersuchungen*, Paderborn 2009, S. 9–26.
- 2009 [1066] von der Pfordten, Dietmar (2009): On the Dignity of Man in Kant, *Philosophy* 84, S. 371–91.<sup>159</sup>
- 1981 [1067] Philips, Michael (1981): Is Kant's Practical Reason Practical?, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 15, S. 95–108.
- 1989 [1068] Pieper, Annemarie (1989): Wie ist ein kategorischer Imperativ möglich?, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt

---

<sup>158</sup> “This paper introduces Husserl's ethics by examining his critique of Kant's ethics. It presents Husserl's lectures on ethics in which he offers his own ethical theory in a historical context. The phenomenological ethics seeks to combine the advantages of both the traditional empiricism and rationalism. Husserl's ethics takes into account that emotions play an essential role in the constitution of values and morals. Contrariwise, Husserl fights against relativism in ethics and praises Kant for the discovery of an absolute moral imperative. He considers Kant's ethics as a rationalistic position that is too formal and that does not take into account that every will must be motivated by some concrete material good that is evaluated in our feelings or emotions.”

<sup>159</sup> “The contribution starts with the observation that Kant mentioned Human Dignity in his main works with great variety in emphasis. In the ‘Grundlegung’ from 1785 we find a significant treatment and again in the ‘Tugendlehre’ from 1798 but none in the ‘Kritik der Praktischen Vernunft’ from 1788 and in the ‘Rechtslehre’ from 1797. This needs an explanation. In the ‘Grundlegung’ human dignity is not attached to the second formula of the categorical imperative, the formula of self-purposefulness, as it is often assumed, but to the third formula of a kingdom of ends. It is there explained as self-legislation. This placement needs also an explanation, which is attempted by the article. In the ‘Tugendlehre’ human dignity is then explained as self-purposefulness. So Kant changed his understanding of human dignity from the ‘Grundlegung’ to the ‘Tugendlehre’. But the question is: why?”

a. M., S. 264–81.

- 2002 [1069] Pieper, Annemarie (2002): Zweites Hauptstück (57–71), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 115–33. – ‘On the Concept of an Object of Pure Practical Reason’ (Chapter 2 of the Analytic of Practical Reason), in *Kant’s Moral and Legal Philosophy*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Otfried Höffe, Cambridge 2009, S. 179–97.
- 1997 [1070] Piper, Adrian M. S. (1997): Kant on the Objectivity of the Moral Law, in *Reclaiming the History of Ethics. Essays for John Rawls*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath, Barbara Herman und Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge, S. 240–69.
- 2012 [1071] Piper, Adrian M. S. (2012): Kant’s Self-Legislation Procedure Reconsidered, *Kant Studies Online* 2012, S. 203–77.
- 2012 [1072] Piper, Adrian S. (2012): Kant’s Two Solutions to the Free Rider Problem, *Kant-Yearbook 4: Kant and Contemporary Moral Philosophy*, S. 113–42.<sup>160</sup>
- 2000 [1073] Pippin, Robert B. (2000): Kant’s Theory of Value: On Allen Wood’s *Kant’s Ethical Thought, Inquiry* 43, S. 239–65.
- 1786 [1074] Pistorius, Hermann Andreas (1786): Rezension der „Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten“, in *Materialien zu Kants Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Rüdiger Bittner und Konrad Cramer, Frankfurt a. M., S. 144–60.
- 1984 [1075] Pleines, Jürgen-Eckardt (1984): *Eudaimonia zwischen Kant und Aristoteles. Glückseligkeit als höchstes Gut menschlichen Handelns*, Würzburg, S. 13–33 (“Kants Auseinandersetzung mit dem Eudämonismus”).
- 1991 [1076] Plumer, Gilbert (1991): Kant’s Neglected Argument Against Consequentialism, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 29, S. 501–20.
- 1989 [1077] Pogge, Thomas W. (1989): The Categorical Imperative, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 172–93. Wiederabgedruckt in *Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*,

---

<sup>160</sup> “Kant identifies what are in fact Free Riders as the most noxious species of *polemicists*: those who attack metaphysical beliefs in the existence of God, freedom or immortality as lacking empirical proof, in order to conceal the flimsy metaphysical foundations of their own cynicism. Kant thinks polemic reduces the stature and authority of reason to a method of squabbling that destabilizes social equilibrium and portends disintegration into the Hobbesian state of nature. In the first *Critique*, Kant agrees with Hobbes that this process can only be reversed through consensual agreement to relinquish the unlimited freedom of this state for the authority of law. He proposes two textually related solutions to the Free Rider problem: First, a critique of reason in its polemical use in the first *Critique*, and, in the *Groundwork*, its application to the Free Rider’s self-defensive polemical subterfuge. Second, he argues that promise-keeping is a perfect duty that allows no exceptions “to the advantage of inclination.” These two solutions appear as connected steps in Kant’s attempted derivation of perfect and imperfect duties from the categorical imperative. The questionable success of the derivation does not affect the independent merit of either solution. The first enables us to better appreciate the role of those laws in structuring and regulating our empirical agency. The second enables us to mend the Social Contract and reverse our descent into Hobbes’ state of nature. The first solution enables us to see the point of the second.”

hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa 1998, S. 189–213.

- 1994 [1078] Pogge, Thomas W. (1994): Freudigers *Grundlegung*, *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 47, S. 223–39.
- 1997 [1079] Pogge, Thomas W. (1997): Is Kant's *Rechtslehre* Comprehensive?, in *Spindel Conference 1997 on Kant's Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Nelson Potter und Mark Timmons (*Southern Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 36, Supplement), Memphis, S. 161–87 (dazu: Bernd Ludwig, Comments: "What's Great About 'Recht'?", S. 189–97).
- 1997 [1080] Pogge, Thomas W. (1997): Kant on Ends and the Meaning of Life, in *Reclaiming the History of Ethics. Essays for John Rawls*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath, Barbara Herman und Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge, S. 361–87.
- 2002 [1081] Pogge, Thomas W. (2002): Is Kant's *Rechtslehre* a 'Comprehensive Liberalism'?, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 133–58.
- 1990 [1082] Pojman, Louis P. (1990): *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong*, Belmont, Cal., S. 91–113 ("Kantian and Deontological Systems").
- 2006 [1083] Pollok, Konstantin (2006): Kant und Habermas über das *principium executionis* moralischer Handlungen, in *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, hrsg. von Heiner F. Klemme, Manfred Kühn und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. 193–227.
- 2007 [1084] Pollok, Konstantin (2007): „Wenn Vernunft volle Gewalt über das Begehrungsvermögen hätte“ – Über die gemeinsame Wurzel der Kantischen Imperative, *Kant-Studien* 98, S. 57–80.
- 2016 [1085] Porcheddu, Rocco (2016): *Der Zweck an sich selbst. Eine Untersuchung zu Kants „Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten“*, Berlin (*Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte* 186).<sup>161</sup>
- 1973 [1086] Potter, Nelson (1973): Paton on the Application of the Categorical Imperative, *Kant-Studien* 64, S. 411–22.
- 1974 [1087] Potter, Nelson (1974): The Argument of Kant's *Groundwork*, Chapter 1, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* Suppl. Vol. 1, S. 73–91. Wiederabgedruckt in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa 1998, S. 29–49.
- 1975 [1088] Potter, Nelson (1975): How to Apply the Categorical Imperative, *Philosophia* 5, S. 395–416.
- 1985 [1089] Potter, Nelson (1985): Kant on Ends That Are at the Same Time Duties, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 66, S. 78–92.
- 1993 [1090] Potter, Nelson (1993): Reply to Allison, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 1, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 391–400. – Zu [11].
- 1993 [1091] Potter, Nelson (1993): What Is Wrong with Kant's Four Examples?, *Journal of Philosophical Research* 18, S. 213–29.
- 1994 [1092] Potter, Nelson (1994): Kant on Obligation and Motivation in Law and Ethics, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 2, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 95–

---

<sup>161</sup> Inhalt: Einleitung. I Gehalt und Form des Zwecks an sich selbst. II Der Begriff des Zwecks an sich selbst und der Zusammenhang der Formeln des kategorischen Imperativs. III Der Zweck an sich selbst und die Deduktion des kategorischen Imperativs. Anhang. Literatur. Namenregister. Sachregister

- 1994 [1093] Potter, Nelson (1994): Maxims in Kant's Moral Philosophy, *Philosophia* 23, S. 59–90.
- 1996 [1094] Potter, Nelson (1996): Kant and the Moral Worth of Actions, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 34, S. 225–242.
- 1997 [1095] Potter, Nelson (1997): The Synthetic a priori Proposition of Kant's Ethical Philosophy, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* Band 5: Themenschwerpunkt: 200 Jahre Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 437–59.
- 1997 [1096] Potter, Nelson (1997): Supererogation and Overdetermination in Kant's Ethics: Analysis and Interpretation at their Best in Baron, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* Band 5: Themenschwerpunkt: 200 Jahre Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 489–96. – Zu [79].
- 2002 [1097] Potter, Nelson (2002): Duties to Oneself, Motivational Internalism, and Self-Deception in Kant's Ethics, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 371–90.
- 2003 [1098] Potter, Nelson (2003): Applying the Categorical Imperative in Kant's Rechtslehre, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 11, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 37–51.
- 2005 [1099] Potter, Nelson (2005): Kant on Duties to Animals, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 13: *Philosophia Practica Universalis. Festschrift für Joachim Hruschka zum 70. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 299–311.
- 1997 [1100] Potter, Nelson/Timmons, Mark (Hrsg.) (1997): *Spindel Conference 1997 on Kant's Metaphysics of Morals* (*Southern Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 36, Supplement), Memphis.
- 2006 [1101] Powell, Brian K. (2006): Kant and Kantians on "the Normative Question", *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 9, S. 535–44.<sup>162</sup>
- 2002 [1102] Powers, Thomas M. (2002): The Integrity of Body: Kantian Moral Constraints on the Physical Self, in *Persons and Their Bodies: Rights, Responsibilities, Relationships*, hrsg. von Mark J. Cherry, New York, S. 209–32.
- 1983 [1103] Prauss, Gerold (1983): *Kant über Freiheit als Autonomie*, Frankfurt a. M. (2. Auflage: 2017).
- 1989 [1104] Prauss, Gerold (1989): Für sich selber praktische Vernunft, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 253–

---

<sup>162</sup> "After decades of vigorous debate, many contemporary philosophers in the Kantian tradition continue to believe, or at least hope, that morality can be given a firm grounding by showing that rational agents cannot consistently reject moral requirements. In the present paper, I do not take a stand on the possibility of bringing out the alleged inconsistency. Instead I argue that, even if a successful argument could be given for this inconsistency, this would not provide an adequate answer to "the normative question" (i.e., "why should I be moral?"). My defense of this claim emerges from a defense of a claim about Kant, namely, that he did not attempt to answer the normative question in this way. After carefully articulating Kant's answer to the normative question, I argue that his answer to this question contains a lesson about why we should not embrace the approach that is popular among many contemporary Kantians."

63. – Reason Practical in its Own Right, in *Kant's Moral and Legal Philosophy*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Otfried Höffe, Cambridge 2009, S. 123–33.

- 2014 [1105] Puls, Heiko (2014): Quo errat demonstrator – warum es in der Grundlegung eine Faktum-These gibt. Drei Argumente gegen Dieter Schöneckers Interpretation, in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 15–34.
- 2014 [1106] Puls, Heiko (2014): Quare errat disceptator? Eine Erwiderung auf Dieter Schöneckers Replik, in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 45–58.
- 2016 [1107] Puls, Heiko (2016): Kant's Justification of Parental Duties, *Kantian Review* 21, S. 53–75.<sup>163</sup>
- 2016 [1108] Puls, Heiko (2016): Sittliches Bewusstsein und kategorischer Imperativ in Kants ›Grundlegung‹. Ein Kommentar zum dritten Abschnitt, Berlin.<sup>164</sup>
- 2014 [1109] Puls, Heiko (Hrsg.) (2014): *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, Berlin.
- 2015 [1110] Puls, Heiko (2015): Kant über die äußerste Grenze aller praktischen Philosophie – Ein Kommentar zur Sektion 5 der *Grundlegung*, in *Kants Begründung von Freiheit und Moral in Grundlegung III. Neue Interpretationen*, hrsg. von Dieter Schönecker, Münster, S. 157–214.
- 2001 [1111] Quarfood, Marcel (2001): Kant's Practical Deduction of Moral Obligation in *Groundwork* III, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 72–79.
- 2006 [1112] Quarfood, Marcel (2006): The Circle and the Two Standpoints (GMS III, 3), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 285–300.
- 2002 [1113] Prichard, H. A. (2002): Kant's *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals*, in Prichard, *Moral Writings*, hrsg. von Jim MacAdam, Oxford, S. 50–76.
- 2002 [1114] Rachels, James (2002): *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*, New York, 4. Aufl., S. 130–40 (“Kant and Respect for Persons”). 5. Auflage von Stuart Rachels, New York 2007, S. 130–40. (Änderung gegenüber der 4. Aufl.: “additional justifications for punishment are

---

<sup>163</sup> “In his applied moral philosophy, Kant formulates the parents’ duty to make their child happy. I argue that, for Kant, this duty is an *ad hoc* attempt at compensating for the parental guilt of having brought a person into the condition of existence – and hence also having created her need for happiness – on their own initiative. I argue that Kant’s considerations regarding parental duties and human reproduction in general imply arguments for an ethically justified anti-natalism, but that this position is abolished in his teleology for meta-ethical reasons.”

<sup>164</sup> “The third section of Kant’s *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals* is one of the most difficult texts to interpret in practical philosophy. The aim of the argumentation and structure of the text remain contentious to this day and its interpretation is largely contingent on questions of philology. The commentary presented in this book interprets the section word by word along the text, calling into question several popular research hypotheses.”

noted”).

- 2015 [1115] Raedler, Sebastian (2015): *Kant and the Interests of Reason*, Berlin. (*Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte* 182)<sup>165</sup>
- 1993 [1116] Rahman, Wahidur A. N. M. (1993): Kant’s Concepts of Duty and Happiness, *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* 20, S. 85–108.
- 2002 [1117] Ranasinghe, Nalin (2002): Ethics for the Little Man: Kant, Eichmann, and the Banality of Evil, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 299–317.
- 1981 [1118] Raphael, D. D. (1981): *Moral Philosophy*, Oxford, S. 55–66 (“Kantian Ethics”).
- 2008 [1119] Rasic, Smail (2008): Die Grundformel des Kategorischen Imperativs, die Selbstzweck-Formel und das Rechtsprinzip, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 335–45.
- 1907 [1120] Rashdall, Hastings (1907): *The Theory of Good and Evil. A Treatise on Moral Philosophy* Vol. I, Oxford, S. 102–38 (“Chapter V. The Categorical Imperative”).
- 1995 [1121] Rauscher, Frederick (1995): Kant’s Conflation of Pure Practical Reason and Will, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Band 2, S. 579–86.
- 2002 [1122] Rauscher, Frederick (2002): Kant’s Moral Anti-Realism, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 40, S. 477–499.
- 2006 [1123] Rauscher, Frederick (2006): Reason as a Natural Cause, in *Moralische Motivation. Kant und die Alternativen*, hrsg. von Heiner F. Klemme, Manfred Kühn und Dieter Schönecker, Hamburg, S. 97–110.
- 2008 [1124] Rauscher, Frederick (2008): Why Kant’s Ethics Is A Priori – and Why It Matters, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 347–57.
- 2009 [1125] Rauscher, Frederick (2009): Freedom and Reason in *Groundwork* III, in *Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 203–23.
- 2015 [1126] Rauscher, Frederick (2015): Die äußerste Grenze aller praktischen Philosophie und die Einschränkungen der Deduktion in *Grundlegung* III, in *Kants Begründung von Freiheit und Moral in Grundlegung III. Neue Interpretationen*, hrsg. von Dieter Schönecker, Münster, S. 215–30.
- 2015 [1127] Rauscher, Frederick (2015): *Naturalism and Realism in Kant’s Ethics*, Cambridge. (Dazu: *Kantian Review* 22 (2017), S. 463–507: Author Meets Critics.)
- 1989 [1128] Rawls, John (1989): Themes in Kant’s Moral Philosophy, in *Kant’s Transcendental Deductions:*

---

<sup>165</sup> Foreword. Introduction. 1 Humans as Hybrids. 2 A Brief Exercise in Transcendental Idealism. 3 The Moral Law. 4 The Fact of Reason. 5 The Will. 6 Value. 7 The Highest Good. 8 Aufklärung. 9 Social Life. 10 Conclusion. Bibliography. Subject Index. Index of Names.

- The Three Critiques and the Opus Postumum*, hrsg. von Eckart Förster, Stanford, S. 81–113. Wiederabgedruckt in Rawls, *Collected Papers*, hrsg. von Samuel Freeman, Cambridge, Mass. 1999, S. 497–528. – Themen der kantischen Moralphilosophie, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn 2004, S. 22–57.
- 2000 [1129] Rawls, John (2000): *Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy*, hrsg. von Barbara Herman, Cambridge, Mass, S. 143–325. – *Geschichte der Moralphilosophie. Hume – Leibniz – Kant – Hegel*, hrsg. von Barbara Herman, Frankfurt a. M. 2002, S. 199–421.
- 2012 [1130] Rayman, Joshua (2012): *Kant on Sublimity and Morality*, Cardiff.
- 1988 [1131] Reath, Andrews (1988): Two Conceptions of the Highest Good in Kant, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 26, S. 593–619.
- 1989 [1132] Reath, Andrews (1989): Hedonism, Heteronomy and Kant's Principle of Happiness, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 70, S. 42–72. Revidierte Version in Reath, *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2006, S. 33–66. – Dazu: [691].
- 1989 [1133] Reath, Andrews (1989): Kant's Theory of Moral Sensibility: Respect for the Moral Law and the Influence of Inclination, *Kant-Studien* 80, S. 284–302. Revidierte Version in Reath, *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2006, S. 8–32.
- 1989 [1134] Reath, Andrews (1989): The Categorical Imperative and Kant's Conception of Practical Rationality, *Monist* 72, S. 384–410. Wiederabgedruckt in Reath, *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2006, S. 67–91.
- 1994 [1135] Reath, Andrews (1994): Agency and the Imputation of Consequences in Kant's Ethics, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 2, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 259–81. Wiederabgedruckt in Reath, *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2006, S. 250–69.
- 1994 [1136] Reath, Andrews (1994): Legislating the Moral Law, *Nous* 28, S. 435–64. Wiederabgedruckt in Reath, *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2006, S. 92–120.
- 1995 [1137] Reath, Andrews (1995): Autonomy and Practical Reason: Thomas Hill's Kantianism, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 3, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 423–36.
- 1995 [1138] Reath, Andrews (1995): Understanding Kantian Autonomy, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Band 1, S. 1185–92.
- 1997 [1139] Reath, Andrews (1997): Introduction, in Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*, hrsg. von Mary Gregor, Cambridge, S. vii–xxxi.
- 1997 [1140] Reath, Andrews (1997): Legislating for a Realm of Ends: The Social Dimension of Autonomy, in *Reclaiming the History of Ethics. Essays for John Rawls*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath, Barbara Herman und Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge, S. 214–39. Wiederabgedruckt in Reath, *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2006, S. 173–95.

- 1997 [1141] Reath, Andrews (1997): Self-Legislation and Duties to Oneself, in *Spindel Conference 1997 on Kant's Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Nelson Potter und Mark Timmons (*Southern Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 36, Supplement), Memphis, S. 103–24 (dazu: Stephen Engstrom, Comments: Deriving Duties to Oneself, S. 125–30).
- 2002 [1142] Reath, Andrews (2002): Self-Legislation and Duties to Oneself, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 349–70. Wiederabgedruckt in Reath, *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2006, S. 231–49.
- 2003 [1143] Reath, Andrews (2003): Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785): Duty and Autonomy, in: *The Classics of Western Philosophy: A Reader's Guide*, hrsg. von Jorge J. E. Gracia u.a., Malden, MA, S. 346–356.
- 2003 [1144] Reath, Andrews (2003): Value and Law in Kant's Moral Theory. A Critical Review of Paul Guyer, *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*, *Ethics* 114, S. 127–55.
- 2006 [1145] Reath, Andrews (2006): Agency and Universal Law, in Reath, *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2006, S. 196–230.
- 2006 [1146] Reath, Andrews (2006): Autonomy of the Will as the Foundation of Morality, in Reath, *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford 2006, S. 121–72.
- 2006 [1147] Reath, Andrews (2006): *Agency and Autonomy in Kant's Moral Theory. Selected Essays*, Oxford.<sup>166</sup> – Dazu: Book Symposion in *Philosophical Books* 49 (2008): [604], [741], [1468].

---

<sup>166</sup> “Andrews Reath presents a selection of his best essays on various features of Kant’s moral psychology and moral theory, with particular emphasis on his conception of rational agency and his conception of autonomy. The opening essays explore different elements of Kant’s views about motivation, including his account of respect for morality as the distinctive moral motive and his view of the principle of happiness as a representation of the shared structure of non-moral choice. These essays stress the unity of Kant’s moral psychology by arguing that moral and non-moral considerations motivate in essentially the same way. Several of the essays develop an original approach to Kant’s conception of autonomy that emphasizes the political metaphors found throughout Kant’s writings on ethics. They argue that autonomy is best interpreted not as a psychological capacity, but as a kind of sovereignty: in claiming that moral agents have autonomy, Kant regards them as a kind of sovereign legislator with the power to give moral law through their willing. The final essays explore some of the implications of this conception of autonomy elsewhere in Kant’s moral thought, arguing that his Formula of Universal Law uses this conception of autonomy to generate substantive moral principles and exploring the connection between Kantian self-legislation and duties to oneself. The collection offers revised versions of several previously published essays, as well as two new papers, ‘Autonomy of the Will as the Foundation of Morality’ and ‘Agency and Universal Law’. It will be of interest to all students and scholars of Kant, and to many moral philosophers.” Contents: 1 Kant’s Theory of Moral Sensibility: Respect for the Moral Law and the Influence of Inclination. 2 Hedonism, Heteronomy, and Kant’s Principle of Happiness. 3 The Categorical Imperative and Kant’s Conception of Practical Rationality. 4 Legislating the Moral Law. 5 Autonomy of the Will as the Foundation of Morality. 6 Legislating for a Realm of Ends: The Social Dimension of Autonomy. 7 Agency and Universal Law. 8 Duties to Oneself and Self-Legislation. 9 Agency and the Imputation of Consequences in Kant’s Ethics.

- 2008 [1148] Reath, Andrews (2008): Autonomy, Taking One's Choices to Be Good, And Practical Law: Replies To Critics, *Philosophical Books* 49, S. 125–37. – Zu [604], [741], [1468].
- 2010 [1149] Reath, Andrews (2010): Introduction, in *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 1–10.
- 2010 [1150] Reath, Andrews (2010): Formal Principles and the Form of a Law, in *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 31–54.
- 2013 [1151] Reath, Andrews (2013): Formal Approaches to Kant's Formula of Humanity, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 201–28.
- 2013 [1152] Reath, Andrews (2013): Kant's Moral Philosophy, in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Ethics*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 443–64.
- 2019 [1153] Reath, Andrews (2019): Autonomy and the Idea of Freedom. Some Reflections on *Groundwork* III, *Kantian Review* 24, S. 223–48.<sup>167</sup>
- 2010 [1154] Reath, Andrews/Timmermann, Jens (Hrsg.) (2010): *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, Cambridge.<sup>168</sup>
- 2002 [1155] Regan, Donald (2002): The Value of Rational Nature, *Ethics* 112, S. 267–91.
- 2010 [1156] Rehbock, Theda (2010): Moral und Sprache. Ist das Verbot der Lüge sprachphilosophisch begründbar?, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 58, S. 105–25.<sup>169</sup>

---

<sup>167</sup> "This article explores a set of questions about the 'idea of freedom' that Kant introduces in the fourth paragraph of *Groundwork* III. I develop a reading that supports treating it as a normative notion and brings out its normative content in some detail. I argue that we should understand the idea as follows: that it is a general feature of reasoning and judgement that it understands itself to be a correct or sound application of the normative standards of the relevant domain of cognition, not influenced by irrelevant or external factors. Reasoning and judgement are thus normatively committed to these standards of correctness. A second and related concern is to explore connections between the idea of freedom and Kant's conception of autonomy and to identify different points at which autonomy plays a role in the argument of *Groundwork* III. In the final section, I mine the idea of freedom for a set of normative commitments specific to rational agency that play a foundational role in Kant's moral conception."

<sup>168</sup> Preface vii. List of contributors viii. Translations and abbreviations x. Introduction – Andrews Reath 1. The origin and aim of Kant's Critique of Practical Reason – Heiner F. Klemme 11. Formal principles and the form of a law – Andrews Reath 31. Moral consciousness and the 'fact of reason' – Pauline Kleingeld 55. Reversal or retreat? Kant's deductions of freedom and morality – Jens Timmermann 73. The Triebfeder of pure practical reason – Stephen Engstrom 90. Two conceptions of compatibilism in the Critical Elucidation – Pierre Keller 119. The Antinomy of Practical Reason: reason, the unconditioned and the highest good – Eric Watkins 145. The primacy of practical reason and the idea of a practical postulate – Marcus Willaschek 168. The meaning of the Critique of Practical Reason for moral beings: the Doctrine of Method of Pure Practical Reason – Stefano Bacin 197. Bibliography 216. Index 223.

<sup>169</sup> "The paper tries to defend the Augustinian and Kantian position on the moral problem of lying against the popular opinion that this position must be rejected as an inhuman rigorism. The first part argues that Augustine and Kant do not intend to condemn entirely any kind of lying in any single case, which would be the task of (the power of) judgment (Urteilkraft). Rather, they strive for a clarification of lying as a

- 1991 [1157] Reibenschuh, Gernot (1991): Über ‚Das Faktum der reinen Vernunft‘. Eine Skizze, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 365–74.
- 1935 [1158] Reich, Klaus (1935): *Kant und die Ethik der Griechen*, Tübingen.
- 1939 [1159] Reich, Klaus (1939): Kant and Greek Ethics, *Mind* 48, S. 338–54, 446–63.
- 2004 [1160] Reid, James (2004): Morality and Sensibility in Kant: Toward a Theory of Virtue, *Kantian Review* 8, S. 89–114.
- 1990 [1161] Reiman, Jeffrey (1990): *Justice and Modern Moral Philosophy*, New Haven, S. 128–41 (“Kant and the Nature of Respect”).
- 1951 [1162] Reiner, Hans (1951): *Pflicht und Neigung. Die Grundlagen der Sittlichkeit erörtert und neu bestimmt mit besonderem Bezug auf Kant und Schiller*, Meisenheim, S. 15– 49 („Kants System der Ethik und Schillers ethische Anschauungen in ihrem Verhältnis zueinander“), S. 50–88 („Auseinandersetzung mit Kants System der Ethik“).
- 1963 [1163] Reiner, Hans (1963): Kants Beweis zur Widerlegung des Eudämonismus und das Apriori der Sittlichkeit, *Kant-Studien* 54. Wiederabgedruckt in Reiner, *Die Grundlagen der Sittlichkeit*, Meisenheim, S. 311–47.
- 1974 [1164] Reiner, Hans (1974): *Die Grundlagen der Sittlichkeit*, zweite, durchgesehene und stark erweiterte Auflage von *Pflicht und Neigung*, Meisenheim, S. 15–49 („Kants System der Ethik und Schillers ethische Anschauungen in ihrem Verhältnis zueinander“), S. 50–88 („Auseinandersetzung mit Kants System der Ethik“).
- 1905 [1165] Renner, Hugo (1905): Der Begriff der sittlichen Erfahrung, *Kant-Studien* 10, S. 59–75.
- 1991 [1166] Rescher, Nicholas (1991): On the Unity of Kant’s Categorical Imperative, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 375–96.
- 2000 [1167] Rescher, Nicholas (2000): On the Reach of Pure Reason in Kant’s Practical Philosophy, in ders., *Kant and the Reach of Pure Reason. Studies in Kant’s Theory of Rational Systematization*, Cambridge, S. 188–99.
- 2000 [1168] Rescher, Nicholas (2000): On the Rationale of Kant’s Categorical Imperative, in ders., *Kant and the Reach of Pure Reason. Studies in Kant’s Theory of Rational Systematization*, Cambridge, S. 200–29.
- 2000 [1169] Rescher, Nicholas (2000): On the Unity of Kant’s Categorical Imperative, in ders., *Kant and the Reach of Pure Reason. Studies in Kant’s Theory of Rational Systematization*, Cam-

---

fundamental moral concept of language. Those concepts are not morally neutral, as consequentialist positions hold, but function rather as a kind of conceptual measure or compass for moral judgment. That means that single lies can be excusable or an inevitable evil. But under no circumstance do we have a right or even an obligation to lie. The second part shows how the moral prohibition against lying as a linguistic act can be argued for - as Augustine and Kant do - by reflection on the anthropological meaning of language for human existence. For this purpose, following the phenomenological tradition three meanings of language are distinguished: 1. language as object, 2. language as practice, 3. language as “Sinnhorizont” (conceptual structured horizon of sense).”

bridge, S. 230–47.

- 2012 [1170] Richter, Philip (2012): Was ‚gebieten‘ Ratschläge? Zur Unterscheidung technischer und pragmatischer Imperative bei Kant, in: *Reflexionen des Möglichen*, hrsg. von Peter Fischer, Andreas Luckner und Ulrike Ramming, Münster, S. 113–25.
- 2013 [1171] Richter, Philip (2013): *Kants „Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten“. Ein systematischer Kommentar*, Darmstadt (Reihe: *Werkinterpretationen*).<sup>170</sup>
- 2015 [1172] Richter, Philip (2015): Zum Problem der ‚Anwendung‘ in der Ethik: Das Paradox der unvollkommenen Pflicht in der Moralphilosophie Kants, *Filozofija I Društvo* 26.3, S. 540–564
- 1989 [1173] Ricken, Friedo (1989): Homo noumenon und homo phaenomenon, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 234–52.
- 1998 [1174] Ricken, Friedo (1998): *Allgemeine Ethik*, 3., erweiterte und überarbeitete Auflage, Stuttgart u. a., S. 109–25 („Kants Kategorischer Imperativ“).
- 2002 [1175] Ricken, Friedo (2002): Die Postulate der reinen praktischen Vernunft (122–148), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 187–202. – The Postulates of Pure Practical Reason (CPrR: 122–148), in *Kant’s Moral and Legal Philosophy*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Otfried Höffe, Cambridge 2009, S. 213–29.
- 2013 [1176] Ricken, Friedo (2013): Die Religionslehre als Lehre der Pflichten gegen Gott liegt außerhalb der Grenzen der reinen Moralphilosophie (TL 6: 486–491), in *Kant’s “Tugendlehre”. A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 411–30.
- 2004 [1177] Rickless, Samuel C. (2004): From the Good Will to the Formula of Universal Law, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 68, S. 554–577.
- 2005 [1178] Ridge, Michael (2005): Why Must We Treat Humanity with Respect. Evaluating the Regress Argument, *European Journal of Analytic Philosophy* 1, S. 57–73.<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>170</sup> „Kants ›Grundlegung zur Metaphysik‹ der Sitten ist eines der Hauptwerke der Moralphilosophie und somit unverzichtbarer Bestandteil jedes Philosophiestudiums. Ziel der Abhandlung ist nach Kant die »Aufsuchung und Festsetzung des obersten Prinzips der Moralität«. Dieses Prinzip entwickelt er allein aus der Struktur der reinen Vernunft: Dieser in der Lehre erprobte Kommentar verhilft Studienanfängern zur selbständigen Aneignung des Textes: Die Argumentationsschritte werden transparent gemacht, Schachtelsätze gegliedert und interpretiert sowie Problemstellung einzelner Passagen erläutert. Fortgeschrittene Studierende finden zudem eine ausführliche Diskussion des Forschungsstandes in den Fußnoten, was die Literaturrecherche bei der Erstellung von Referaten, Haus- und Abschlussarbeiten unterstützt. Eine Übersicht der Argumentationsschritte im Anhang erleichtert die Navigation durch den Text.“

<sup>171</sup> “The idea that our most basic duty is to treat each other with respect is one of the Enlightenment’s greatest legacies and Kant is often thought to be one of its most powerful defenders. If Kant’s project were successful then the lofty notion that humanity is always worthy of respect would be vindicated by pure practical reason. Further, this way of defending the ideal is supposed to reflect our autonomy, insofar as it is always one’s own reason that demands that one treat humanity with respect. In this article, I consider what I take to be one of the most important and compelling attempts to defend the Kantian project. I draw the

- 1988 [1179] Riedel, Manfred (1988): Imputation der Handlung und Applikation des Sittengesetzes. Über den Zusammenhang von Hermeneutik und praktischer Urteilskraft in Kants Lehre vom „Faktum der Vernunft“, in ders., *Urteilskraft und Vernunft. Kants ursprüngliche Fragestellung*, Frankfurt a. M. 1989, S. 98–124.
- 1989 [1180] Riedel, Manfred (1989): Kritik der moralisch urteilenden Vernunft. Kants vorkritische Ethik und die Idee einer ‚Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten‘, in ders., *Urteilskraft und Vernunft. Kants ursprüngliche Fragestellung*, Frankfurt a. M., S. 61–97.
- 2007 [1181] Riley, Patrick (2007): Kant against Hobbes in Theory and Practice, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 4, S. 194–206.<sup>172</sup>
- 2010 [1182] Rinofner-Kreidl, Sonja (2010): Husserl’s Categorical Imperative and His Related Critique of Kant, in *Epistemology, Archaeology, Ethics. Current Investigations of Husserl’s Corpus*, hrsg. von Pol Vandavelde und Sebastian Luft, London, New York, S. 188–210.
- 2006 [1183] Rivera, Faviola (2006): Kantian Ethical Duties, *Kantian Review* 11, S. 78–101.
- 2014 [1184] Rivera-Castro, Faviola (2014): Kant’s Formula of the Universal Law of Nature Reconsidered. A Critique of the Practical Interpretation, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 11, S. 185–208.<sup>173</sup>
- 2016 [1185] Rivero, Gabriel (2016): Nötigung und Abhängigkeit. Zur Bestimmung des Begriffs der Verbindlichkeit bei Kant bis 1775, in *Das Verhältnis von Recht und Ethik in Kants praktischer Philosophie*, hrsg. von Bernd Dörflinger, Dieter Hüning und Günter Kruck, Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, S. 45–70.
- 2015 [1186] Rocha, James (2015): Kantian Respect for Minimally Rational Animals, *Social Theory and Practice* 41, S. 309–27.<sup>174</sup>

---

disappointing conclusion that this attempt does not succeed. The reasons this attempt fails shed some light on the difficulties facing any attempt to defend the Kantian project.”

<sup>172</sup> “In the middle section of *Theory and Practice*, Kant speaks briefly ‘against Hobbes’; but for a fuller version of Kant’s anti-Hobbesianism one must turn to the three *Critiques*, the *Groundwork*, and *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*. It is in those works that one learns that, for Kant, Hobbes’s notion of ‘will’ as fully determined ‘last appetite’ destroys the freedom needed to take ‘ought’ or moral necessity as the motives for self-determined action; that Hobbes’s version of the social contract is thus incoherent; that Hobbes is not even able to show how moral ideas (i.e. ‘ought’) are conceivable through the ‘pressure’ of ‘outward objects’. For Kant, in short, Hobbes has no adequate notions of will, freedom, moral necessity, ideation, or even obligatory contract, and therefore fails in his own stated aims.”

<sup>173</sup> “I criticize the widely accepted “practical” interpretation of the universality test contained in Kant’s first formula of the categorical imperative in the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* – the formula of the universal law of nature. I argue that this interpretation does not work for contradictions in conception because it wrongly takes contradictions in the will as the model for them and, as a consequence, cannot establish a clear distinction between the two kinds of contradiction. This interpretation also assumes an understanding of universality that departs from Kant’s own and, cannot, for this reason, capture the kind of contradiction that he explicitly claims to establish. I provide an alternative interpretation, which I call revised logical interpretation, that allows us to account for contradictions in conception, including those examples that the practical interpretation cannot handle, as well as to establish a clear distinction between the two kinds of contradiction.”

- 2006 [1187] Röd, Wolfgang (2006): *Die Philosophie der Neuzeit 3: Teil 1: Kritische Philosophie von Kant bis Schopenhauer* (= *Geschichte der Philosophie IX, 1*, hrsg. von Wolfgang Röd), München, S. 74–92 (“[I] 4. Die Ethik [Kants]”).
- 2007 [1188] Rödl, Sebastian (2007): Comments on Guyer, *Inquiry* 50, S. 489–96.<sup>175</sup> – Zu [498].
- 2013 [1189] Rödl, Sebastian (2013): Why Ought Implies Can, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 42–56.
- 2010 [1190] Roff, Heather M. (2010): Kantian Provisional Duties, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 18, S. 533–62.
- 2004 [1191] Rogerson, Kenneth F. (2004): Kant on Beauty and Morality, *Kant-Studien* 95, S. 338–354.
- 2001 [1192] Rohden, Valerio (2001): Ciceros *formula* und Kants „neue Formel“ des Moralprinzips, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 305–14.
- 2009 [1193] Rohlf, Michael (2009): Contradiction and Consent in Kant’s Ethics, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 43, S. 507–20.
- 2011 [1194] Rohlf, Michael (2011): Kant’s Early Ethics, *American Dialectic* 1, S. 137–66.
- 2017 [1195] Rohlf, Michael (2017): Contemporary Kantian Moral Philosophy, in *The Palgrave Kant Handbook*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, London, S. 791–813.

---

<sup>174</sup> “Immanuel Kant, in a much-maligned view, thought that we could only have indirect duties to nonhuman animals who have no inherent moral value since they lack rationality. While there are various responses to this worrisome position, no one seems to consider that animals could conceivably qualify as having rationality, even on Kantian high standards. Animals engage in various activities (such as playing, seeking revenge, and altruistically helping others) that could be taken as indicators of the core aspects of rationality that Kant requires for having absolute worth (such as a reflective self-consciousness, a free end-setting ability, and the ability to make moral demands on others). While these animal behaviors will not prove that animals are rational, we must remember that we also cannot prove that other humans are rational. Instead, my goal is only to provide a basis for a precautionary moral principle that requires treating animals as minimally rational, given that they might be. On this basis, we ought to accept some direct Kantian duties for the respectful treatment of animals.”

<sup>175</sup> “Before and in the Groundwork, Kant argues as follows for the validity of the moral law: we want to be free. Following the moral law is the only way to be free. So we should follow the moral law. The first premise of this syllogism is treated differently before and in the Groundwork. First Kant thought it an empirical fact that men want to be free and want it more than anything else. Later he sought an a priori argument showing that we ought to want to be free and are right in thinking it good. The former justification of the moral law is superior. When we look to “salvage the normative core of Kantian moral philosophy” (Guyer 445), we should turn to it. – So far Paul Guyer.

It is evident that Guyer fails to describe Kant’s thought in the Groundwork. It is equally clear that Kant never held the position Guyer claims he held before the Groundwork. (The quotations Guyer gives in support of his claim show this.) Therefore I shall not discuss Guyer’s interpretation of Kant. Instead I shall consider the philosophical merits of the position he ascribes to the pre-critical Kant, and which he recommends as superior. We shall see that that position makes no sense. This indirectly addresses the interpretive question, as it is a reason against ascribing it to Kant.”

- 1995 [1196] Rohs, Peter (1995): Warum Kant kein Utilitarist war, in *Zum moralischen Denken*, hrsg. von Christoph Fehige und Georg Meggle, Frankfurt a. M. 1995, Bd. 2, S. 35–41.
- 1976 [1197] Rollin, Bernard E. (1976): There is Only One Categorical Imperative, *Kant-Studien* 67, S. 60–72.
- 2018 [1198] Römer, Inga (2018): *Das Begehren der reinen praktischen Vernunft. Kants Ethik aus phänomenologischer Sicht*, Hamburg.<sup>176</sup>
- 2014 [1199] Römer, Inga (Hrsg.) (2014): *Affektivität und Ethik bei Kant und in der Phänomenologie*, Berlin.
- 1998 [1200] Rommel, Herbert (1998): Zur Aktualität der Kantischen Frage nach ethischen Handlungsmotiven, *Ethica* (Innsbruck) 6, S. 163–83.
- 1991 [1201] Römpf, Georg (1991): Kants Ethik als Philosophie des Glücks, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 563–72.
- 2001 [1202] Römpf, Georg (2001): Die Artikulation der Autonomie – Zur systematischen Stellung der Tugendlehre in der kantischen Philosophie, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 80–88.
- 2004 [1203] Römpf, Georg (2004): Die Sprache der Freiheit. Kants moralphilosophische Sprachauffassung, *Kant-Studien* 95, S. 182–203.
- 2004 [1204] Römpf, Georg (2006): *Kants Kritik der reinen Freiheit. Eine Erörterung der Metaphysik der Sitten*, Berlin.<sup>177</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> „Stehen sich Kants Ethik und die mit Edmund Husserl beginnende phänomenologische Bewegung tatsächlich in Form eines Antagonismus gegenüber? Noch immer wird diese Frage nicht selten bejaht. Die Hypothese der vorliegenden Studie ist jedoch, dass die Behauptung eines solchen Antagonismus letztlich weder aus der Perspektive der kantischen Schriften noch aus der Entwicklungsgeschichte der Phänomenologie heraus aufrecht erhalten werden kann. Denn gibt es nicht in Kants Ethik und ihrer Grundlegung Perspektiven, die den Vorwurf des abstrakten, lebensfernen Formalismus bereits entkräften? Und findet sich im Nachgang zu den materialen Wertethikern nicht innerhalb der phänomenologischen Bewegung der Versuch einer Erneuerung gerade der formalistischen Tendenz der kantischen Ethik? Die systematische Perspektive, die aus dieser Untersuchung hervorgeht, ist eine Ethik des Begehrens der reinen praktischen Vernunft, in der sich das individuelle Begehren angesichts einer gebietenden Vernunft auf je eigenem Wege konkretisiert, einer reinen praktischen Vernunft, deren Aufkommen allerdings mit Levinas als genuin intersubjektiv verstanden wird.“

<sup>177</sup> „Inhaltsübersicht. A. Einleitung – B. Die ‚Metaphysik der Sitten‘ als Kritik der reinen Freiheit: Die reine Freiheit als individuelle Eleutheronomie – Das Factum der Vernunft und die Tat der Person – Die reine Freiheit und der Gegenstand der Kantischen Philosophie des Rechts – Rechts- und Tugendlehre als Kritik der reinen Freiheit – C. Die Freiheit im äußeren Gebrauch: Die Verbindlichkeit einer freien Handlung – Die Person und ihre Tat – Tatfreiheit und Maximenfreiheit – Der moralische Begriff des Rechts – Der rechtliche Mensch und sein vernünftiger Selbstzweck – Das Subjekt und sein Mein und Dein – D. Rechtsverhältnis und Rechtsgeltung: Die Person und ihr rechtlich Eigenes – Die Konstitution des Rechts in der Selbstdifferenzierung des Subjekts – Die ‚private‘ Konstitution des Rechtsverhältnisses und die ‚provisio‘ auf den bürgerlichen Zustand – Das Prinzip des Richters und der Beginn des Rechtsverhältnisses – Der Staat und die Demonstration der Freiheit im Rechtsverhältnis – Wider den Kontraktualismus: der Rechtszustand als

- 2001 [1205] Rosen, Stanley (2001): Kant über Glückseligkeit, in *Systematische Ethik mit Kant*, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 355–80.
- 2011 [1206] Rosenkoetter, Timothy (2011): Kant on Construction, Apriority, and the Moral Relevance of Universalization, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 19, 1143–74.<sup>178</sup>
- 1933 [1207] Ross, Alf (1933): *Kritik der sogenannten praktischen Erkenntnis. Zugleich Prolegomena zu einer Kritik der Rechtswissenschaft*, Kopenhagen, Leipzig, S. 299–322 („Kants Moralphilosophie“).
- 1954 [1208] Ross, W. D. (1954): *Kant's Ethical Theory. A Commentary on the Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*, Oxford.
- 1979 [1209] Rossvær, Viggo (1979): *Kant's Moral Philosophy. An Interpretation of the Categorical Imperative*, Oslo.
- 1982 [1210] Rossvær, Viggo (1982): Kant's Practical Philosophy, in *Contemporary Philosophy* Vol. 3, hrsg. von G. Floistad, Den Haag, S. 187–217.
- 1989 [1211] Rossvær, Viggo (1989): The Categorical Imperative and the Natural Law Formula, in *Grundle-*

---

Konstitutionsbedingung von Personalität – E. Die Freiheit im äußeren Selbstverhältnis: Recht und Tugend und die Notwendigkeit einer freien Handlung – ‚Fortitudo moralis‘ und Pflichtzwecke – Tugendpflichten und die Selbsterzeugung der Freiheit in der Welt – Der Ursprung der Tugendpflichten in der Basisargumentation der Kantischen Ethik – Die Tugend und die autopoietische Konstitution des Menschen als Subjekt – F. Freiheit und Selbstverpflichtung: Die Antinomie der Pflichten gegen sich selbst und die Autonomie des Selbstverhältnisses – Die Pflichten gegen sich selbst und die Selbstauffassung als animalisches und moralisches Wesen – Selbstverpflichtung und Freiheit in der Animalität: das Problem des Suizids – Selbstverpflichtung und Freiheit in der Moralität: das Problem der Lüge – Der innere Richter und der Beginn des Selbstverhältnisses – Das Prinzip der Verpflichtetheit und die Pflichten gegen Andere – G. Die Kritik der reinen Freiheit als Denken der Differenz des Bewußtseins: Die kritizistische Aufgabe und der Gedanke der Differenz – Die Situierung des Denkens der Differenz – Die Differenz als Differenzierung des Bewußtseins – Das ‚Ich denke‘ und das ‚Meine‘ – Die Possessivität ‚meiner‘ Vorstellungen – H. Rückblick: Der Status einer Kritik der reinen Freiheit: Die Architektonik des juridischen Modells der Vernunftkritik – Die Konstitution des ‚mein‘ und die Selbstdifferenzierung des moralischen Subjekts – ‚Meine Vorstellungen‘ im apperzeptiven Selbstverhältnis und die Konstitution von Subjektivität aus Freiheit – Die Kritik der reinen Vernunft aus der Perspektive der Kritik der reinen Freiheit – Zusammenfassung – Literatur- und Sachwortverzeichnis“

<sup>178</sup> “This paper introduces a *referential* reading of Kant’s practical project, according to which maxims are made morally permissible by their correspondence to objects, though not the ontic objects of Kant’s theoretical project but deontic objects (what ought to be). It illustrates this model by showing how the content of the Formula of Universal Law might be determined by what our capacity of practical reason can stand in a referential relation to, rather than by facts about what kind of beings we are (viz., uncaused causes). This solves the neglected puzzle of why there are passages in Kant’s works suggesting robust analogies between mathematics and ethics, since to universalize a maxim is to test a priori whether a practical object with that particular content can be constructed. An apparent problem with this hypothesis is that the medium of practical sensibility (feeling) does not play a role analogous to the medium of theoretical sensibility (intuition). In response I distinguish two separate Kantian accounts of mathematical apriority. The thesis that maxim universalization is a species of construction, and thus a priori, turns out to be consistent with the account of apriority that informs Kant’s understanding of actual mathematical practice.”

gung zur *Metaphysik der Sitten*. Ein kooperativer Kommentar, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 194–205.

- 1989 [1212] Rotenstreich, Nathan (1989): On the Formalism of Kant's Ethics, in *Kant's Practical Philosophy Reconsidered. Papers Presented at the Seventh Jerusalem Philosophical Encounter*, hrsg. von Yirmiah Yovel, S. 49–62.
- 2003 [1213] Rottenberg, Elizabeth (2003): The Legacy of the Future: Kant and the Ethical Question, *Kant-Studien* 94, S. 172–197.
- 2001 [1214] Rudolph, Enno (2001): MacIntyres Kantkritik. Zur Verteidigung des Kategorischen Imperativs, in *Systematische Ethik mit Kant*, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 286–97.
- 1989 [1215] Rumsey, Jean R. (1989): The Development of Character in Kantian Moral Theory, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 27, S. 247–65.
- 1990 [1216] Rumsey, Jean R. (1990): Agency, Human Nature and Character in Kantian Theory, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 24, S. 109–21.
- 1966 [1217] Saarnio, U. (1966): Die logischen Grundlagen der formalen Ethik Immanuel Kants, *Kant-Studien* 57, S. 484–99.
- 1990 [1218] Sala, Giovanni B. (1990): Das Gesetz oder das Gute? Zum Ursprung und Sinn des Formalismus in der Ethik Kants, *Gregorianum* 71, S. 67–95, 315–52.
- 2004 [1219] Sala, Giovanni B. (2004): *Kants „Kritik der praktischen Vernunft“*. Ein Kommentar, Darmstadt.
- 2005 [1220] Sala, Giovanni B. (2005): Der Formalismus in der Ethik Kants – Überlegungen zu einer alten Kontroverse, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 52, S. 191–215.
- 2006 [1221] Santozki, Ulrike (2006): *Die Bedeutung antiker Theorien für die Genese und Systematik von Kants Philosophie. Eine Analyse der drei Kriterien [!]*, Berlin, S. 149–229 („III Die Grundlegung zur *Metaphysik der Sitten* und die *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*)
- 2012 [1222] Sargentis, Konstantinos (2012): Moral Motivation in Kant, *Kant Studies Online* 2012, S. 93–121.
- 2018 [1223] Sarkar, Husain (2018): *Kant and Parfit. The Groundwork of Morals*, New York.<sup>179</sup>
- 2008 [1224] Sato, Tsutomu (2008): Chemical Affinity in Kant's Practical Philosophy, in *Recht und Frieden in*

---

<sup>179</sup> “Derek Parfit's *On What Matters* is widely recognized as elegant, profound, and destined to change the landscape of moral philosophy. In Volume One, Parfit argues that the distinct—indeed, powerfully conflicting—theories of deontology and contractualism can be woven together in a way so as to yield utilitarian conclusions. Husain Sarkar in this book calls this, *The Ultimate Derivation*. Sarkar argues, however, that this derivation is untenable. To underwrite this conclusion, this book traverses considerable Parfitian terrain. Sarkar shows why Parfit hasn't quite solved what Sidgwick had called "the profoundest problem in ethics"; he offers a reading of Kant, Rawls, and Scanlon that reveals Parfit's keen utilitarian bias; and he demonstrates why Parfit's *Triple Theory* does not succeed in its task of unifying conflicting moral theories (without making substantial utilitarian assumptions). The final chapter of the book is about meta-ethics. It shows that Parfit's *Convergence Principle* is mistaken even though it unveils Parfit's utterly humane concerns: Moral philosophers are not, as Parfit thinks, climbing the same mountain. But for all that, Sarkar maintains, Parfit's book is arguably the greatest consequential tract in the history of moral philosophy.”

*der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Band 3: Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 359–68.

- 2019 [1225] Saunders, Joe (2019): Kant and Degree of Responsibility, *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 36, S. 137–54.<sup>180</sup>
- 2005 [1226] Saurette, Paul (2005): *The Kantian Imperative: Humiliation, Common Sense, Politics*, Toronto.
- 2001 [1227] Scarano, Nico (2001): *Moralische Überzeugungen. Grundlinien einer antirealistischen Theorie der Moral*, Paderborn, S. 116–28 („Kategorische Imperative und Handlungsrationali-tät“).
- 2002 [1228] Scarano, Nico (2002): Moralisches Handeln. Zum dritten Hauptstück von Kants *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (71–89), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 135–52.
- 2006 [1229] Scarano, Nico (2006): Necessity and Apriority in Kant’s Moral Philosophy. An Interpretation of the *Groundwork’s* Preface (GMS, 387–392), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 3–22.
- 1998 [1230] Scarre, Geoffrey (1998): Interpreting the Categorical Imperative, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 6, S. 223–36.
- 2012 [1231] Schadow, Steffi (2012): *Achtung für das Gesetz. Moral und Motivation bei Kant*, Berlin.<sup>181</sup>
- 2013 [1232] Schadow, Steffi (2012): Recht und Ethik in Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten* (MS 6: 218–221 und TL 6: 390f.), in *Kant’s “Tugendlehre”. A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 85–112.
- 1992 [1233] Schaller, Walter E. (1992): The Relation of Moral Worth to the Good Will in Kant’s Ethics, *Journal of Philosophical Research* 17, S. 351–82.

---

<sup>180</sup> “Kant views every human action as either entirely determined by natural necessity or entirely free. In viewing human action this way, it is unclear how he can account for degrees of responsibility. In this article, I consider three recent attempts to accommodate degrees of responsibility within Kant’s framework, but argue that none of them are satisfying. In the end, I claim that transcendental idealism constrains Kant such that he cannot provide an adequate account of degrees of responsibility.”

<sup>181</sup> „Die Frage, wie das, was die Vernunft einsieht, dazu motivieren kann, dies auch zu tun, gehört zu den Grundfragen von Kants praktischer Philosophie. Die vorliegende Untersuchung erschließt Kants Antwort auf das Problem der moralischen Motivation innerhalb seiner Handlungstheorie und Moralphilosophie. Neben einer philosophiehistorischen und systematischen Einordnung liefert sie eine umfassende textnahe Analyse der kantischen Argumente, die auch werkgeschichtliche Aspekte berücksichtigt. Auf diese Weise entsteht ein reichhaltiges Bild der kantischen Theorie moralischer Motivation, die in Kants Konzept der Moralbegründung nicht nur verwurzelt ist, sondern dieses auch unterstützt. So ist die Achtung vor dem Gesetz als Modus zu verstehen, in dem sich der Mensch die praktische Norm zu eigen macht. Moralische Gründe erweisen sich nach der hier vorgeschlagenen Interpretation als unbedingte, universal gültige Regeln, deren praktische Bedeutung als subjektive Handlungsgrundsätze und Motive erst durch Kants Theorie der moralisch-rationalen Sensibilität verständlich wird. Kants Ansatz ist damit nicht nur werkinern von Interesse, sondern liefert darüber hinaus einen inspirierenden Beitrag zu einer modernen Theorie praktischer Normativität.“

- 1993 [1234] Schaller, Walter E. (1993): Should Kantians Care about Moral Worth?, *Dialogue* 32, S. 25–40.
- 1995 [1235] Schaller, Walter E. (1995): From the *Groundwork* to the *Metaphysics of Morals*: What Happened to Morality in Kant's Theory of Justice?, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 12, S. 333–45.
- 2000 [1236] Schaller, Walter E. (2000): Kant on Right and Moral Rights, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 38, S. 321–42.
- 1992 [1237] Scheffler, Samuel (1992): *Human Morality*, New York, Oxford, S. 61–68.
- 1995 [1238] Schefczyk, Michael (1995): *Moral ohne Nutzen. Eine Apologie des Kantischen Formalismus*, St. Augustin.
- 1991 [1239] Schicker, Rudolf (1991): „Sic volo sic iubeo stet pro ratione voluntas“. Kant als Rezipient Juvenals und das Problem einer transzendental begründeten Ethik, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 397–404.
- 1938 [1240] Schilpp, Paul Arthur (1938): *Kant's Pre-Critical Ethics*, Second Edition, Evanston 1960.
- 1913 [1241] Schink, Willi (1913): Kant und die stoische Ethik, *Kant-Studien* 18, S. 419–75.
- 2005 [1242] Schmidt, Claudia M. (2005): The Anthropological Dimension of Kant's Metaphysics of Morals, *Kant-Studien* 96, S. 66–84.
- 1961 [1243] Schmucker, Josef (1961): *Die Ursprünge der Ethik Kants in seinen vorkritischen Schriften und Reflektionen*, Meisenheim.
- 1955 [1244] Schmucker, Josef (1955): Der Formalismus und die materialen Zweckprinzipien in der Ethik Kants, in *Kant und die Scholastik heute*, hrsg. von J. B. Lotz SJ, Pullach, S. 155–205. Wiederabgedruckt in *Kant. Analysen – Probleme – Kritik*. Bd. III. *Hans Wagner zum 80. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Hariolf Oberer, Würzburg 1997, S. 99–156.
- 1992 [1245] Schneewind, J. B. (1992): Autonomy, Obligation, and Virtue: An Overview of Kant's Moral Philosophy, in *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Cambridge, S. 309–41.
- 1993 [1246] Schneewind, J. B. (1993): Kant and Natural Law Ethics, *Ethics* 104, S. 53–74.
- 1996 [1247] Schneewind, J. B. (1996): Kant and Stoic Ethics, in *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics. Rethinking Happiness and Duty*, hrsg. von Stephen Engstrom und Jennifer Whiting, Cambridge, S. 285–301.
- 1998 [1248] Schneewind, J. B. (1998): *The Invention of Autonomy. A History of Modern Moral Philosophy*, Cambridge, S. 508–30 (“Kant in the History of Moral Philosophy”).
- 2002 [1249] Schneewind, J. B. (2002): Why Study Kant's Ethics?, in *Immanuel Kant, Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, edited and translated by Allen W. Wood. With Essays by J. B. Schneewind, Marica Baron, Shelly Kagan, Allen W. Wood, New Haven 2002, S. 83–91.
- 2009 [1250] Schneewind, J. B. (2009): Kant Against the ‘Spurious Principles of Morality’, in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 140–58.

- 1989 [1251] Schnoor, Christian (1989): *Kants Kategorischer Imperativ als Kriterium der Richtigkeit des Handelns*, Tübingen. – Vgl. dazu [688], [1554].
- 1985 [1252] Schöndorf, Harald (1985): „Denken-Können“ und „Wollen-Können“ in Kants Beispielen für den kategorischen Imperativ, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 39, S. 549–73.
- 1996 [1253] Schönecker, Dieter E. (1996): Zur Analytizität der *Grundlegung*, *Kant-Studien* 87, S. 348–54.
- 1997 [1254] Schönecker, Dieter E. (1997): Die ‚Art von Zirkel‘ im dritten Abschnitt der *Grundlegung*, *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 22, S. 189–202.
- 1997 [1255] Schönecker, Dieter E. (1997): Die Methode der *Grundlegung* und der Übergang von der gemeinen sittlichen zur philosophischen Vernunftkenntnis, in *Kant. Analysen – Probleme – Kritik*. Bd. III. *Hans Wagner zum 80. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Hariolf Oberer, Würzburg, S. 81–98.
- 1997 [1256] Schönecker, Dieter E. (1997): Gemeine sittliche und philosophische Vernunftkenntnis. Zum ersten Übergang in Kants *Grundlegung*, *Kant-Studien* 88, S. 311–33. – The Transition from Common Rational Moral Knowledge to Philosophical Rational Moral Knowledge in the *Groundwork*, in *Kant’s Moral and Legal Philosophy*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Otfried Höffe, Cambridge 2009, S. 93–122.
- 1999 [1257] Schönecker, Dieter E. (1999): *Kant: Grundlegung III. Die Deduktion des kategorischen Imperativs*, Freiburg, München.
- 2001 [1258] Schönecker, Dieter E. (2001): What is the ‘First Proposition’ Regarding Duty in Kant’s *Grundlegung*?, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 89–95.
- 2006 [1259] Schönecker, Dieter E. (2006): How is a categorical imperative possible? Kant’s deduction of the categorical imperative (GMS, III, 4), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 301–24.
- 2010 [1260] Schönecker, Dieter E. (2010): Kant über Menschenliebe als moralische Grundlage, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 92, S. 133–75.<sup>182</sup>
- 2012 [1261] Schönecker, Dieter (2012): Once Again: What is the ‘First Proposition’ in Kant’s *Groundwork*? Some Refinements, a New Proposal, and a Reply to Henry Allison, *Kantian Review* 17, S. 281–296.<sup>183</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup> “In the Introduction of the *Tugendlehre*, Kant identifies love of human beings as one of the four moral predispositions that make us receptive to the moral law. We claim that this love is neither benevolence nor the aptitude of the inclination to beneficence in general (both are also called love of human beings); rather it is *amor complacentiae*, which Kant understands as the delight in moral striving for perfection. We also provide a detailed analysis of Kant’s almost completely neglected theory of moral predispositions. They are necessary conditions to be aware of the moral law and to be motivated by it.”

<sup>183</sup> “Discussing the concept of duty in *Groundwork* 1, Kant refers to a ‘second proposition’ and a ‘third proposition’, the latter being a ‘Folgerung aus beiden vorigen’. However, Kant does not identify what the ‘first proposition’ is. In this paper, I will argue that the first proposition is this: An action from duty is an action from respect for the moral law. I defend this claim against a critique put forward by Allison according

- 2013 [1262] Schönecker, Dieter (2013): Das gefühlte Faktum der Vernunft. Skizze einer Interpretation und Verteidigung, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 61, S. 91–107.<sup>184</sup>
- 2013 [1263] Schönecker, Dieter (2013): Duties to Others from Love (TL 6: 448–461), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 309–42.
- 2013 [1264] Schönecker, Dieter (2013): Kant's Moral Intuitionism: The Fact of Reason and Moral Predispositions, *Kant Studies Online* (<http://www.kantstudiesonline.net>) (Februar 2013), S. 1–38.
- 2014 [1265] Schönecker, Dieter (2014): Das gefühlte Faktum der Vernunft. Skizze einer Interpretation und Verteidigung, in *Affektivität und Ethik bei Kant und in der Phänomenologie*, hrsg. von Inga Römer, Berlin, S. 55–78.
- 2014 [1266] Schönecker, Dieter (2014): Warum es in der *Grundlegung* keine Faktum-These gibt. Drei Argumente, in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 1–14.
- 2014 [1267] Schönecker, Dieter (2014): Quare errat disceptator. Eine Erwiderung auf Heiko Puls, in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 35–44.
- 2015 [1268] Schönecker, Dieter (2015): Bemerkungen zu Oliver Sensen, *Kant on Human Dignity*, Chapter 1, *Kant-Studien* 106, S. 68–77. – Zu [1313].
- 2016 [1269] Schönecker, Dieter (2016): Why There Is No Fact of Reason in the *Groundwork*. Three Arguments, in *Theories of Action and Morality. Perspectives from Philosophy and Social Theory*, hrsg. von Mark Torralba und José Alznauer, Hildesheim, S. 55–77.
- 2002 [1270] Schönecker, Dieter E./Wood, Allen E. (2002): *Kants „Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten“.* Ein einführender Kommentar, Paderborn. – *Immanuel Kant's Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals. A Commentary*, Cambridge, Mass. 2015.
- 2015 [1271] Schönecker, Dieter E. (Hrsg.): *Kants Begründung von Freiheit und Moral in Grundlegung III. Neue Interpretationen*, Münster.
- 2013 [1272] Schönrich Gerhard (2013): Kants Werttheorie. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion, *Kant-Studien* 104,

---

to which 'respect' is a concept that is not, and could not be, introduced in paragraphs 9–13 of *Groundwork* 1. Further, I will argue that the first proposition as I understand it can also be reconstructed as the conclusion ('Folgerung') of a deductive argument proper; however, I will also discuss the option that 'Folgerung' could be understood as a corollary rather than a conclusion. Finally, Allison's own interpretation will be criticized."

<sup>184</sup> "Kant is by no means the pure rationalist that Husserl and others represented him as being. To the contrary I claim that Kant is an ethical intuitionist when it comes to our recognition of the validity of the moral law. Interpreting Kant's famous thesis about the "fact of reason", I will first argue for three interpretative theses: 1. The factum theory explains our insight into the binding character of the moral law; it is a theory of justification. 2. In our consciousness of the categorical imperative, the moral law is immediately given in its unconditional and binding validity. 3. The unconditional validity of the CI is given in the feeling of respect. Drawing on basic thoughts of Reformed Epistemology, I will then sketch a way to defend Kant's theory."

- 1819 [1273] Schopenhauer, Arthur (1819, 1844<sup>2</sup>, 1859<sup>3</sup>): *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* Erster Band, Zweiter Teilband, Anhang: Kritik der Kantischen Philosophie, in Schopenhauer, *Zürcher Ausgabe. Werke in zehn Bänden* Band II, Zürich 1977, S. 509–651: S. 637–43.
- 1841 [1274] Schopenhauer, Arthur (1841, 1860<sup>2</sup>): *Preisschrift über die Grundlage der Moral*, in Schopenhauer, *Zürcher Ausgabe. Werke in zehn Bänden* Band VI, Zürich 1977, S. 157–224 („II. Kritik des von Kant der Ethik gegebenen Fundaments“).
- 2008 [1275] Schossberger, Cynthia (2008): The Kingdom of Ends and the Fourth Example in the *Groundwork* II, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 369–77.
- 1997 [1276] Schott, Robin May (Hrsg.) (1997): *Feminist Perspectives on Kant*, hrsg. von, University Park, Pa.
- 2005 [1277] Schroeder, Mark (2005): The Hypothetical Imperative?, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 83, S. 357–72.<sup>186</sup>
- 1988 [1278] Schröer, Christian (1988): *Naturbegriff und Moralbegründung. Die Grundlegung der Ethik und deren Kritik durch Immanuel Kant*, Stuttgart u. a.
- 2003 [1279] Schroth, Jörg (2003): Der voreilige Schluß auf den Nonkonsequentialismus in der Nelson- und Kant-Interpretation, in *Philosophiegeschichte und logische Analyse*, hrsg. von Uwe Meixner und Albert Newen, Band 6: *Geschichte der Ethik*, Paderborn, S. 123–50.
- 2008 [1280] Schroth, Jörg (2008): The Priority of the Right in Kant’s Ethics, in *Kant’s Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 77–100.
- 2012 [1281] Schulzke, Marcus (2012): Kant’s Categorical Imperative, the Value of Respect, and the Treatment of Women, *Journal of Military Ethics* 11, S. 26–41.<sup>187</sup>

---

<sup>185</sup> “In Kant’s writings there is no worked out theory of values. Nonetheless, he has given some hints as to what such a Kantian theory of value might look like. I argue for the claim that his theory should be classified as a version of a fitting-attitude theory of value that is nowadays advocated by several philosophers. Values are, according to Kant, dependent on proper pro-attitudes (Kant’s term for pro-attitudes is *Wohlgefallen*). In order for a pro-attitude to be apt, the pro-attitude must be explained by reasons that are grounded in properties the attitude is about. One problem for this view is the so-called “wrong kinds of reasons problem”. According to my view, this problem can be solved by delivering distinct definitions of aptness for first- and second-order pro-attitudes. I try to show that Kant has hinted at this solution for the “wrong kinds of reasons problem”.”

<sup>186</sup> “According to the standard view, Kant held that hypothetical imperatives are universally binding edicts with disjunctive objects: take-the-means-or-don’t-have-the-end. But Kant thought otherwise. He held that they are edicts binding only on some – those who have an end.”

<sup>187</sup> “This paper explores the relevance of Kant’s categorical imperative to military ethics and the solution it suggests for improving the treatment of women in the military. The second formulation of the categorical imperative makes universal respect for humanity a moral requirement by asserting that one must always treat other people as means in themselves and never as merely means to an end. This principle is a promising guide for military ethics and can be reconciled with the acts of violence required by war. This

- 2017 [1282] Schumski, Irina (2017): The Problem of Relevant Descriptions and the Scope of Moral Principles, *European Journal of Philosophy* 25, S. 1588–1613.<sup>188</sup>
- 1999 [1283] Schwaiger, Clemens (1999): *Kategorische und andere Imperative. Zur Entwicklung von Kants praktischer Philosophie bis 1785*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.
- 2010 [1284] Schwartz, Jeremy (2010): Do Hypothetical Imperatives Require Categorical Imperatives?, *European Journal of Philosophy* 18, S. 84–107.<sup>189</sup>
- 2008 [1285] Schwartz, Maria (2008): Maximen, Ratschläge der Klugheit und der verborgene Zweck, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 379–90.
- 1898 [1286] Schwarz, H. (1898): Der Rationalismus und der Rigorismus in Kants Ethik. Eine kritisch-systematische Untersuchung. Erster Artikel, *Kant-Studien* 2, S. 50–68.
- 1898 [1287] Schwarz, H. (1898): Der Rationalismus und der Rigorismus in Kants Ethik. Eine kritisch-systematische Untersuchung. Zweiter Artikel, *Kant-Studien* 2, S. 259–76.
- 1971 [1288] Schwemmer, Oswald (1971): *Philosophie der Praxis. Versuch zur Grundlegung einer Lehre vom moralischen Argumentieren in Verbindung mit einer Interpretation der praktischen Philosophie Kants*, Frankfurt a. M. 1980 (mit einem Nachwort zu Neuauflage).

---

paper argues that it can also regulate soldiers' relations to each other and that it may contribute to reorienting military culture in a way that overcomes the biases against female military personnel."

<sup>188</sup> "In her seminal attack on modern moral philosophy, G. E. M. Anscombe claims that Kant's 'rule about universalizable maxims is useless without stipulations as to what shall count as a relevant description of an action with a view to constructing a maxim about it'. Although this so-called problem of relevant descriptions has received considerable attention in the literature, there is little agreement on how it should be understood or solved. My aim in this paper is, first, to clarify the problem by clearing up several misunderstandings, and, second, to show that the problem is rooted in a standard assumption about Kant's stance on the scope of moral principles—an assumption that precludes its solution. I argue that the problem consists in the fact that Kant's formula of universal law seems to stand in need of an account of moral sensibility that does not render the formula superfluous. But, as my discussion of existing solutions reveals, there can be no such account. Instead, I propose a dissolution: we should think of the formula of universal law itself as Kant's account of moral sensibility. In order to do so, we must reject the standard assumption that a principle is universal if and only if it holds for all instances of the action type that it specifies."

<sup>189</sup> "Recently, the idea that every hypothetical imperative must somehow be 'backed up' by a prior categorical imperative has gained a certain influence among Kant interpreters and ethicists influenced by Kant. Since instrumentalism is the position that holds that hypothetical imperatives can by themselves and without the aid of categorical imperatives explain all valid forms of practical reasoning, the influential idea amounts to a rejection of instrumentalism as internally incoherent. This paper argues against this prevailing view both as an interpretation of Kant and as philosophical understanding of practical reason. In particular, it will be argued that many of the arguments that claim to show that hypothetical imperatives must be backed up by categorical imperatives mistakenly assume that the form of practical reasoning must itself occur as a premise within the reasoning. An alternative to this assumption will be offered. I will conclude that while instrumentalism may well be false, there is no reason to believe it is incoherent."

- 1973 [1289] Schwemmer, Oswald (1973): Vernunft und Moral. Versuch einer kritischen Rekonstruktion des kategorischen Imperativs bei Kant, in *Kant. Zur Deutung seiner Theorie von Erkennen und Handeln*, hrsg. von Gerold Prauss, Köln, S. 255–73.
- 1983 [1290] Schwemmer, Oswald (1983): Die praktische Ohnmacht der reinen Vernunft. Bemerkungen zum kategorischen Imperativ Kants, *Neue Hefte für Philosophie 22: Kants Ethik heute*, S. 1–24. Wiederabgedruckt in Schwemmer, *Ethische Untersuchungen. Rückfragen zu einigen Grundbegriffen*, Frankfurt a. M. 1986, S. 153–81.
- 1986 [1291] Schwemmer, Oswald (1986): Das „Faktum der Vernunft“ und die Realität des Handelns. Kritische Bemerkungen zur transzendentalphilosophischen Normbegründung und ihrer handlungstheoretischen Begriffsgrundlage im Blick auf Kant, in *Handlungstheorie und Transzendentalphilosophie*, hrsg. von Gerold Prauss, Frankfurt a. M., S. 271–302. Wiederabgedruckt in Schwemmer, *Ethische Untersuchungen. Rückfragen zu einigen Grundbegriffen*, Frankfurt a. M. 1986, S. 182–220.
- 1924 [1292] Scott, J. W. (1924): *Kant on the Moral Life. An Exposition of Kant's "Grundlegung"*, London.
- 2010 [1293] Scutt, Marie Zermatt (2010): Kant's Moral Theology, *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 18, S. 611–33.
- 1999 [1294] Secker, Barbara (1999): The Appearance of Kant's Deontology in Contemporary Kantianism: Concepts of Patient Autonomy in Bioethics, *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 24, S. 43–66.
- 1988 [1295] Sedgwick, Sally (1988): Hegel's Critique of the Subjective Idealism of Kant's Ethics, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 26, S. 89–105.
- 1988 [1296] Sedgwick, Sally (1988): On the Relation of Pure Reason to Content: A Reply to Hegel's Critique of Formalism in Kant's Ethics, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 49, S. 59–80.
- 1990 [1297] Sedgwick, Sally (1990): Can Kant's Ethics Survive the Feminist Critique?, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 71, S. 60–79. Erweiterte Version in *Feminist Perspectives on Kant*, hrsg. von Robin May Schott, University Park, Pa. 1997.
- 1991 [1298] Sedgwick, Sally (1991): On Lying and the Role of Content in Kant's Ethics, *Kant-Studien* 82, S. 42–62.
- 1996 [1299] Sedgwick, Sally (1996): Hegel's Critique of Kant's Empiricism and the Categorical Imperative, *Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung* 50, S. 560–581.
- 1998 [1300] Sedgwick, Sally (1998): Metaphysics and Morality in Kant and Hegel, *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 37, S. 1–16, wiederabgedruckt in *The Reception of Kant's Critical Philosophy: Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel*, hrsg. von S. Sedgwick, Cambridge 2000, S. 306–23.
- 2007 [1301] Sedgwick, Sally (2007): The Empty Formalism of Kant's Categorical Imperative. Hegel's Critique Revisited, *Internationale Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 16, S. 5–17.
- 2008 [1302] Sedgwick, Sally (2008): *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals: An Introduction*, Cambridge.
- 1996 [1303] Seebohm, Thomas M. (1996): Kant und Mill über den Ursprung des obersten Prinzips der

Moral, in *Inmitten der Zeit. Beiträge zur europäischen Gegenwartsphilosophie. Festschrift für Manfred Riedel*, hrsg. von Thomas Grethlein und Heinrich Leitner, Würzburg, S. 179–217.

- 1989 [1304] Seel, Gerhard (1989): Sind hypothetische Imperative analytische praktische Sätze?, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 148–71.
- 2009 [1305] Seel, Gerhard (2009): How Does Kant Justify the Universal Objective Validity of the Law of Right?, *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 17, S. 71–94.<sup>190</sup>
- 1995 [1306] Seel, Martin (1995): *Versuch über die Form des Glücks. Studien zur Ethik*, Frankfurt a. M., S. 20–26 („Kant: Einheit ohne Identität“).
- 1986 [1307] Seidler, Victor J. (1986): *Kant, Respect, and Injustice*, London.
- 2000 [1308] Senn, Marcel (2000): Ethik und Recht bei Kant und Spinoza, in *Zur Aktualität der Ethik Spinozas*. hrsg. von Klaus Hammacher, Irmela Reimers-Tovote und Manfred Walther, Würzburg S. 279–316.
- 2004 [1309] Sensen, Oliver (2004): Kants Begriff der Menschenwürde, in *Abwägende Vernunft. Praktische Rationalität in historischer, systematischer und religionsphilosophischer Perspektive*, hrsg. von Franz-Josef Bormann und Christian Schröer, Berlin, S. 220–36.
- 2008 [1310] Sensen, Oliver (2008): Kant’s Treatment of Human Dignity in the *Groundwork*, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 391–401.
- 2009 [1311] Sensen, Oliver (2009): Dignity and the Formula of Humanity, in *Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 102–18.
- 2011 [1312] Sensen, Oliver (2011): Kant’s Conception of Inner Value, *European Journal of Philosophy* 19, S. 262–80.<sup>191</sup>

---

<sup>190</sup> “Since more than 50 years Kant scholars debate the question whether the Law of Right as introduced in the *Metaphysics of Morals* by Kant can be justified by the Categorical Imperative. On the one hand we have those who think that Kant’s theory of right depends from the Categorical Imperative, on the other hand we find a growing group of scholars who deny this. However, the debate has been flawed by confusion and misunderstanding of the crucial terms and principles. Therefore, my first task will be to clarify these terms and principles by introducing distinctions that have been neglected too often. After this I try to show a) that the Law of Right can in fact be justified by using the testing method the Categorical Imperative prescribes and b) that there is no other way to justify it. Doing this I criticize in detail the new arguments adherents of the independence thesis have recently put forward.”

<sup>191</sup> “This article addresses a foundational issue in Kant’s moral philosophy, the question of the relation of the Categorical Imperative to value. There is an important movement in current Kant scholarship that argues that there is a value underlying the Categorical Imperative. However, some scholars have raised doubts as to whether Kant has a conception of value that could ground the Categorical Imperative. In this paper I seek to add to these doubts by arguing, first, that value would have to be of a particular kind in order to be the foundation of Kant’s moral philosophy. Second, I argue that Kant does not have such a conception of value,

- 2011 [1313] Sensen, Oliver (2011): *Kant on Human Dignity*, Berlin. – Vgl. Dazu [60], [156], [778] und [1268].
- 2013 [1314] Sensen, Oliver (2013): Kant's Constructivism, in *Constructivism in Ethics*, hrsg. von Carla Bagnoli, Cambridge, S. 63–81.
- 2015 [1315] Sensen, Oliver (2015): Die Begründung des Kategorischen Imperativs, in *Kants Begründung von Freiheit und Moral in Grundlegung III. Neue Interpretationen*, hrsg. von Dieter Schönecker, Münster, S. 231–56.
- 2015 [1316] Sensen, Oliver (2015): *Kant on Human Dignity Reconsidered. A Reply to My Critics*, *Kant-Studien* 106, S. 107–29. – Zu [60], [156], [778] und [1268].
- 2015 [1317] Sensen, Oliver (2015): The Supreme Principle of Morality, in *Reading Kant's Lectures*, hrsg. von Robert R. Clewis, Berlin, S. 179–99.
- 2017 [1318] Sensen, Oliver (2017): Dignity. Kant's Revolutionary Conception, in *Dignity. A History*, hrsg. von Remy Debes, Oxford, S. 237–61.
- 2017 [1319] Sensen, Oliver (2017): Dignity. Kant's Revolutionary Conception, in *Dignity. A History*, hrsg. von Remy Debes, Oxford, S. 237–61.
- 2017 [1320] Sensen, Oliver (2017): Duties to Oneself, in *The Palgrave Kant Handbook*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, London, S. 285–306.
- 1993 [1321] Seung, T. K. (1993): *Intuition and Construction. The Foundation of Normative Theory*, New Haven, S. 144–74 (“Kantian Reversal”).
- 1994 [1322] Seung, T. K. (1994): *Kant's Platonic Revolution in Moral and Political Philosophy*, Baltimore, S. 95–129 (“The Groundwork and the Second Critique: Kant's Formalism”), S. 130–54 (“The Metaphysics of Morals: Kant's Platonic Reversion”).
- 2007 [1323] Seung, T. K. (2007): *Kant: A Guide for the Perplexed*, London, S. 90–143 (“2. Practical reason (ethics, politics, and religion)”)<sup>192</sup>.
- 2008 [1324] Seymour, Melissa (2008): Widening the Field for the Practice of Virtue: Kant's Wide Imperfect Duties, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 403–13.
- 1976 [1325] Shalgi, M. (1976): Universalized Maxims as Moral Laws. The Categorical Imperative Revisited, *Kant-Studien* 67, S. 172–91.
- 2015 [1326] Shand, John (2015): Kant, Respect, and Hypothetical Acts, *Philosophy* 90, S. 505–18.<sup>193</sup>

---

and that his arguments rule out that value could ground his moral philosophy. I then outline an alternative reading of how Kant uses ‘inner value’. My conclusion will be that Kant does not derive the Categorical Imperative from an underlying value. While some of his passages could also be read as if value were foundational for Kant, a close look at these passages and his arguments point away from this conclusion.”

<sup>192</sup> Kant's ethical Platonism (S. 93), The Categorical Imperative (S. 95), Formal and substantive rationality (S. 104), The existence of the categorical imperative (S. 107), Rational autonomy and moral legislation (S. 114), The dialectic of practical reason (S. 126), Religion of practical reason (S. 131), The immanent ideas (S. 135).

<sup>193</sup> “The role of hypothetical acts, as opposed to actual acts, has been neglected in understanding the nature of what is required by the Respect for Persons formulation of the Categorical Imperative in concrete moral

- 2006 [1327] Shaver, Robert (2006): Korsgaard on Hypothetical Imperatives, *Philosophical Studies* 129, S. 335–47.<sup>194</sup>
- 1995 [1328] Sherline, Edward (1995): Heteronomy and Spurious Principles of Morality in Kant's *Groundwork*, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 76, S. 32–46.
- 1990 [1329] Sherman, Nancy (1990): The Place of Emotions in Kantian Morality, in *Identity, Character, and Morality. Essays in Moral Psychology*, hrsg. von Owen Flanagan und Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, Cambridge, Mass., S. 149–70.
- 1995 [1330] Sherman, Nancy (1995): Reason and Feelings in Kantian Morality, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 55, S. 369–77.
- 1997 [1331] Sherman, Nancy (1997): *Making a Necessity of Virtue. Aristotle and Kant on Virtue*, Cambridge.
- 1997 [1332] Sherman, Nancy (1997): Kantian Virtue: Priggish or Passional?, in *Reclaiming the History of Ethics. Essays for John Rawls*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath, Barbara Herman und Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge, S. 270–96.
- 1998 [1333] Sherman, Nancy (1998): Concrete Kantian Respect, in *Virtue and Vice*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 119–48.
- 2014 [1334] Sherman, Nancy (2014): The Place of Emotions in Kantian Morality, in *Kant on Emotion and Value*, hrsg. von Alix Cohen, Houndmills, S. 11–32.
- 2001 [1335] Shibuya, Haruyoshi (2001): Kant und das Problem des Wert-Nihilismus, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 327–33.
- 1989 [1336] Siep, Ludwig (1989): Wozu Metaphysik der Sitten? Bemerkungen zur Vorrede der *Grundlegung*, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 31–44. – What is the Purpose of a Metaphysics of Morals? Some Observations on the Preface to the *Groundwork the Metaphysics of Morals*, in *Kant's Moral and Legal Philosophy*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Otfried Höffe, Cambridge 2009, S. 77–92
- 1991 [1337] Siitonen, Arto (1991): Zur Theorie und Argumentation in der „Kritik der praktischen Vernunft“, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 405–14.
- 1959 [1338] Silber, John R. (1959): The Contents of Kant's Ethical Thought, Pts. 1 and 2, *Philosophical*

---

relations between persons. This had led to a failure to understand fully the way and the extent to which the Categorical Imperative may be present in all such relations with others as encapsulated in an appropriate attitude towards others that may refer to hypothetical acts, as well as actual acts. The result is an underestimation of the direct relevance and moral efficacy of the Categorical Imperative.”

<sup>194</sup> “I argue that rationalists need not adopt Kant's method for determining what one has reason to do, where by “Kant's method” I mean the view that normative guidance comes only from directives imposed on the agent by the agent's own will. I focus on Kant's argument for “imperatives of skill,” one sort of hypothetical imperative. I argue, against Korsgaard, that Kant's argument is neither better nor significantly different than the sort of argument non-Kantian rationalists offer. I close by arguing that Korsgaard is wrong to think that her question “why should I care about performing the means to my ends?” is a serious worry.”

*Quarterly* 9, S. 193–207, 309–18.

- 1959 [1339] Silber, John R. (1959): The Copernican Revolution in Ethics: The Good Reexamined, *Kant-Studien* 51, S. 85–101.
- 1959 [1340] Silber, John R. (1959): The Metaphysical Importance of the Highest Good as the Canon of Pure Reason in Kant's Philosophy, *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 1, S. 233–44. – Die metaphysische Bedeutung des höchsten Guts als Kanon der reinen Vernunft in Kants Philosophie, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 23 (1969), S. 538–49.
- 1959 [1341] Silber, John R. (1959): Kant's Conception of the Highest Good as Immanent and Transcendent, *Philosophical Review* 68, S. 469–92. – Immanenz und Transzendenz des höchsten Gutes bei Kant, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 18 (1964), S. 386–407.
- 1961 [1342] Silber, John R. (1960/61): Die Analyse des Pflicht- und Schuldnerlebnisses bei Kant und Freud, *Kant-Studien* 52, S. 295–309.
- 1963 [1343] Silber, John R. (1963): The Highest Good in Kant's Ethics, *Ethics* 73, S. 179–97.
- 1974 [1344] Silber, John R. (1974): Procedural Formalism in Kant's Ethics, *Review of Metaphysics* 28, S. 197–36.
- 1981 [1345] Silber, John R. (1981): Kant and the Mythic Roots of Morality, *Dialectica* 35, S. 167–93.
- 1982 [1346] Silber, John R. (1982): The Moral Good and the Natural Good in Kant's Ethics, *Review of Metaphysics* 36, S. 397–438.
- 2012 [1347] Silber, John (2012): *Kant's Ethics. The Good, Freedom, and the Will*, Berlin.
- 2000 [1348] Simon, Josef (2000): Moral bei Kant und Nietzsche, *Nietzsche-Studien* 29, S. 178–198.
- 2003 [1349] Simon, Josef (2003): *Kant. Die fremde Vernunft und die Sprache der Philosophie*, Berlin, S. 163–205 („Der kategorische Imperativ und seine Verdeutlichungen“).
- 1989 [1350] Simmons, Keith (1989): Kant on Moral Worth, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 6, S. 85–100.
- 1993 [1351] Simmons, Lance (1993): Kant's Highest Good: Albatross, Keystone, Achilles Heel, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 10, S. 355–68.
- 1986 [1352] Simpson, Peter (1986): Autonomous Morality and the Idea of the Noble (I. Kant), *Interpretation* 14 (New York), S. 353–70.
- 1954 [1353] Singer, Marcus G. (1954): The Categorical Imperative, *Philosophical Review* 63, S. 577–91.
- 1961 [1354] Singer, Marcus G. (1961): *Generalization in Ethics. An Essay in the Logic of Ethics, with the Rudiments of a System of Moral Philosophy*, New York, S. 217–38 (“The Categorical Imperative”), S. 239–99 (“The Application of the Categorical Imperative”). – *Verallgemeinerung in der Ethik. Zur Logik moralischen Argumentierens*, Frankfurt a. M. 1975, S. 256–277 („Der kategorische Imperativ“), S. 278–342 („Die Anwendung des kategorischen Imperativs“).
- 2002 [1355] Singleton, Jane (2002): Virtue Ethics, Kantian Ethics, and Consequentialism, *Journal of Philosophical Research*, S. 537–551.
- 2007 [1356] Singleton, Jane (2007): Kant's Account of Respect: A Bridge between Rationality and Anthropology, *Kantian Review* 12, S. 40–60.

- 2015 [1357] Sirovátka, Jakub (2015): *Das Sollen und das Böse in der Philosophie Immanuel Kants. Zum Zusammenhang zwischen kategorischem Imperativ und dem Hang zum Bösen*, Hamburg.
- 2019 [1358] Sirovátka, Jakub (2019): Die Aufrichtigkeit als die Wurzel der Moralität. Kant (und Nietzsche), *Kant-Studien* 110, S. 256–71.<sup>195</sup>
- 1969 [1359] Sitter, B. (1969): Voraussetzungen in Kants Begründung der Ethik, *Studi Internazionali di Filosofia* 1, S. 117–30.
- 1981 [1360] Skorpen, Erling (1981): Making Sense of Kant's Third Example, *Kant-Studien* 72, S. 415–29.
- 1992 [1361] Skorpen, Erling (1992): Kant's Indirect Duty To Secure Happiness, *Existencia* 2, S. 255–276.
- 2009 [1362] Skorupski, John (2009): Autonomy and Impartiality: *Groundwork* III, in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 159–75.
- 2018 [1363] Skorupski, John (2018): Comment on Jens Timmermann, 'Autonomy, Progress and Virtue: Why Kant Has Nothing to Fear from the Overdemandingness Objection,' *Kantian Review* 23, S. 399–405. – Zu [1478].
- 2007 [1364] Slomp, Gabriella (2007): Kant against Hobbes: Reasoning and Rhetoric, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 4, S. 207–22.<sup>196</sup>
- 1984 [1365] Smith, Steven G. (1984): Worthiness to Be Happy and Kant's Concept of the Highest Good, *Kant-Studien* 75, S. 168–90.
- 2011 [1366] Smit, Houston und Timmons, Mark (2011): The Moral Significance of Gratitude in Kant's Ethics, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 49, S. 295–320.
- 2013 [1367] Smit, Houston und Timmons, Mark (2013): Kant's Grounding Project in *The Doctrine of Virtue*, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 229–68.
- 2011 [1368] Sneddon, Andrew (2011): A New Kantian Response to Maxim-Fiddling, *Kantian Review* 16, S. 67–88.<sup>197</sup>

---

<sup>195</sup> "In this essay, I examine the motive of inner truthfulness in the moral philosophy of Kant, which came to the fore in his work in the 1790s. Truthfulness and sincerity are interpreted as the roots of all morality. In the first chapter, I present two interpretations of inner honesty from two different perspectives: in relation to a duty to oneself and to the issue of conscience. The second chapter (the core of the essay) works out the main demand of truthfulness, especially in the context of the theory of radical evil from *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*. As a last step, I show that with the motive of truthfulness, Kant's philosophy meets the thinking of F. Nietzsche, with its emphasis on sincerity."

<sup>196</sup> "This paper aims to offer an analysis of 'Against Hobbes', the title of the second section of Kant's essay *On the Common Saying: That May be Correct in Theory but is of no Use in Practice*. The paper suggests that we should take the title 'Against Hobbes' seriously and that Kant meant to target Hobbes as the standard-bearer of the old regime and in particular Hobbes's claim that the Head of state cannot act unjustly against his citizens. It is argued that Kant's interpretation of Hobbes conforms to what can be regarded as the majority view in Hobbesian scholarship and that Kant poses a serious challenge to Hobbes, in so far as he removes the very foundations from Hobbes's argument on justice, namely, a specific notion of natural law. Finally the paper highlights Kant's lack of interest in engaging with possible Hobbesian counter-arguments."

- 2002 [1369] Sob, Brigitte (2002): Die transzendente Ethik Kants. Zur Problematik einer apriorischen Moraltheorie, Frankfurt a.M., Berlin, Bern u.a.<sup>198</sup>
- 1983 [1370] Sommer, Manfred (1983): Mit dem Zufall leben. Überlegungen zu Kants Moralphilosophie, *Neue Hefte für Philosophie 22: Kants Ethik heute*, S. 95–112.
- 2005 [1371] Sommerfeld-Lethen, Caroline (2004): *Wie moralisch werden? Kants moralistische Ethik*, Freiburg.
- 2007 [1372] Sommerfeld-Lethen, Caroline (2007): Motiva auxiliaria. Kants Motivationstheorie zwischen Aristoteles und der Moralistik, in *Was ist und was sein soll. Natur und Freiheit bei Immanuel Kant*, hrsg. von Udo Kern, Berlin, S. 287–98.
- 1987 [1373] Sorell, Tom (1987): Kant's Good Will and Our Good Nature, *Kant-Studien 78*, S. 87–101. Wiederabgedruckt in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa 1998, S. 81–100.
- 1998 [1374] Spadr, Peter H. (1998): Scheler's Criticism of the Emptiness of Kant's Formal Ethics, in *Denken des Ursprungs – Ursprung des Denkens. Schelers Philosophie und ihre Anfänge in Jena*, hrsg. von Christian Bermes, Wolfhart Henckmann und Heinz Leonardy, Würzburg, S. 121–36.
- 1997 [1375] Speight, C. Allen (1997): The *Metaphysics of Morals* and Hegel's Critique of Kantian Ethics, *History of Philosophy Quarterly 14*, S. 379–402.
- 2002 [1376] Staege, Roswitha (2002): Hypothetische Imperative, *Kant-Studien 93*, S. 42–56.
- 1900 [1377] Stange, Carl (1900): Der Begriff der „hypothetischen Imperative“ in der Ethik Kants, *Kant-Studien 4*, S. 232–47.
- 1900 [1378] Stange, Carl (1900): *Einleitung in die Ethik. I: System und Kritik der ethischen Systeme*, Leipzig, S. 81–194 („Die Ethik als Lehre vom sittlichen Willen (Kant)“).
- 1920 [1379] Stange, Carl (1920): *Die Ethik Kants. Zur Einführung in die Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, Leipzig.<sup>199</sup>

---

<sup>197</sup> “There has long been a suspicion that Kant's test for the universalizability of maxims can be easily subverted: instead of risking failing the test, design your maxim for any action whatsoever in a manner guaranteed to pass. This is the problem of maxim-fiddling. The present discussion of this problem has two theses:

- 1) That extant approaches to maxim-fiddling are not satisfactory;
- 2) That a satisfactory response to maxim-fiddling can be articulated using Kantian resources, especially the first two formulations of the categorical imperative.

This approach to maxim-fiddling draws our attention to a Kantian notion of an offence against Morality itself that has largely been overlooked.”

<sup>198</sup> „Die kantische Ethik steht im Spannungsfeld von Rationalismus und Unmittelbarkeit, welche von der Vernunft nicht mehr zu fassen ist. Es ist das Faszinierende an der Theorie Kants, dass Moralität als vernünftiges Phänomen erkannt wird, welches intersubjektive Geltung beanspruchen muss. Gleichwohl kommt praktische Vernunft im Begriff des Gewissens in einen rational nicht mehr einholbaren Bereich. Inhalt: Die kantische Freiheitstheorie – Das Problem der praktischen Vernunft – Der kategorische Imperativ – Das Gewissen.“

- 2001 [1380] Stangneth, Bettina (2001): Das „Faktum der Vernunft“. Versuch einer Ortsbestimmung, in *Akten des 9. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Bd. 3, Berlin, S. 104–12.
- 2007 [1381] Stapleford, Scott (2007): On the Contradiction in Conception Test of the Categorical Imperative, *South African Journal of Philosophy* 26, 306–18.<sup>200</sup>
- 1997 [1382] Stark, Cynthia A. (1997): The Rationality of Valuing Oneself: A Critique of Kant on Self-Respect, *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 35 (1), S. 65–82.
- 1998 [1383] Stark, Cynthia A. (1998): An Unapologetic Defense of Kant’s Ethics, *Ratio* 11, S. 186–92.
- 1997 [1384] Stegmaier, Werner (1997): *Interpretationen: Hauptwerke der Philosophie. Von Kant bis Nietzsche*, Stuttgart, S. 61–94: Immanuel Kant: *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*.
- 2001 [1385] Steigleder, Klaus (2001): Hypothetische Imperative als reflexive Urteile, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd. III, S. 113–21.
- 2001 [1386] Steigleder, Klaus (2001): Kants Konzeption der Moralphilosophie als „Metaphysik der Sitten“, in *Interdisziplinäre Ethik. Grundlagen, Methoden, Bereiche*, hrsg. von Adrian Holderegger und Jean-Pierre Wils, Freiburg, Wien, S. 101–123.
- 2002 [1387] Steigleder, Klaus (2002): Kant, in *Handbuch Ethik*, hrsg. von Marcus Düwell, Christoph Hüben-thal und Micha H. Werner, Stuttgart, Weimar, S. 128–139.
- 2002 [1388] Steigleder, Klaus (2002): *Kants Moralphilosophie. Die Selbstbezüglichkeit reiner praktischer Vernunft*, Stuttgart, Weimar.
- 2006 [1389] Steigleder, Klaus (2006): The Analytic Relationship of Freedom and Morality (GMS III, 1), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 225–46.
- 2008 [1390] Steigleder, Klaus (2008): Vernunft und Universalismus am Beispiel Immanuel Kants, in *Grund-positionen und Anwendungsprobleme der Ethik (Kolleg Praktische Philosophie Band 2)*, hrsg. von Volker Steenblock, Stuttgart, S. 55–82.<sup>201</sup>
- 1999 [1391] Steinberger, Peter J. (1999): The Standard View of the Categorical Imperative, *Kant-Studien* 90, S. 91–99.

---

<sup>199</sup> Inhalt: Einleitung (1), Der Apriorismus der theoretischen Philosophie Kants (4), Der Begriff der praktischen Vernunft (22), Der Apriorismus der praktischen Vernunft (37), Glückseligkeit und Sittlichkeit (48), Der Formalismus der Kantischen Ethik (63), Die Lehre von der Freiheit (77), Das Gefühl der Achtung (91), Der Begriff des höchsten Gutes (97), Die Postulate der praktischen Vernunft (117–29).

<sup>200</sup> “The author argues against Christine Korsgaard’s influential interpretation of Kant’s contradiction in conception test of the categorical imperative. Korsgaard’s rejection of the ‘teleological’ interpretation is shown to be based on a misunderstanding of the role that teleology plays for Kant in ruling out immoral maxims, and her defence of the ‘practical’ interpretation is shown to be less faithful to the text than the competing ‘logical’ interpretation. The works of Barbara Herman and Allen Wood are also discussed and evaluated.”

<sup>201</sup> „1. Hinführung: Zwei Kernthesen Kants und ihre Erläuterung. 2. Bedingtes und unbedingtes Sollen. 3. Die Begründung des moralischen Sollens. 4. Zum Gehalt moralischen Sollens. 5. Literaturhinweise“

- 1990 [1392] Stekeler Weithofer, Pirmin (1990): Willkür und Wille bei Kant, *Kant-Studien* 81, S. 304–20.
- 2004 [1393] Stern, Robert (2004): Does ‘Ought’ Imply ‘Can’? And Did Kant Think It Does?, *Utilitas* 16, S. 42–61.<sup>202</sup>
- 2012 [1394] Stern, Robert (2012): On Hegel’s Critique of Kant’s Ethics: Beyond the Empty Formalism Objection, in *Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*, hrsg. von Thom Brooks, Chichester, Oxford, S. 73–99.
- 2012 [1395] Stern, Robert (2012): *Understanding Moral Obligation: Kant, Hegel, Kierkegaard*, Cambridge, S. 5–100 (Part I: Kant. 1. Kant, Moral Realism, and the Argument from Autonomy (7). 2. The Argument from Autonomy and the Problem of Moral Obligation (41). 3. Kant’s Solution to the Problem of Moral Obligation (68).)
- 2013 [1396] Stern, Robert (2013): Kant, Moral Obligation, and the Holy Will, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 125–52.
- 2015 [1397] Stern, Robert (2015): *Kantian Ethics: Value, Agency, and Obligation*, Oxford.<sup>203</sup>
- 1981 [1398] Stevens, Rex P. (1981): *Kant on Moral Practice*, Macon, GA.
- 2015 [1399] Sticker, Martin (2015): Educating the Common Agent: Kant on the Varieties of Moral Education, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 97, S. 358–87.<sup>204</sup>
- 2017 [1400] Sticker, Martin (2017): Kant’s Criticism of Common Moral Rational Cognition, *European Journal*

---

<sup>202</sup> “The aim of this article is twofold. First, it is argued that while the principle of ‘ought implies can’ is certainly plausible in *some* form, it is tempting to misconstrue it, and that this has happened in the way it has been taken up in some of the current literature. Second, Kant’s understanding of the principle is considered. Here it is argued that these problematic conceptions put the principle to work in a way that Kant does not, so that there is an important divergence here which can easily be overlooked.”

<sup>203</sup> Contents: I. Themes from Kant’s Ethics. 1: Kant, Moral Obligation, and the Holy Will. 2: Constructivism and the Argument from Autonomy. 3: The Value of Humanity: Reflections on Korsgaard’s Transcendental Argument. 4: Moral Scepticism and Agency: Kant and Korsgaard. 5: Moral Scepticism, Constructivism, and the Value of Humanity. 6: Does ‘Ought’ Imply ‘Can’? And Did Kant Think It Does? 7: Why Does Ought Imply Can? II. Ethics after Kant. 8: On Hegel’s Critique of Kant’s Ethics: Beyond the Empty Formalism Objection. 9: Does Hegelian Ethics Rest on a Mistake? 10: ‘My Station and its Duties’: Social Role Accounts of Obligation in Green and Bradley. 11: The Ethics of the British Idealists: Perfectionism after Kant. 12: Round Kant or Through Him? On James’s Arguments for Freedom, and their Relation to Kant’s 13: ‘Duty and Virtue are Moral Introversions’: On Løgstrup’s Critique of Morality. 14: Divine Commands and Secular Demands: On Darwall on Anscombe on ‘Modern Moral Philosophy’. Bibliography. Index.

<sup>204</sup> “I discuss the relation between Kant’s trust in the rational capacities of ordinary agents and education. First, I show that Kant is very optimistic regarding our common moral capacities. Then I discuss what room this leaves for moral education. I argue that a discussion of Kant’s conception of moral education should distinguish between different functions of education: (i) education is necessary for agents to make the transition from a purely instrumental to a pure practical use of reason (Basic Education); (ii) education can strengthen the motivational force of the moral law by presenting the moral law in all its dignity and clarity (Motivational Education); (iii) education can instruct agents about the source of morality and offer an abstract formula of the Categorical Imperative (Philosophical Education); and (iv) education can enhance agents’ capacity to apply general moral principles to concrete cases (Education of Judgement).”

of *Philosophy* 25, S. 85–108.<sup>205</sup>

- 2017 [1401] Sticker, Martin (2017): When the Reflective Watch-Dog Barks: Conscience and Self-Deception in Kant, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 51, S. 85–104.
- 2019 [1402] Sticker, Martin (2019): A Funeral March for Those Drowning in Shallow Ponds. Imperfect Duties and Emergencies, *Kant-Studien* 110, S. 236–55.<sup>206</sup>
- 2002 [1403] Stohr, Karen E. (2002): Virtue Ethics and Kant's Cold-Hearted Benefactor, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 187–204.
- 2011 [1404] Stohr, Karen (2011): Kantian Beneficence and the Problem of Obligatory Aid, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 8, S. 45–67.<sup>207</sup>
- 2007 [1405] Stolzenberg, Jürgen (2007): Kants Ethik und die Möglichkeit des Altruismus (Thomas Nagel), in *Kant in der Gegenwart*, hrsg. von Jürgen Stolzenberg, Berlin, S. 247–68.
- 2008 [1406] Stolzenberg, Jürgen (2008): The Pure "I Will" Must Be Able to Accompany All of My Desires: The Problem of a Deduction of the Categories of Freedom in Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason*, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Inter-*

---

<sup>205</sup> "There is a consensus that Kant's aim in the *Groundwork* is to clarify, systematize and vindicate the common conception of morality. Philosophical theory hence serves a restorative function. It can strengthen agents' motivation, protect against self-deception and correct misunderstandings produced by uncritical moral theory. In this paper, I argue that Kant also corrects the common perspective and that Kant's *Groundwork* shows in which senses the common perspective, even considered apart from its propensity to self-deception and without being influenced by misleading theory, is deficient. Critical practical philosophy needs to set right agents about the stringency of some of their duties, and agents need to be made aware that they have certain other duties. I discuss how Kant corrects the common agent's notion of the stringency of the duty to not make false promises and how Kant corrects the common agent's notion of duties to self. I finally discuss how his critical practical philosophy can become popular and achieve the correction of the common perspective. I stress the role of education informed by philosophical theory for this and contrast it with so called 'popular philosophy'."

<sup>206</sup> "I discuss the problem that Kant's ethics seems to be incapable of capturing our strong intuition that emergencies create a context for actions that is very different from other cases of helping and from other opportunities to further obligatory ends. I argue that if we pay attention to how Kant grounds beneficence we see that distress and emergency function as constitutive concerns. They are vital to establishing the duty of beneficence in the first place, and they also guide the application of duties to specific cases. Kant's conception of imperfect duties to others, when understood correctly, offers a way to understand why emergencies are morally important, but also why other factors have a place in our moral reasoning."

<sup>207</sup> "Common sense tells us that in certain circumstances, helping someone is morally obligatory. That intuition appears incompatible with Kant's account of beneficence as a wide imperfect duty, and its implication that agents may exercise latitude over which beneficent actions to perform. In this paper, I offer a resolution to the problem from which it follows that some opportunities to help admit latitude and others do not. I argue that beneficence has two components: the familiar wide duty to help others achieve their ends and a narrow duty to avoid indifference to others as end-setters. Although we are not always required to help, we are always required not to be indifferent. When helping someone is the only way not to be indifferent to a person, helping him/her is obligatory. My account avoids certain difficulties with other proposed solutions and can also address an important concern about proximity."

*nationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 415–25.

- 1979 [1407] Storheim, E. (1979): Kants und Fichtes Begründung der Moral, in *Erneuerung der Transzendentalphilosophie im Anschluß an Kant und Fichte. Reinhard Lauth zum 60. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Klaus Hammacher und Albert Mues, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, S. 411–24.
- 1993 [1408] Stratton-Lake, Philip (1993): Formulating Categorical Imperatives, *Kant-Studien* 83, S. 317–40.
- 1998 [1409] Stratton-Lake, Philip (1998): Kant and Contemporary Ethics, *Kantian Review* (Cardiff) 2, S. 1–13.
- 1999 [1410] Stratton-Lake, Philip (1999): Recent Work on Kant's Moral Philosophy, *Philosophical Books* 40, S. 209–18.
- 2000 [1411] Stratton-Lake, Philip (2000): *Kant, Duty and Moral Worth*, London.<sup>208</sup>
- 2006 [1412] Stratton-Lake, Philip (2006): Moral Motivation in Kant, in *A Companion to Kant*, hrsg. von Graham Bird, Oxford, S. 322–34.
- 2008 [1413] Stratton-Lake, Philip (2008): Being Virtuous and the Virtues: Two Aspects of Kant's *Doctrine of Virtue*, in *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 101–21.
- 1995 [1414] Stuhlmann-Laeisz, Rainer (1995): Obligation and Prohibition: The Only Possible Outcomes of a Moral Decision Following Kant's Categorical Imperative, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Band 2, S. 605–20.
- 1991 [1415] Sturma, Dieter (1991): Autonomie und Kontingenz. Kants nicht-reduktionistische Theorie des moralischen Selbst, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 573–88.
- 2004 [1416] Sturma, Dieter (2004): Kants Ethik der Autonomie, in *Kants Ethik*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks und Dieter Sturma, Paderborn 2004, S. 160–77.
- 2013 [1417] Sudakow, Andrej (2013): Person und Persönlichkeit. Ansätze zum konkreten Personalismus in Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten*, in *Kants »Metaphysik der Sitten« in der Diskussion. Ein Arbeitsgespräch an der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel 2009*, hrsg. von Werner Euler und Burkhard Tuschling, Berlin, S. 211–20.
- 1974 [1418] Sullivan, Roger J. (1974): The Kantian Critique of Aristotle's Moral Philosophy: An Appraisal, *Review of Metaphysics* 28, S. 24–53.
- 1989 [1419] Sullivan, Roger J. (1989): *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory*, Cambridge.
- 1994 [1420] Sullivan, Roger J. (1994): *An Introduction to Kant's Ethics*, Cambridge.

---

<sup>208</sup> "An examination of Kant's account of moral worth. The debate over whether or not Kant said moral actions have worth only if they are carried out from duty or whether actions carried out from mixed motives can be good is complex and lies at the heart of Kant's philosophy. Philip Stratton-Lake offers an account of acting from duty which utilizes the distinction between primary and secondary motives. He maintains that the moral law should not be understood as normative moral reason but as playing a transcendental role. Thus, a Kantian account of moral worth is one where the virtuous agent is one who is responsive to concrete particular considerations whilst preserving an essential role for universal moral principles."

- 1995 [1421] Sullivan, Roger J. (1995): The Influence of Kant's Anthropology on His Moral Theory, *Review of Metaphysics* 49, S. 77–94.
- 1996 [1422] Sullivan, Roger J. (1996): Introduction, in Immanuel Kant, *The Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Mary Gregor, Cambridge, S. vii–xxvi.
- 1997 [1423] Sullivan, Roger J. (1997): The Positive Role of Prudence in the Virtuous Life, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* Band 5: Themenschwerpunkt: 200 Jahre Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 461–70.
- 2007 [1424] Surprenant, Chris W. (2007): Cultivating Virtue: Moral Progress and the Kantian State, *Kantian Review* 12, S. 90–112.
- 2014 [1425] Surprenant, Chris W. (2014): *Kant and the Cultivation of Virtue*, New York.<sup>209</sup>
- 2005 [1426] Sussman, David (2005): Perversity of the Heart, *Philosophical Review* 114, S. 153–77. [Über das radikale Böse, *on radical evil*.]
- 2008 [1427] Sussman, David (2008): From Deduction to Deed: Kant's Grounding of the Moral Law, *Kantian Review* 13, S. 52–81.
- 2015 [1428] Sussman, David (2015): The Highest Good: Who Needs It?, in *The Highest Good in Aristotle and Kant*, hrsg. von Joachim Aufderheide und Ralf M. Bader, Oxford, S. 214–28.
- 2001 [1429] Sverdlik, Steven (2001): Kant, Nonaccidentalness and the Availability of Moral Worth, *Journal of Ethics* 5, S. 293–313.<sup>210</sup>
- 2012 [1430] Svovoda, Toby (2012): Duties Regarding Nature. A Kantian Approach to Environmental Ethics, *Kant-Yearbook 4: Kant and Contemporary Moral Philosophy*, S. 143–63.<sup>211</sup>

---

<sup>209</sup> 1. The Project of Kant's Practical Philosophy. 2. Freedom and Civil Society. 3. Autonomy, Coercion, and the Moral Law. 4. Moral Education and the Cultivation of Virtue. 5. Making Moral Decisions.

<sup>210</sup> "Contemporary Kantians who defend Kant's view of the superiority of the sense of duty as a form of motivation appeal to various ideas. Some say, if only implicitly, that the sense of duty is always "available" to an agent, when she has a moral obligation. Some, like Barbara Herman, say that the sense of duty provides a "nonaccidental" connection between an agent's motivation and the act's rightness. In this paper I show that the "availability" and "nonaccidentalness" arguments are in tension with one another. And the "availability" idea, although certainly supported by some passages in Kant himself, is also clearly denied in other passages. My conclusion is that Kantians will need to abandon either availability or nonaccidentalness if they wish to have a consistent set of views about the sense of duty."

<sup>211</sup> "Many philosophers have objected to Kant's account of duties regarding nonhuman nature, arguing that it does not ground adequate moral concern for non-human natural entities. However, the traditional interpretation of Kant on this issue is mistaken, because it takes him to be arguing merely that humans should abstain from animal cruelty and wanton destruction of flora solely because such actions could make one more likely to violate one's duties to human beings. Instead, I argue, Kant's account of duties regarding nature grounds much stronger limitations on how humans may treat non-human animals and flora, since such duties are rooted in the imperfect duty to increase one's own moral perfection. This duty proscribes actions affecting nonhuman nature that decrease one's moral perfection, such as those that cause organisms unnecessary harm. Moreover, the duty to moral perfection prescribes (but does not strictly require) actions affecting non-human nature that increase one's moral perfection, such as those that

- 2011 [1431] Swanton, Christine (2011): Kant's Impartial Virtues of Love, in *Perfecting Virtue. New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence Jost und Julian Wuerth, Cambridge, S. 241–259.
- 2013 [1432] Sweet, Kristie E. (2013): *Kant on Practical Life. From Duty to History*, Cambridge.<sup>212</sup>
- 1983 [1433] Swoyer, Chris (1983): Kantian Derivations, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 13, S. 409–31.
- 1993 [1434] Sytsma, Sharon (1993): The Role of "Achtung" in Kant's Moral Theory, *Auslegung* 19, S. 117–22.
- 2002 [1435] Tannenbaum, Julie (2002): Acting with Feeling from Duty, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 5, S. 321–337.<sup>213</sup>
- 2003 [1436] Taylor, Christopher R. (2003): Depositum II – Konrad Cramer's Reflections on the Logical Structure of a Kantian Moral Argument, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 57, S. 601–611.<sup>214</sup> – Zu [235]. Vgl. Dazu [1459].

---

benefit organisms. Given this interpretation, I show that, contrary to a widely held view, Kant's moral philosophy can ground a coherent and robust approach to environmental ethics."

<sup>212</sup> "Kant's 'practical philosophy' comprehends a diverse group of his writings on ethics, politics, law, religion, and the philosophy of history and culture. Kristi E. Sweet demonstrates the unity and interdependence of these writings by showing how they take as their animating principle the human desire for what Kant calls the unconditioned – understood in the context of his practical thought as human freedom. She traces the relationship between this desire for freedom and the multiple forms of finitude that confront human beings in different aspects of practical life, and stresses the interdependence of the pursuit of individual moral goodness and the formation of community through the state, religion, culture and history. This study of Kant's approach to practical life discovers that doing our duty, itself the realization of our individual freedom, requires that we set for ourselves and pursue a whole constellation of social, political and other communal ends."

Contents: Introduction. 1. Freedom of the self as such: the good will, duty, and moral feeling. 2. Freedom of the self over time: virtue. 3. Freedom of the self and the moral world: the highest good. 4. Enacting the moral world: founding and promoting a civil condition. 5. Enacting the moral world: joining the ethical community. 6. Human finitude undone: culture and history. Conclusion: practical reason's 'peculiar fate'.

<sup>213</sup> "A central claim in Kantian ethics is that an agent is properly morally motivated just in case she acts from duty alone. Bernard Williams, Michael Stocker, and Justin Oakley claim that certain emotionally infused actions, such as lending a compassionate helping hand, can only be done from compassion and not from duty. I argue that these critics have overlooked a distinction between an action's manner, how an action is done, and its motive, the agent's reason for acting. Through a range of examples I demonstrate how an emotion can determine an action's manner without also serving as the motive. Thus, it is possible for an agent to act compassionately from duty alone. This distinction between the manner and the motive of an action not only restores a central claim in Kantian ethics but it also allows for an expanded role of emotions in moral action."

<sup>214</sup> "Konrad Cramer, in "Reflections on the Logical Structure of a Kantian Moral Argument", argues that the Universal Law Formulation (UL) of the Categorical Imperative is best understood as providing us with an indirect method for determining the moral permissibility of acting on our maxims. He then goes on argue, however, that no interpretation of UL is consistent with Kant's epistemic claim that we can easily discover what morality demands of us. In response I argue that Cramer relies on an excessively demanding interpretation of Kant's epistemic claim and that his indirect interpretation of UL rests on a problematic account

- 2000 [1437] Taylor, Richard (2000): *Good and Evil*, Amherst, S. 139–56 (“Kantian Morality”).
- 2005 [1438] Taylor, Robert S. (2005): Kantian Personal Autonomy, *Political Theory* 33, S. 602–28.<sup>215</sup>
- 1951 [1439] Teale, A. E. (1951): *Kantian Ethics*, London.
- 2003 [1440] Teehan, John (2003): Kantian Ethics: After Darwin, *Zygon* 38, S. 49–60.
- 2003 [1441] Tenenbaum, Sergio (2003): Speculative Mistakes and Ordinary Temptations: Kant on Instrumentalist Conceptions of Practical Reason, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 20, S. 203–223.
- 1995 [1442] Terada, Toshiro (1995): ‘The Universal Principle of Right’ as the Supreme Principle of Kant’s Practical Philosophy, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Band 2, S. 541–48.
- 2008 [1443] Thiel, Karsten M. (2008): Über Kants vermeintlichen Rigorismus, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: Sektionen III–IV, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 439–49.
- 2013 [1444] Thiel, Karsten M. (2013): Kant’s Categorical Imperative and the Moral Worth of Increasing Profits, in *Handbook of the Philosophical Foundations of Business Ethics*, hrsg. von Christoph Luetge, Dordrecht, S. 339–54.
- 1903 [1445] Thilly, Frank (1903): Kant and Teleological Ethics, *Kant-Studien* 8, S. 30–46.
- 1993 [1446] Thomas, Geoffrey (1993): *An Introduction to Ethics. Five Central Problems of Moral Judgement*, London, S. 80–93 (“Kant”).
- 1988 [1447] Thomas, Laurence (1988): Moral Motivation: Kantians versus Humeans (and Evolution), in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 367–83.
- 1990 [1448] Thomas, Laurence (1990): Trust, Affirmation, and Moral Character: A Critique of Kantian Morality, in *Identity, Character, and Morality. Essays in Moral Psychology*, hrsg. von Owen Flanagan und Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, Cambridge, Mass., S. 235–57.

---

how our maxims relate to the actions that we perform on their basis. I then turn to the question of the overall plausibility of UL, and stress the need to interpret it within the context of Kant’s overall moral system.”

<sup>215</sup> “Jeremy Waldron has recently raised the question of whether there is anything approximating the creative self-authorship of personal autonomy in the writings of Immanuel Kant. After considering the possibility that Kantian prudential reasoning might serve as a conception of personal autonomy, I argue that the elements of a more suitable conception can be found in Kant’s Tugendlehre, or “Doctrine of Virtue” – specifically, in the imperfect duties of self-perfection and the practical love of others. This discovery is important for at least three reasons: first, it elucidates the relationship among the various conceptions of autonomy employed by personal-autonomy theorists and contemporary Kantians; second, it brings to the surface previously unnoticed or undernoticed features of Kant’s moral theory; and third, it provides an essential line of defense against certain critiques of contemporary Kantian theories, especially that of John Rawls.”

- 2016 [1449] Thomas, Natalie (2016): *Animal Ethics and the Autonomous Animal Self*, London, S. 129–53 (“Kantian Ethics and Animals”).
- 2017 [1450] Thomason, Krista K. (2017): A Good Enough Heart: Kant and the Cultivation of Emotions, *Kantian Review* 22, S. 441–62.<sup>216</sup>
- 2008 [1451] Thorndike, Oliver (2008): *Ethica Deceptrix: The Significance of Baumgarten’s Notion of a Chimerical Ethics for the Development of Kant’s Moral Philosophy*, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 451–61.
- 2018 [1452] Thorndike, Oliver (2018): *Kant’s Transition Project and Late Philosophy. Connecting the Opus postumum and Metaphysics of Morals*, London, Oxford, New York.<sup>217</sup>
- 2006 [1453] Thorpe, Lucas (2006): The Point of Studying Ethics According to Kant, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 40, S. 461–74.
- 2016 [1454] Tiberius, Valerie (2016): Does the New Wave in Moral Psychology Sink Kant?, in *The Blackwell Companion to Naturalism*, hrsg. von Kelly James Clark, Chichester, S. 336–50.
- 2000 [1455] Timmermann, Jens (2000): Kant’s Puzzling Ethics of Maxims, *Harvard Review of Philosophy* 8, S. 39–52.
- 2000 [1456] Timmermann, Jens (2000): Kant und die Lüge aus Pflicht. Zur Auflösung moralischer Dilemmata in einer kantischen Ethik, *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 107, S. 267–283.
- 2001 [1457] Timmermann, Jens (2001): The Dutiful Lie: Kantian Approaches to Moral Dilemmas, in *Kant und die Berliner Aufklärung. Akten des IX. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, hrsg. von Volker Gerhardt, Rolf-Peter Horstmann und Ralph Schumacher, Berlin, New York, Bd.

---

<sup>216</sup> “One way of understanding Kant’s views about moral emotions is the cultivation view. On this view, emotions play a role in Kantian morality provided they are properly cultivated. I evince a sceptical position about the cultivation view. First, I show that the textual evidence in support of cultivation is ambiguous. I then provide an account of emotions in Kant’s theory that explains both his positive and negative views about them. Emotions capture our attention such that they both disrupt the mind’s composure and serve as a surrogate for reason. As such, Kant cannot recommend that we cultivate our emotions.”

<sup>217</sup> “*Kant’s Transition Project and Late Philosophy* is the first study to provide a close reading of the connection between texts written by Kant during 1796 and 1798. Connecting Kant’s unfinished book project, the *Opus postumum*, with the *Metaphysics of Morals*, it identifies and clarifies issues at the forefront of Kant’s focus towards the end of his life.

Labelled by Kant as the “Transition Project”, the *Opus postumum* generates debate among commentators as to why Kant describes the project as filling a “gap” within his system of critical philosophy. This study argues for a pervasive transition project that can be traced through Kant’s entire critical philosophy and is the key to addressing current debates in the scholarship.

By showing that there is not only a Transition Project in Kant’s theoretical philosophy but also a Transition Project in his practical philosophy, it reveals why an accurate assessment of Kant’s critical philosophy requires a new understanding of the *Opus postumum* and Kant’s parallel late writings on practical philosophy. Rather than seeing Kant’s late thoughts on a Transition as afterthoughts, they must be seen at the centre of his critical philosophy.”

III, S. 345–54.

- 2001 [1458] Timmermann, Jens (2001): Alles halb so schlimm: Bemerkungen zu Kants ethischem Rigorismus, in *Ethik ohne Dogmen. Aufsätze für Günther Patzig*, hrsg. von Achim Stephan und Klaus Peter Rippe, Paderborn, S. 58–82.
- 2003 [1459] Timmermann, Jens (2003): Depositum I – Konrad Cramers Diskussion der logischen Struktur eines Kantischen Beispiels für moralisches Argumentieren, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 57, S. 589–600.<sup>218</sup> – Zu [235]. Vgl. dazu [1436].
- 2003 [1460] Timmermann, Jens (2003): *Sittengesetz und Freiheit. Untersuchungen zu Immanuel Kants Theorie des freien Willens*, Berlin, New York, S. 145–88 („Kapitel IV. Maximen“), 189–207 („Kapitel V. Moralische Motivation: das Phänomen der Achtung“).
- 2005 [1461] Timmermann, Jens (2005): Good but Not Required? – Assessing the Demands of Kantian Ethics, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 2, S. 9–27.<sup>219</sup>
- 2005 [1462] Timmermann, Jens (2005): When the Tail Wags the Dog: Animal Welfare and Indirect Duty in Kantian Ethics, *Kantian Review* 10, S. 128–49.
- 2005 [1463] Timmermann, Jens (2005): Why Kant Could not Have Been a Utilitarian, *Utilitas* 17, S. 243–64.<sup>220</sup> – Vgl. dazu [376], [1527].

---

<sup>218</sup> „Kant vertritt in der Kritik der praktischen Vernunft und im Gemeinspruch die Auffassung, daß man eine Leihgabe auch dann nicht einfach einbehalten darf, wenn dies gefahrlos möglich wäre. Wie Konrad Cramer allerdings in seinem Aufsatz zum „Depositum“ zeigt, ist es gar nicht so leicht, auf der Grundlage der Kantischen Ethik ein gutes Argument für diese Auffassung zu rekonstruieren. Im Ausgang von Cramers Kritik wird hier der Versuch unternommen, Kants Position zu stärken: Die Maxime desjenigen, der das hinterlegte Gut einbehält, ist die, sein Vermögen mit allen sicheren Mitteln zu vergrößern; wäre nun diese Maxime allgemein verbreitet, so würde es der ursprüngliche Eigentümer gar nicht wagen, sich von seinem Eigentum zu trennen. Es gäbe keine Deposita. Derjenige, der sich so am Gut eines andern bereichern möchte, untergräbt bei Allgemeinheit seiner Maxime tatsächlich die Bedingung der Möglichkeit der Einbehaltung des Depositums. Entscheidend wichtig für den Erfolg der Rekonstruktion ist die präzise Unterscheidung von „Regeln“ und „Maximen“.“

<sup>219</sup> “There seems to be a strong sentiment in pre-philosophical moral thought that actions can be morally valuable without at the same time being morally required. Yet Kant, who takes great pride in developing an ethical system firmly grounded in common moral thought, makes no provision for any such extraordinary acts of virtue. Rather, he supports a classification of actions as either obligatory, permissible or prohibited, which in the eyes of his critics makes it totally inadequate to the facts of morality. The related idea of uncommonly grand and noble deeds is frequently dismissed by Kant as high-flown emotional nonsense. Such considerations give rise to the fear that actions intuitively classed as morally commendable but not required must be re-classified as commands of duty by Kant, making his ethical theory as unbearably demanding as direct utilitarianism. The paper divides into three sections: (1) an examination of the nature of moral goodness from a meta-ethical angle that introduces some passages from Kant’s writings presenting strong theoretical evidence against the case for supererogatory action; (2) a critique of Thomas Hill’s suggestion that within the category of wide duty we can accommodate some of the main features of actions classified as supererogatory in other ethical systems; concluding that, contra Hill, there are no actions of wide duty that can be so characterized in any significant sense; and (3) a final discussion of the problem of how demanding the requirements of Kantian ethical theory really are.”

- 2006 [1464] Timmermann, Jens (2006): Kantian Duties to the Self, Explained and Defended, *Philosophy* 81, S. 505–30.<sup>221</sup>
- 2006 [1465] Timmermann, Jens (2006): Value without Regress: Kant’s ‘Formula of Humanity’ Revisited, *European Journal of Philosophy* 14, S. 69–93.
- 2007 [1466] Timmermann, Jens (2007): Simplicity and Authority: Reflections on Theory and Practice in Kant’s Moral Philosophy, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 4, S. 167–82.<sup>222</sup>
- 2007 [1467] Timmermann, Jens (2007): *Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals: A Commentary*, Cambridge.
- 2008 [1468] Timmermann, Jens (2008): Agency and Imputation: Comments on Reath, *Philosophical Books* 49, S. 114–24. – Zu [1147].
- 2008 [1469] Timmermann, Jens (2008): Kant’s *Grundlegung*: a Reply to Dieter Schönecker, *Kantian Review* 13, S. 171–77.
- 2008 [1470] Timmermann, Jens (2008): Limiting Freedom: On the Free Choice of Ends in Kantian Moral Philosophy, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 427–37.

---

<sup>220</sup> “In 1993, Richard Hare argued that, contrary to received opinion, Kant *could* have been a utilitarian. In this article, I argue that Hare was wrong. Kant’s theory would not have been utilitarian or consequentialist even if his practical recommendations coincided with utilitarian commands: Kant’s theory of value is essentially anti-utilitarian; there is no place for rational contradiction as the source of moral imperatives in utilitarianism; Kant would reject the move to separate levels of moral thinking: first-order moral judgement makes use of the principle of morality; and, relatedly, he would resist the common utilitarian distinction between actions and their motives because any correct description of an action must refer to motivation. The article concludes with the thought that any consequentialist theory based on pre-given ends (teleology) lacks the philosophical resources to distinguish between willing something as a means and as an end, leaving means only, and destroying transparency.”

<sup>221</sup> “The present article is an attempt to clarify the Kantian conception of duties to the self and to defend them against common objections. Kant’s thesis that all duty rests on duties to the self is shown to follow from the autonomy of the human will; and the allegation that they are impossible because the agent could always release himself from such a duty turns out to be question-begging. There is no attempt to prove that there are such duties, but they are revealed to be an indispensable part of morality. Traditional attributes of moral commands, such as ‘categoricity’ or ‘overridingness’ make no sense in a one-sidedly other-regarding or social conception of morality.”

<sup>222</sup> “What is the proper task of Kantian ethical theory? This paper seeks to answer this question with reference to Kant’s reply to Christian Garve in Section I of his 1793 essay on *Theory and Practice*. Kant reasserts the distinctness and natural authority of our consciousness of the moral law. Every mature human being is a moral professional – even philosophers like Garve, if only they forget about their ill-conceived ethical systems and listen to the voice of pure practical reason. Normative theory, Kant argues, cannot be refuted with reference to alleged experience. It is the proper task of the moral philosopher to emphasize this fact. The paper also discusses Kant’s attempts to clarify his moral psychology, philosophy of value and conception of the highest good in the course of replying to Garve’s challenge.”

- 2009 [1471] Timmermann, Jens (2009): Acting from Duty: Inclination, Reason and Moral Worth, in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 45–62.
- 2010 [1472] Timmermann, Jens (2010): Reversal or Retreat? Kant's Deductions of Freedom and Morality, in *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 73–90.
- 2013 [1473] Timmermann, Jens (2013): Duties to Oneself as Such (TL 6: 417–420), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 207–220.
- 2013 [1474] Timmermann, Jens (2013): Kantian Dilemmas? Moral Conflict in Kant's Ethical Theory, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 95, S. 36–64.<sup>223</sup>
- 2015 [1475] Timmermann, Jens (2015): Why Some Things Must Remain Unknown: Kant on Faith, Moral Motivation, and the Highest Good, in *The Highest Good in Aristotle and Kant*, hrsg. von Joachim Aufderheide und Ralf M. Bader, Oxford, S. 229–42.
- 2016 [1476] Timmermann, Jens (2016): Kant über Mitleidenschaft, *Kant-Studien* 107, S. 729–32.
- 2018 [1477] Timmermann, Jens (2018): A Tale of Two Conflicts. On Pauline Kleingeld's New Reading of the Formula of Universal Law, *Kant-Studien* 109, S. 581–96.<sup>224</sup> – Zu [767].
- 2018 [1478] Timmermann, Jens (2018): Autonomy, Progress and Virtue. Why Kant has Nothing to Fear from the Overdemandingness Objection, *Kantian Review* 23, S. 379–97.<sup>225</sup> – Dazu: [1363].

---

<sup>223</sup> “This paper explores the possibility of moral conflict in Kant's ethics. An analysis of the only explicit discussion of the topic in his published writings confirms that there is no room for genuine moral dilemmas. Conflict is limited to nonconclusive ‘grounds’ of obligation. They arise only in the sphere of ethical duty and, though defeasible, ought to be construed as the result of valid arguments an agent correctly judges to apply in the situation at hand. While it is difficult to determine in theory what makes some of them stronger than others, these ‘grounds’ can account for practical residue in conflict cases and for a plausible form of agent regret. The principle that ‘ought implies can’ survives intact.”

<sup>224</sup> “Pauline Kleingeld's “Contradiction and Kant's Formula of Universal Law”, published in this journal in 2017, presents a powerful challenge to what has become the standard (‘practical’) reconstruction of the categorical imperative. In this response to Kleingeld, I argue that she is right to emphasise the ‘simultaneity requirement’ – that we must be able to will a proposed maxim and ‘simultaneously’, ‘also’ or ‘at the same time’ the maxim in its universalised form – but I deny that this removes the categorical imperative test from the world of universalisation because the agent must be understood as part of that world. There are two distinct types of conflict: a contradiction that results from non-universalisability and Kleingeld's ‘volitional’ conflict, located within the will of the immoral agent. The standard ‘practical’ reconstruction of the categorical imperative remains largely intact.”

<sup>225</sup> “Is Kant's ethical theory too demanding? Do its commands ask too much of us, either by calling for self-sacrifice on particular occasions, or by pervading our lives to the extent that there is no room for permissible action? In this article, I argue that Kant's ethics is very demanding, but not excessively so. The notion of ‘latitude’ (the idea that wide duty admits of ‘exceptions’) does not help. But we need to bear in mind (i) that moral laws are self-imposed and cannot be externally enforced; (ii) that ‘right action’ is not a category of Kantian ethics – there is a more and a less, and lack of perfection does not entail vice; and (iii)

- 2009 [1479] Timmermann, Jens (Hrsg.) (2009): *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*, Cambridge.
- 1984 [1480] Timmons, Mark (1984): Contradictions and the Categorical Imperative, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 66, S. 294–312.
- 1985 [1481] Timmons, Mark (1985): Kant on the Possibility of Moral Motivation, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 23, S. 377–98.
- 1989 [1482] Timmons, Mark (1989): McCarthy on Practical Necessitation in Kant, *Kant-Studien* 80, S. 198–207.
- 1991 [1483] Timmons, Mark (1991): Kant on the Possibility of Practical Propositions, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 415–28.
- 1992 [1484] Timmons, Mark (1992): Necessitation and Justification in Kant's Ethics, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 22, S. 223–61.
- 1994 [1485] Timmons, Mark (1994): Evil and Imputation in Kant's Ethics, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 2, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 113–41.
- 1997 [1486] Timmons, Mark (1997): Decision Procedures, Moral Criteria, and the Problem of Relevant Descriptions in Kant's Ethics, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* Band 5: Themenschwerpunkt: 200 Jahre Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 389–417.
- 2002 [1487] Timmons, Mark (2002): *Moral Theory. An Introduction*, Lanham, S. 151–87 ("Kant's Moral Theory").
- 2002 [1488] Timmons, Mark (2002): Motive and Rightness in Kant's Ethical System, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 255–88.
- 2005 [1489] Timmons, Mark (2005): The Philosophical and Practical Significance of Kant's Universality Formulations of the Categorical Imperative, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 13: *Philosophia Practica Universalis. Festschrift für Joachim Hruschka zum 70. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 313–33.
- 2006 [1490] Timmons, Mark (2006): The Categorical Imperative and Universalizability (GMS, 421–424), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 158–99.
- 2013 [1491] Timmons, Mark (2013): The Perfect Duty to Oneself as an Animal Being (TL 6: 421–428), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 221–44.
- 2002 [1492] Timmons, Mark (Hrsg.) (2002): *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, Oxford.
- 2013 [1493] Timmons, Mark (Hrsg.) (2013): *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, Oxford.
- 2008 [1494] Torralba, José M. (2008): Kant on the Law of Nature as the Type of Moral Law: "On the Typic of the Faculty of Pure Practical Judgment" and the Good as the Object of Practical

---

that only practice makes perfect, i.e. how much virtue can realistically be expected can vary from agent to agent. The principle that 'ought' is limited by 'can' is firmly entrenched in Kant's ethical thought."

Reason, in *Natural Law: Historical, Systematic and Juridical Approaches*, hrsg. von Alejandro N. García, Mario Šilar und José M. Torralba, Cambridge, S. 195–221.

- 2009 [1495] Torralba, José M. (2009): The Three-fold Function of the Faculty of Judgment in Kant's Practical Philosophy: Typik, Moral Judgement and Conscience, in J. M. Torralba, *Libertad, objeto práctico y acción. La facultad del juicio en la filosofía moral de Kant*, Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, S. 423-43.
- 2003 [1496] Trampota, Andreas (2003): *Autonome Vernunft oder moralische Sehkraft? Das epistemische Fundament der Ethik bei Immanuel Kant und Iris Murdoch*, Stuttgart.
- 2004 [1497] Trampota, Andreas (2004): Autonome Vernunft mit moralischer Sehkraft. Die Komplementarität von Allgemeinem und Besonderem bei Immanuel Kant, in *Abwägende Vernunft. Praktische Rationalität in historischer, systematischer und religionsphilosophischer Perspektive*, hrsg. von Franz-Josef Bormann und Christian Schröer, Berlin, S. 203–19.
- 2013 [1498] Trampota, Andreas (2013): The Concept and Necessity of an End in Ethics (TL 6: 379–389), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 139–58.
- 2013 [1499] Trampota, Andreas/Sensen, Oliver/Timmermann, Jens (Hrsg.) (2013): *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, Berlin.<sup>226</sup>
- 2006 [1500] Trapp, Rainer W. (2006): *Folter oder selbstverschuldete Rettungsbefragung?*, Paderborn, S. 109–21.
- 1990 [1501] Trianosky, Gregory (1990): Natural Affection and Responsibility for Character: A Critique of Kantian Views of the Virtues, in *Identity, Character, and Morality. Essays in Moral Psychology*, hrsg. von Owen Flanagan und Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, Cambridge, Mass., S. 93–109.
- 1993 [1502] Tugendhat, Ernst (1993): *Vorlesungen über Ethik*, Frankfurt a. M., S. 98–130 („Kants Grundle-

---

<sup>226</sup> Acknowledgements. Contents. Abbreviations. Introduction. Idee und Notwendigkeit einer Metaphysik der Sitten (MS 6:205 – 209, 214 – 218 und TL 6:375 – 378), Zöller, Günter. Das Verhältnis der Vermögen des menschlichen Gemüts zu den Sittengesetzen (MS 6:211 – 214), Höwing, Thomas. Die Einteilungen der *Metaphysik der Sitten* im Allgemeinen und die der Tugendlehre im Besonderen (MS 6:218 – 221 und RL 6:239 – 242 und TL 6:388 – 394, 410 – 413), Ludwig, Bernd. Recht und Ethik in Kants *Metaphysik der Sitten* (MS 6:218 –221 und TL 6:390 f.), Schadow, Steffi. Prior Concepts of the Metaphysics of Morals (MS 6:221 – 228), Baum, Manfred. The Concept and Necessity of an End in Ethics (TL 6:379 – 389), Trampota, Andreas. Virtue and Its Ends (TL 6:394 – 398), Denis, Lara. Virtue and Sensibility (TL 6:399 – 409), Goy, Ina. Duties to Oneself as Such (TL 6:417 – 420), Timmermann, Jens. The Perfect Duty to Oneself as an Animal Being (TL 6:421 – 428), Timmons, Mark. The Perfect Duty to Oneself Merely as a Moral Being (TL 6:428 –437), Bacin, Stefano. The Inner Court of Conscience, Moral Self-Knowledge, and the Proper Object of Duty (TL 6:437 – 444), Esser, Andrea M. Imperfect Duties to Oneself (TL 6:444 – 447), Hill, Thomas. Duties to Others from Love (TL 6:448 – 461), Schönecker, Dieter. Duties to Others From Respect (TL 6:462 – 468), Sensen, Oliver. Friendship, Duties Regarding Specific Conditions of Persons, and the Virtues of Social Intercourse (TL 6:468 – 474), Baron, Marcia. Ethische Methodenlehre: Didaktik und Asketik (TL 6:477 – 485), Dörflinger, Bernd. Die Religionslehre als Lehre der Pflichten gegen Gott liegt außerhalb der Grenzen der reinen Moralphilosophie (TL 6:486 – 491), Ricken, Friedo. Notes on Contributors. Index of Names. Index of Subjects.

gung zur Metaphysik der Sitten: der 1. Abschnitt“), S. 131–60 („Der 2. Abschnitt von Kants Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten“).

- 1998 [1503] Tunick, Mark (1998): *Practices and Principles. Approaches to Ethical and Legal Judgment*, Princeton, N. J., S. 20–30.
- 1998 [1504] Tuschling, Burkhard (1998): Die Idee des Rechts: Hobbes und Kant, in *Recht, Staat und Völkerrecht bei Immanuel Kant*, hrsg. von Dieter Hüning und Burkhard Tuschling, Berlin, S. 85–117.
- 2000 [1505] Uleman, Jennifer K. (2000): On Kant, Infanticide, and Finding Oneself in a State of Nature, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 54, S. 173–75.
- 2010 [1506] Uleman, Jennifer K. (2010): *An Introduction to Kant's Moral Philosophy*, Cambridge.<sup>227</sup>
- 2016 [1507] Uleman, Jennifer K. (2016): No King and No Torture: Kant on Suicide and Law, *Kantian Review* 21, S. 77–100.<sup>228</sup>
- 2016 [1508] Uleman, Jennifer K. (2016): Kant and Moral Motivation. The Value of Free Rational Willing, in *Moral Motivation. A History*, hrsg. von Iakovos Vasiliou, Oxford, S. 202–26.
- 2005 [1509] Uniacke, Suzanne (2005): Responsibility and Obligation: Some Kantian Directions, *International*

---

<sup>227</sup> Acknowledgements ix. **1 Introduction: the strange thing** 1. The strange thing 1. The free rational will 9. The value of free rational will 15. The importance of the strange thing for moral philosophy 19. **2 A sketch of Kantian will: desire and the human subject** 23. Desire, choice, will 25. Desire and the human subject 34. **3 A sketch continued: the structure of practical reason** 39. Will as practical reason: practical rules, laws, and principles 39. Maxims, or subjective practical principles 41. Grounds for action: the representation in a principle of something as good 48. Imperatives 51. Pure practical reason, or the possibility of a categorical imperative 56. **4 A sketch completed: freedom** 63. An overview of the free Kantian will 63. The free Kantian will in more detail 65. Rational freedom 72. **5 Against nature: Kant's argumentative strategy** 75. The problem 75. Kant's understanding of nature 79. Kant's common-sense case against a natural foundation for morality 80. Kant against nature 107. **6 The categorical imperative: free will willing itself** 111. Kant's formalism 112. Kant's categorical imperative: its form and its content 121. Free will willing itself 140. **7 What's so good about the good Kantian will? The appeals of the strange thing** 145. Introduction 145. The good of free rational willing 149. **8 Conclusion: Kant and the goodness of the good will** 175. Bibliography 180. Index 187.

<sup>228</sup> “Kant's most canonical argument against suicide, the universal law argument, is widely dismissed. This paper attempts to save it, showing that a suicide maxim, universalized, undermines all bases for practical law, resisting both the non-negotiable value of free rational willing and the ordinary array of sensuous commitments that inform prudential incentives. Suicide therefore undermines moral law-governed community as a whole, threatening 'savage disorder'. In pursuing this argument, I propose a non-teleological and non-theoretical nature – a 'practical nature' or moral law governed whole – the realization of which morality demands.”

- 2003 [1510] Unna, Yvonne (2003): Kant's Answers to the Casuistical Questions Concerning Self-Disembodiment, *Kant-Studien* 94, S. 454–73.
- 2010 [1511] Varden, Helga (2010): Kant and Lying to the Murderer at the Door . . . One More Time: Kant's Legal Philosophy and Lies to Murderers and Nazis, *Journal of Social Philosophy* 41, S. 403–21.
- 2017 [1512] Varden, Helga (2017): Kant and Sexuality, in *The Palgrave Kant Handbook*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, London, S. 331–53.
- 2004 [1513] Velleman, J. David (2004): Willing the Law, in *Practical Conflicts: New Philosophical Essays*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler und Peter Baumann, Cambridge, S. 27–56. Wiederabgedruckt in Velleman, *Self to Self. Selected Essays*, Cambridge 2006, S. 284–311.
- 2006 [1514] Velleman, J. David (2006): A Brief Introduction to Kantian Ethics, in ders., *Self to Self. Selected Essays*, Cambridge, S. 16–44.
- 1991 [1515] Virvidakis, Stelios (1991): On Constructing and Discovering Moral Facts, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 429–38.
- 2008 [1516] Vogt, Katja (2008): Duties to Others: Demands and Limits, in *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, hrsg. von Monika Betzler, Berlin, S. 219–43.
- 1989 [1517] Vossenkuhl, Wilhelm (1989): „Von der äußersten Grenze aller praktischen Philosophie“, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 299–313.
- 1990 [1518] Vuillemin, Jules (1990): Kant's Moral Intuitionism, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 75, 57–70.
- 1994 [1519] Wagner, Hans (1994): Kants Konzept von hypothetischen Imperativen, *Kant-Studien* 85, S. 78–84.
- 1993 [1520] Wahidure Rahman, A. N. M. (1993): Kant's Concepts of Duty and Happiness, *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* 20, S.85–103.
- 1972 [1521] Walhout, D. (1972): Kant's Conception of Nonmoral Good, *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 3, S. 7–19.
- 2012 [1522] Walker, Mark Thomas (2012): *Kant, Schopenhauer and Morality: Recovering the Categorical Imperative*, Basingstoke.
- 1978 [1523] Walker, Ralph C. S. (1978): *Kant*, London, S. 151–64 (“XI. The Moral Law”).

---

<sup>229</sup> “This paper asks how we should conceptualize the relationship between responsibility and obligation. Its central concern is the relevance of considerations of obligation to the attribution of responsibility for what we do or bring about. The paper approaches this issue through an examination of Kant's complex, challenging and instructive theory of responsibility, in which strict obligation plays a pivotal role in attributions of responsibility for the outcomes of our actions. Even if we do not accept Kant's strongly juridical concept of responsibility, his theory provides insight into the way in which we should see the connection between responsibility and obligation.”

- 1988 [1524] Walker, Ralph C. S. (1989): The Rational Imperative: Kant Against Hume, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 74, 113–33.
- 1989 [1525] Walker, Ralph C. (1989): Achtung in the *Grundlegung*, in *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten. Ein kooperativer Kommentar*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Frankfurt a. M., S. 97–116.
- 2017 [1526] Walker, Ralph C. (2017): The Primacy of Practical Reason, in *The Palgrave Kant Handbook*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, London, S. 191–209.
- 2016 [1527] Wall, Edmund (2016): Timmermann, Forschler, and the Attempt to Bridge the Kantian-Consequentialist Gap, *Metaphilosophy* 47, S. 696–99. – Zu [376], [1463].
- 2015 [1528] Walla, Alice Pinheiro (2015): Kant’s Moral Theory and Demandingness, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 18, S. 731–43.<sup>230</sup>
- 2006 [1529] Ward, Andrew (2006): *Kant. The Three Critiques*, Cambridge, S. 139–79 (“Critique of Practical Reason”).
- 1972 [1530] Ward, Keith (1972): *The Development of Kant’s View of Ethics*, Oxford.
- 2014 [1531] Ware, Owen (2014): Rethinking Kant’s Fact of Reason, *Philosophers’ Imprint* 14, No. 32, S. 1–21.<sup>231</sup>
- 2014 [1532] Ware, Owen (2014): Skepticism in Kant’s *Groundwork*, *European Journal of Philosophy* 24, S. 375–96.<sup>232</sup>

---

<sup>230</sup> “In this paper, I sketch a Kantian account of duties of rescue, which I take to be compatible with Kant’s theory. I argue that there is in fact no Btrumping relation^ between imperfect and perfect duties but merely that Blatitude shrinks away^ in certain circumstances. Against possible demandingness objections, I explain why Kant thought that imperfect duty must allow latitude for choice and argue that we must understand the necessary space for pursuing one’s own happiness as entailed by Kant’s justification of one’s duty to promote other’s happiness. Nevertheless, becoming worthy of happiness has always priority over one’s own happiness, even when circumstances are such that we cannot secure our own happiness without seriously neglecting more pressing needs of other persons. I conclude that Kant’s moral theory calls for complementation by the political and juridical domain. Implementing just political institutions and creating satisfactorily well-ordered societies create an external world which is friendlier to our attempts to reconcile moral integrity and a happy human life.”

<sup>231</sup> “Kant’s doctrine of the Fact of Reason is one of the most perplexing aspects of his moral philosophy. The aim of this paper is to defend Kant’s doctrine from the common charge of dogmatism. My defense turns on a previously unexplored analogy to the notion of ‘matters of fact’ popularized by members of the Royal Society in the seventeenth century. In their work, ‘facts’ were beyond doubt, often referring to experimental effects one could witness first hand. While Kant uses the German equivalent (‘Tatsachen’) in different contexts, I argue that the scientific analogy opens up a new framework for interpreting his strategy of justification in the Critique of Practical Reason. In the final section, I address a few possible objections to my reading, one of which I anticipate coming from Dieter Henrich (1989) and Ian Proops (2003), who have argued that Kant’s Fact of Reason is best understood under a legal analogy”

<sup>232</sup> “This paper offers a new interpretation of Kant’s relationship with skepticism in the *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. My position differs from commonly held views in the literature in two ways. On the one hand, I argue that Kant’s relationship with skepticism is active and systematic (contrary to Hill, Wood, Rawls, Timmermann, and Allison). On the other hand, I argue that the kind of skepticism Kant is interested

- 2015 [1533] Ware, Owen (2015): Accessing the Moral Law through Feeling, *Kantian Review* 20, S. 301–11.<sup>233</sup>  
– Zu [467]. – Dazu: [470].
- 2017 [1534] Ware, Owen (2017): Kant’s Deductions of Morality and Freedom, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 47, S. 116–47.<sup>234</sup>
- 1967 [1535] Warnock, G. J. (1967): The Primacy of Practical Reason, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Volume 52, S. 253–66:
- 1961 [1536] Wassmer, Thomas A. (1960/61): Responsibility and Pleasure in Kantian Morality, *Kant-Studien* 52, S. 452–66.
- 2010 [1537] Watkins, Eric (2010): The Antinomy of Practical Reason: Reason, the Unconditioned and the Highest Good, in *Kant’s Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 145–67.
- 2002 [1538] Watkins, Eric/Fitzpatrick, William (2002): O’Neill and Korsgaard on the Construction of Normativity, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 349–67. – Vgl. dazu [217].
- 1986 [1539] Watson, Stephen H. (1986): Kant on Autonomy, the Ends of Humanity and the Possibility of Morality, *Kant-Studien* 77, S. 165–182.
- 2003 [1540] Weber, Michael (2003): The Motive of Duty and the Nature of Emotions: Kantian Reflections on the Moral Worth, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 33, S. 183–202.
- 2007 [1541] Weber, Michael (2007): More on the Motive of Duty, *Journal of Ethics* 11, S. 65–86.<sup>235</sup>

---

in does not speak to the philosophical tradition in any straightforward sense (contrary to Forster and Guyer). On my reading, Kant takes up a skeptical method in the *Groundwork* as a way of exposing certain obstacles in our ordinary and philosophical thinking about morality. The central obstacle he is interested in is practical in character, arising from a natural tendency we have to rationalize against the moral law. In attempting to resolve this tendency, I argue, the *Groundwork* turns out to have a profoundly educative task.”

<sup>233</sup> “In this article I offer a critical commentary on Jeanine Grenberg’s claim that, by the time of the second *Critique*, Kant was committed to the view that we only access the moral law’s validity through the feeling of respect. The issue turns on how we understand Kant’s assertion that our consciousness of the moral law is a ‘fact of reason’. Grenberg argues that all facts must be forced, and anything forced must be felt. I defend an alter native interpretation, according to which the fact of reason refers to the actuality of our moral consciousness.”

<sup>234</sup> “It is commonly held that Kant ventured to derive morality from freedom in *Groundwork* III. It is also believed that he reversed this strategy in the second *Critique*, attempting to derive freedom from morality instead. In this paper, I set out to challenge these familiar assumptions: Kant’s argument in *Groundwork* III rests on a moral conception of the intelligible world, one that plays a similar role as the ‘fact of reason’ in the second *Critique*. Accordingly, I argue, there is no reversal in the proof-structure of Kant’s two works.”

<sup>235</sup> “A number of neo-Kantians have suggested that an act may be morally worthy even if sympathy and similar emotions are present, so long as they are not what in fact motivates right action—so long as duty, and duty alone, in fact motivates. Thus, the ideal Kantian moral agent need not be a cold and unfeeling person, as some critics have suggested. Two objections to this view need to be answered. First, some maintain that motives cannot be present without in fact motivating. Such non-motivating reasons, it is claimed, are incoherent. Second, if such motives are not in fact motivating, then nonetheless the moral agent’s

- 2015 [1542] Wehofsits, Anna (2015): *Anthropologie und Moral. Affekte, Leidenschaften und Mitgefühl in Kants Ethik*, Berlin.
- 2001 [1543] Weidemann, Hermann (2001): Kants Kritik am Eudämonismus und die Platonische Ethik, *Kant-Studien* 92, S. 19–37.
- 2008 [1544] Weinrib, Jacob (2008): The Juridical Significance of Kant's 'Supposed Right to Lie', *Kantian Review* 13, S. 141–70.
- 2000 [1545] Weiper, Susanne (2000): *Triebfeder und höchstes Gut. Untersuchungen zum Problem der sittlichen Motivation bei Kant, Schopenhauer und Scheler*, Würzburg.
- 1971 [1546] Welding, S. O. (1971): Über den Begriff der Pflicht bei Kant, *Ratio* 13, S. 148–73.
- 1986 [1547] Wellmer, Albrecht (1986): *Ethik und Dialog. Elemente des moralischen Urteils bei Kant und in der Diskursethik*, Frankfurt a. M.
- 2007 [1548] Wendel, Hans Jürgen (2007): Vernünftige Selbstbestimmung und gutes Leben, in *Was ist und was sein soll. Natur und Freiheit bei Immanuel Kant*, hrsg. von Udo Kern, Berlin, S. 241–64.
- 1991 [1549] Wenzel, Uwe Justus (1991): Moral im Abstand. Die „Operation der Reflexion“ im moralischen Grenzfall, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 439–54.
- 1974 [1550] Werner, Hans-Joachim (1974): Moralität ohne Inhalt? Zum Problem der Bestimmbarkeit allgemeiner ethischer Normen im Anschluß an die Ethik Kants, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 28, S. 585–98.
- 2003 [1551] Werner, Micha H. (2003): *Diskursethik als Maximenethik. Von der Prinzipienbegründung zur Handlungsorientierung*, Würzburg, S. 102–50 („Anwendungsprobleme' der Ethik Kants“).
- 2004 [1552] Werner, Micha H. (2004): Kants pflichtenethischer Rigorismus und die Diskursethik: eine maximenethische Deutung des Anwendungsproblems, in *Perspektiven der Diskursethik*, hrsg. von Niels Gottschalk-Mazouz, Würzburg, S. 81–110.
- 1991 [1553] Westphal, Kenneth R. (1991): Hegel's Critique of Kant's Moral World View, *Philosophical Topics* 19, S. 133–176.
- 1995 [1554] Westphal, Kenneth R. (1995): How "Full" is Kant's Categorical Imperative?, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 3, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 465–509. – Zu [555] und [1251].
- 2002 [1555] Westphal, Kenneth R. (2002): A Kantian Justification of Possession, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 89–110.
- 2005 [1556] Westphal, Kenneth R. (2005): Kant, Hegel, and Determining Our Duties, in *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 13: *Philosophia Practica Universalis. Festschrift für Joachim Hruschka zum*

---

performance of right action will be objectionably cold and unfeeling. While the first objection is not compelling, since the alternative according to which all motives in fact motivate but differ in strength suffers from the very same problems attributed to the neo-Kantian view, the second has force, and any account of moral worth must make room for motives such as sympathy actually motivating right action.”

70. Geburtstag, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd und Jan C. Joerden, Berlin, S. 335–54.

- 2016 [1557] Westphal, Kenneth R. (2016): *How Hume and Kant Reconstruct Natural Law: Justifying Strict Objectivity without Debating Moral Realism*, Oxford.
- 2016 [1558] Westra, Adam (2016): *The Typic in Kant's Critique of Practical Reason. Moral Judgment and Symbolic Representation*, Berlin.
- 2011 [1559] White, Mark D. (2011): *Kantian Ethics and Economics. Autonomy, Dignity, and Character*, Stanford, Cal.
- 1990 [1560] White, Roger M. (1990): 'Ought' Implies 'Can': Kant and Luther, a Contrast, in *Kant and His Influence*, hrsg. von George MacDonald Ross und Tony McWalter, Bristol. Reprint: London 2005, S. 1–72.
- 1996 [1561] Whiting, Jennifer (1996): Self-Love and Authoritative Virtue: Prolegomenon to a Kantian Reading of *Eudemian Ethics* viii 3, in *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics. Rethinking Happiness and Duty*, hrsg. von Stephen Engstrom und Jennifer Whiting, Cambridge, S. 162–199.
- 1994 [1562] Wichmann, Heinz (1994): Probleme der Kantischen Ethik. Überlegungen im Anschluß an Paul Menzers kritische Betrachtung, *Kant-Studien* 85, S. 303–308.
- 1998 [1563] Wielenberg, E. (1998): Goodness without Qualification, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 32, S. 93–104.
- 1995 [1564] Wiggins, David (1995): Categorical Requirements: Kant and Hume on the Idea of Duty, in *Virtues and Reasons. Philippa Foot and Moral Theory. Essays in Honour of Philippa Foot*, hrsg. von Rosalind Hursthouse, Gavin Lawrence und Warren Quinn, Oxford, S. 297–330.
- 1984 [1565] Wike, Victoria (1984): Kant's Practical Antinomy, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 22, S. 425–33.
- 1987 [1566] Wike, Victoria (1987): The Role of Happiness in Kant's *Groundwork*, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 21, S. 73–78.
- 1991 [1567] Wike, Victoria (1991): Kant on the Indirect Duty to Pursue Happiness, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke, Bonn, Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 599–613.
- 1983 [1568] Wike, Victoria (1983): Metaphysical Foundations of Morality in Kant, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 17, S. 225–33.
- 1993 [1569] Wike, Victoria (1993): Does Kant's Ethics Require that the Moral Law Be the Sole Determining Ground of the Will?, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 27, S. 85–92.
- 2011 [1570] Wike, Victoria S. (2011): Defending Kant Against Nodding's Care Ethics Critique, *Kant Studies Online* (Januar 2011), S. 1–26, <http://www.kantstudiesonline.net>.
- 2010 [1571] Wike, Victoria/Showler, Ryan L. (2010): Kant's Concept of the Highest Good and the Archetype-Ectype Distinction, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 44, S. 521–33.
- 1975 [1572] Wilde, Leo Henri (1975): *Hypothetische und Kategorische Imperative. Eine Interpretation zu Kants „Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten“*, Bonn.
- 1894 [1573] Wilde, Norman (1894): Kant's Relation to Utilitarianism, *Philosophical Review* 3, S. 289–304.

- 1997 [1574] Wildt, Andreas (1997): Zum Verhältnis von Recht und Moral bei Kant, *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie* 83, S. 159–74.
- 1991 [1575] Willaschek, Marcus (1991): Die Tat der Vernunft. Zur Bedeutung der These vom „Factum der Vernunft“, *Akten des Siebenten Internationalen Kant-Kongresses, Mainz 1990*, hrsg. von Gerhard Funke. Bonn/Berlin, Band II, 1, S. 455–79.
- 1992 [1576] Willaschek, Marcus (1992): *Praktische Vernunft. Handlungstheorie und Moralbegründung bei Kant*, Stuttgart.
- 1995 [1577] Willaschek Marcus (1995): Was sind praktische Gesetze?, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Milwaukee, Band 2, S. 533–40.
- 1997 [1578] Willaschek, Marcus (1997): Why the Doctrine of Right does not belong in the Metaphysics of Morals. On Some Basic Distinctions in Kant’s Moral Philosophy, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 5, S. 205–227.
- 2002 [1579] Willaschek, Marcus (2002): Which Imperatives of Right? On the Non-Prescriptive Character of Juridical Laws in *Kant’s Metaphysics of Morals*, in *Kant’s Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 65–88.
- 2006 [1580] Willaschek, Marcus (2006): Practical Reason. A Commentary on Kant’s *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (GMS, 412–417), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 121–38.
- 2009 [1581] Willaschek, Marcus (2009): Rationale Postulate. Über Kants These vom Primat der reinen praktischen Vernunft, in *Kant und die Zukunft der europäischen Aufklärung*, hrsg. von Heiner Klemme, Berlin, S. 251–68.
- 2009 [1582] Willaschek, Marcus (2009): Right and Coercion: Can Kant’s Conception of Right be Derived from his Moral Theory?, *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 17, S. 49–70.<sup>236</sup>
- 2010 [1583] Willaschek, Marcus (2010): The Primacy of Practical Reason and the Idea of a Practical Postulate, in *Kant’s Critique of Practical Reason. A Critical Guide*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath und Jens Timmermann, Cambridge, S. 168–96.

---

<sup>236</sup> “Recently, there has been some discussion about the relationship between Kant’s conception of right (the sphere of juridical rights and duties) and his moral theory (with the Categorical Imperative as its fundamental norm). In section 1, I briefly survey some recent contributions to this debate and distinguish between two different questions. First, does Kant’s moral theory (as developed in the *Groundwork* and the *Critique of Practical Reason*) imply, or validate, a Kantian conception of right (as developed in the first part of the *Metaphysics of Morals*, the Doctrine of Right)? In other words, is the Categorical Imperative *sufficient* to show that the fundamental principles of right are normatively valid? Second, does Kant’s conception of right *presuppose* his moral theory? In other words, is the Categorical Imperative *necessary* to show that the basic principles of right are normatively valid? In this paper, I will be primarily concerned with defending a negative answer to the first of these questions. In section 2, I will discuss Paul Guyer’s attempt to vindicate a positive answer to the same question. In section 3, reasons will be given why any attempt to derive Kant’s conception of right from the Categorical Imperative must fail because of the analytic connection between right and coercion.”

- 1968 [1584] Williams, T. C. (1968): *The Concept of the Categorical Imperative. A Study of the Place of the Categorical Imperative in Kant's Ethical Theory*, Oxford.
- 2008 [1585] Wilson, Donald (2008): Middle Theory, Manipulation, and Inner Freedom, in *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses*, Band 3: *Sektionen III–IV*, hrsg. von Valerio Rohden, Ricarda R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida und Margit Ruffing, Berlin, S. 463–71.
- 2008 [1586] Wilson, Eric Entrican (2008): Kantian Autonomy and the Moral Self, *Review of Metaphysics* 62, S. 355–81.
- 2009 [1587] Wilson, Eric Entrican (2009): Is Kant's Concept of Autonomy Absurd?, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 26, S. 159–74.
- 2014 [1588] Wilson, Eric Entrican (2014): Kant's Moral Philosophy, in *Routledge Companion to Eighteenth Century Philosophy*, hrsg. von Aaron Garrett, London, S. 442–64.
- 2015 [1589] Wilson, Eric Entrican (2015): Self-Legislation and Self-Command in Kant's Ethics, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 96, S. 256–78.<sup>237</sup>
- 1997 [1590] Wilson, Holly L. (1997): Kant's Integration of Morality and Anthropology, *Kant-Studien* 88, S. 87–104.
- 1980 [1591] Wimmer, Reiner (1980): *Universalisierung in der Ethik. Analyse, Kritik und Rekonstruktion ethischer Rationalitätsansprüche*, Frankfurt a. M., S. 122–206 („Kants politische Philosophie und Ethik“), S. 333–57 („Kants Universalisierungstest für Maximen“).
- 1982 [1592] Wimmer, Reiner (1982): Die Doppelfunktion des Kategorischen Imperativs in Kants Ethik, *Kant-Studien* 73, S. 291–320.
- 2013 [1593] Winegar, Reed (2013): An Unfamiliar and Positive Law: On Kant and Schiller, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 95, S. 275–97.<sup>238</sup>
- 2006 [1594] Witschen, Dieter (2006): Achtung und Nächstenliebe. Zu einer Unterscheidung in Kants „Metaphysik der Sitten“, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 53, S. 617–634.
- 2008 [1595] Witschen, Dieter (2008): Kultivierung des Gewissens – eine Pflicht gegenüber sich selbst. Kantische Reflexionen, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 55, S. 128–

---

<sup>237</sup> “In his later writings, Kant distinguishes between autonomy and self-mastery or self-command. My article explains the relation between these two ideas, both of which are integral to his understanding of moral agency and the pursuit of virtue. I point to problems with other interpretations of this relation and offer an alternative. On my view, self-command is a condition or state achieved by those agents who become proficient at solving problems presented by the passions. Such agents are able to stick to the results of self-legislation over time and thereby achieve a form of temporally extended freedom.”

<sup>238</sup> “A familiar post-Kantian criticism contends that Kant enslaves sensibility under the yoke of practical reason. Friedrich Schiller advanced a version of this criticism to which Kant publicly responded. Recent commentators have emphasized the role that Kant's reply assigns to the pleasure that accompanies successful moral action. In contrast, I argue that Kant's reply relies primarily on the sublime feeling that arises when we merely contemplate the moral law. In fact, the pleasures emphasized by other recent commentators depend on this sublime feeling. These facts illuminate Kant's views regarding the relationship between morality, freedom, and the development of moral feelings.”

- 2012 [1596] Witschen, Dieter (2012): Warum gilt Kant als Erzdeontologe. Ein Spektrum von Gründen, in *Deontologie - Teleologie. Normtheoretische Grundlagen in der Diskussion*, hrsg. von Adrian Holderegger und Werner Wolbert, Fribourg 2012, S. 227–47.
- 2003 [1597] Wittwer, Héctor (2003): Über einige Voraussetzungen und Ergebnisse der Ethik Kants, *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 110, S. 23–45.
- 1988 [1598] Wolf, Jean-Claude (1988): Kant und Schopenhauer über die Lüge, *Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Philosophie* 10, S. 69–80.
- 2006 [1599] Wolf, Jean-Claude (2006): Unordnung in Kants Ethik und Rechtsphilosophie, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 295–309.
- 2009 [1600] Wolff, Michael (2009): Warum das Faktum der Vernunft ein Faktum ist. Auflösung einiger Verständnisschwierigkeiten in Kants Grundlegung der Moral, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 57, S. 511–49.
- 2015 [1601] Wolff, Michael (2015): Warum der kategorische Imperativ nach Kants Ansicht gültig ist – Eine Beschreibung der Argumentationsstruktur im Dritten Abschnitt seiner *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*, in *Kants Begründung von Freiheit und Moral in Grundlegung III. Neue Interpretationen*, hrsg. von Dieter Schönecker, Münster, S. 257–330.
- 2018 [1602] Wolff, Michael (2018): Kant und der praktische Syllogismus. Zu Rüdiger Bittners Einwänden gegen Kants ‚Theorie‘ des Handelns nach Grundsätzen, *Kant-Studien* 109, S. 419–46.<sup>239</sup>
- 1973 [1603] Wolff, Robert Paul (1973): *The Autonomy of Reason. A Commentary on Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Gloucester, Mass. 1986.
- 1972 [1604] Wood, Allen W. (1972): Kant on False Promises, in *Proceedings of the Third International Kant Congress (1970)*, hrsg. von Lewis White Beck, Dordrecht, S. 614–19.
- 1976 [1605] Wood, Allen W. (1976): Kant on the Rationality of Morals, in *Proceedings of the Ottawa Congress on Kant in the Anglo-American and Continental Traditions*, hrsg. von P. La Berge, F. Duchesse und B. E. Morrisey, Ottawa, S. 94p109.
- 1989 [1606] Wood, Allen W. (1989): The Emptiness of the Moral Will, *Monist* 73, S. 454–83.
- 1998 [1607] Wood, Allen W. (1991): Unsociable Sociability: The Anthropological Basis of Kantian Ethics, *Philosophical Topics* 19, S. 325–51. – Ungesellige Geselligkeit: Die anthropologischen Grundlagen der kantischen Ethik, in *Recht, Staat und Völkerrecht bei Immanuel Kant*, hrsg. von Dieter Hüning und Burkhard Tuschling, Berlin 1998, S. 35–52.
- 1991 [1608] Wood, Allen W. (1991): *Hegel's Ethical Thought*, Cambridge, S. 154–73 (“The Emptiness of the Moral Law”).

---

<sup>239</sup> “According to Bittner, Kant has established a theory of action that is untenable because it attempts to explain action on the basis of a theory of practical syllogisms. This article defends Kant’s view (developed in GMS II, AA 04: 412.26–30) by explaining the meaning in which actions can be ‘deduced’ from practical laws or from maxims.”

- 1995 [1609] Wood, Allen W. (1995): Humanity as End in Itself, in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Kant Congress, Memphis 1995*, hrsg. von Hoke Robinson, Vol. 1, Part 1, Milwaukee, S. 301–19. Wiederabgedruckt in *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Critical Essays*, hrsg. von Paul Guyer, Totowa 1998, S. 165–87.
- 1996 [1610] Wood, Allen W. (1996): Self-Love, Self-Benevolence, and Self-Conceit, in *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics. Rethinking Happiness and Duty*, hrsg. von Stephen Engstrom und Jennifer Whiting, Cambridge, S. 141–61.
- 1996 [1611] Wood, Allen W. (1996): General Introduction, in Immanuel Kant, *Practical Philosophy*. Translated and Edited by Mary J. Gregor (*The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*), Cambridge, S.xiii–xxxiii.
- 1997 [1612] Wood, Allen W. (1997): The Final Form of Kant's Practical Philosophy, in *Spindel Conference 1997 on Kant's Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Nelson Potter und Mark Timmons (*Southern Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 36, Supplement), Memphis, S. 1–20 (dazu: Paul Guyer, Comments: Justice and Morality, S. 21–28).
- 1998 [1613] Wood, Allen W. (1998): Kant on Duties Regarding Nonrational Nature, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Supplement 72, S. 189–210.
- 1999 [1614] Wood, Allen W. (1999): *Kant's Ethical Thought*, Cambridge.
- 2000 [1615] Wood, Allen W. (2000): Kant's Practical Philosophy, in *The Cambridge Companion to German Idealism*, hrsg. von Karl Ameriks, S. 57–75.
- 2001 [1616] Wood, Allen W. (2001): Der gute Wille, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 49, S. 819–30.
- 2001 [1617] Wood, Allen W. (2001): Kant versus Eudaimonism, in *Kant's Legacy: Essays in Honor of Lewis White Beck*, hrsg. von Predrag Cicovacki, Rochester, S. 261–81.
- 2001 [1618] Wood, Allen W. (2001): Was ist Kantische Ethik?, in *Systematische Ethik mit Kant*, hrsg. von Hans-Ulrich Baumgarten und Carsten Held, Freiburg, S. 381–408.
- 2002 [1619] Wood, Allen W. (2002): The Final Form of Kant's Practical Philosophy, in *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 1–21.
- 2002 [1620] Wood, Allen W. (2002): Preface and Introduction (3–16), in *Immanuel Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*, hrsg. von Otfried Höffe, Berlin, S. 25–41.
- 2002 [1621] Wood, Allen W. (2002): What Is Kantian Ethics?, in Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, edited and translated by Allen W. Wood. With Essays by J. B. Schneewind, Marica Baron, Shelly Kagan, Allen W. Wood, New Haven 2002, S. 157–81.
- 2005 [1622] Wood, Allen W. (2005): *Kant*, Oxford, S. 129–50 ("Ethical Theory").
- 2006 [1623] Wood, Allen W. (2006): Kant's Formulations of the Moral Law, in *A Companion to Kant*, hrsg. von Graham Bird, Oxford, S. 291–307.
- 2006 [1624] Wood, Allen W. (2006): The Good Without Limitation (GMS, 393–394), in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, hrsg. von Christoph Horn und Dieter Schönecker, Berlin, S. 25–44.

- 2007 [1625] Wood, Allen W. (2007): Comments on Guyer, *Inquiry* 50, S. 465–79.<sup>240</sup> – Zu [498].
- 2008 [1626] Wood, Allen W. (2008): *Kantian Ethics*, Cambridge.<sup>241</sup>
- 2009 [1627] Wood, Allen W. (2009): Duties to Oneself, Duties of Respect to Others, in *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*, hrsg. von Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Malden, MA, S. 229–51.
- 2011 [1628] Wood, Allen W. (2011): Humanity as an End in Itself, in Derek Parfit, *On What Matters* Volume 2, Oxford, S. 58–82.
- 2011 [1629] Wood, Allen W. (2011): Kant and Agent-Oriented Ethics, in *Perfecting Virtue. New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence Jost und Julian Wuerth, Cambridge, S. 58–91.
- 2013 [1630] Wood, Allen W. (2013): Kant on Practical Reason, in *Kant on Practical Justification. Interpretative Essays*, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 57–86. – Revidierte Version in Wood, *The Free Development of Each. Studies on Freedom, Right, and Ethics in Classical German Philosophy*, Oxford 2014, S. 40–69.
- 2014 [1631] Wood, Allen W. (2014): Moral Worth, Merit, and Acting from Duty, in Wood, *The Free Development of Each. Studies on Freedom, Right, and Ethics in Classical German Philosophy*, Oxford, S. 13–39.
- 2014 [1632] Wood, Allen W. (2014): The Independence of Right from Ethics, in Wood, *The Free Development of Each. Studies on Freedom, Right, and Ethics in Classical German Philosophy*, Oxford, S. 70–89.
- 2015 [1633] Wood, Allen W. (2015): Kant and Virtue Ethics, in *The Routledge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Lorraine-Besser Jones und Michael Slote, New York und Abingdon, S. 307–19.
- 2017 [1634] Wood, Allen W. (2017): *Formulas of the Moral Law*, Cambridge (*Cambridge Elements: The Philosophy of Immanuel Kant*).<sup>242</sup>

---

<sup>240</sup> “Paul Guyer’s paper “Naturalistic and Transcendental Moments in Kant’s Moral Philosophy” raises a set of issues about how Kantian ethics should be understood in relation to present day “philosophical naturalism” that are very much in need of discussion. The paper itself is challenging, even in some respects iconoclastic, and provides a highly welcome provocation to raise in new ways some basic questions about what Kantian ethics is and what it ought to be. Guyer offers us an admirably informed and complex argument, both historical and philosophical, that tangles with some of the most difficult problems in Kant’s moral philosophy. It begins with some ambitious and controversial claims about Kant’s moral philosophy prior to the Groundwork of 1785. It then offers an interpretation, and also a fundamental criticism, of the Groundwork’s attempt to establish the moral law based on the idea of freedom of the will. And finally, it raises – and expresses some opinions on – the large and vexed questions of the relationship between transcendental philosophy and philosophical naturalism, and whether Kantian ethics can be made consistent with a naturalistic philosophical outlook. In these comments I will have something to say on each of these three topics, without pretending (any more than Guyer does) to have exhausted what might be said about them.”

<sup>241</sup> Inhalt: Preface. Abbreviations. 1 Reason. 2 Moral Worth. 3 Ethical Theory. 4 The Moral Law. 5 Humanity. 6 Autonomy. 7 Freedom. 8 Virtue. 9 Duties. 10 Conscience. 11 Social Justice. 12 Punishment. 13 Sex. 14 Lies. 15 Consequences. Notes. Index.

- 2017 [1635] Wood, Allen W. (2017): How a Kantian Decides What to Do, in *The Palgrave Kant Handbook*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, London, S. 263–84.
- 2011 [1636] Wuerth, Julian (2011): Moving Beyond Kant's Account of Agency in the *Grounding*, in *Perfecting Virtue. New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence Jost und Julian Wuerth, Cambridge, S. 147–63.
- 2014 [1637] Wuerth, Julian (2014): *Kant on Mind, Action, and Ethics*, Oxford, S. 236–335 (7. Sidgwick, Good Freedom, and the *Wille/Willkür* Distinction Before, In, and After the *Groundwork*. 8. Korsgaard's Intellectualized First-Person Account of Kant's Practical Agent. 9. Kant's Moral Realism and Korsgaard's Constructivism).
- 2002 [1638] Wyller, Truls (2002): *Geschichte der Ethik. Eine systematische Einführung*, Paderborn, (Norwegische Originalausgabe: 1996), S. 151–73 („Immanuel Kant“).
- 2009 [1639] Wyrwich, Thomas (2009): *Moralische Selbst- und Welterkenntnis: Die Deduktion des kategorischen Imperativs in der Kantischen Philosophie*, Würzburg.<sup>243</sup>
- 2011 [1640] Wyrwich, Thomas (2011): From Gratification to Justice. The Tension between Anthropology and Pure Practical Reason in Kant's Conception(s) of the Highest Good, *Kant-Yearbook 3: Anthropology*, S. 91–105.
- 2006 [1641] Yang, Xiaomei (2006): Categorical Imperatives, Moral Requirements, and Moral Motivation, *Metaphilosophy* 37, S. 112–29.<sup>244</sup>

---

<sup>242</sup> “This Element defends a reading of Kant's formulas of the moral law in *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. It disputes a long tradition concerning what the first formula (Universal Law/Law of Nature) attempts to do. The Element also expounds the Formulas of Humanity, Autonomy and the Realm of Ends, arguing that it is only the Formula of Humanity from which Kant derives general duties, and that it is only the third formula (Autonomy/Realm of Ends) that represents a complete and definitive statement of the moral principle as Kant derives it in the *Groundwork*. The Element also disputes the claim that the various formulas are ‘equivalent’, arguing that this claim is either false or else nonsensical because it is grounded on a false premise about what Kant thinks a moral principle is for.”

<sup>243</sup> „Die Studie versucht zu zeigen, dass das bisherige Begründungspotential von Kants „Deduktion“ des kategorischen Imperativs noch nicht ausgeschöpft ist. Die von Kant im dritten Teil seiner Grundlegung gebrauchten Formulierungen von einer „Verstandeswelt“, die der „Sinnenwelt“ zugrunde liegt, und von einem „eigentlichen Selbst“ sind durchaus wörtlich zu nehmen: Die kritische Moralphilosophie zielt in ihrem Innersten auf eine fundamentale Wandlung der Selbst- und Welterkenntnis des fragenden Subjektes. Während es sowohl die theoretizistische als auch die existentialistische Interpretation des unbedingten Sollensanspruchs nicht vermocht haben, eine zureichende Antwort auf die Frage nach dem Grund des Sittengesetzes zu finden, zeigt eine erneute Auseinandersetzung mit Kants Argumenten, dass nur dessen originäre idealistische Begründung, die den reinen Willen als unbedingtes und zugleich wirklichkeitsbildendes Prinzip identifiziert, dazu in der Lage ist. Die Kantische Philosophie lässt sich dergestalt beginnend mit der Grundlegung bis hin zu späteren Schriften wie der Kritik der Urteilskraft als ein Prozess der sukzessiven, anametischen Selbstaufklärung eines natürlichen Moralbewusstseins rekonstruieren. Ein Prozess, der in der Philosophie Fichtes seine Aufnahme und Weiterführung gefunden hat.“

<sup>244</sup> “Kant has argued that moral requirements are categorical. Kant's claim has been challenged by some contemporary philosophers; this article defends Kant's doctrine. I argue that Kant's claim captures the unique feature of moral requirements. The main arguments against Kant's claim focus on one condition that

- 1989 [1642] Yovel, Yirmayahu (Hrsg.) (1989): *Kant's Practical Philosophy Reconsidered: Papers Presented at the Seventh Jerusalem Philosophical Encounter*, December 1986, Dordrecht.
- 2006 [1643] Zaczyk, Rainer (2006): Einheit des Grundes, Grund der Differenz von Moralität und Legalität, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 311–21.
- 2017 [1644] Zaperro, David (2017): Moral Skepticism and the Critique of Practical Reason, in *The Palgrave Kant Handbook*, hrsg. von Matthew C. Altman, London, S. 243–60.
- 2016 [1645] Zhouhuang, Zhengmi (2016): *Der sensus communis bei Kant. Zwischen Erkenntnis, Moralität und Schönheit*, Berlin (*Kantstudien-Ergänzungshefte* 187), S. 38–76 („3 Moralität – Der sensus communis practicus“).
- 2014 [1646] Zimmermann, Stephan (2014): Faktum statt Deduktion. Kants Lehre von der praktischen Selbstrechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes, in *Kants Rechtfertigung des Sittengesetzes in Grundlegung III. Deduktion oder Faktum?*, hrsg. von Heiko Puls, Berlin, S. 103–32.
- 2015 [1647] Zimmermann, Stephan (2015): Wovon handelt „Kants Typik der reinen praktischen Urteilskraft“?, *Kant-Studien* 106, S. 430–60.<sup>245</sup>
- 2016 [1648] Zimmermann, Stephan (Hrsg.) (2016): *Die „Kategorien der Freiheit“ in Kants praktischer Philosophie. Historisch-systematische Beiträge*, Berlin.
- 2006 [1649] Zinkin, Melissa (2006): Respect for the Law and the Use of Dynamical Terms in Kant's Theory of Moral Motivation, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 88, S. 31–53.<sup>246</sup>

---

a categorical imperative must meet: to be independent of desires. I argue that there is another important, but often ignored, condition that a categorical imperative must meet, and this second condition is crucial to understanding why moral requirements are not hypothetical. I also argue that the claim that moral requirements are not categorical because they depend on desires for motivation is beside the point. The issue of whether moral requirements are categorical is not an issue about whether moral desires or feelings are necessary for moral motivation but are rather an issue about the ground of moral desires or moral feelings. Moral requirements are categorical because they are requirements of reason, and reason makes moral desires or feelings possible.”

<sup>245</sup> “This paper seeks to discover the purpose of Kant’s “Typic of Pure Practical Judgement” in the *Critique of Practical Reason*. My first thesis is that the problem underlying this chapter is not a new discovery of the *Critique*: the function of pure practical judgement is simply to test the morality of maxims by means of the so-called type. The new complexity of this approach still calls for a renewed investigation into an old puzzle. To that effect, my second thesis is that the maxim test is related to the doctrine of the categories of freedom, which Kant also newly introduced in the *Critique*. How the test procedure works in detail will be explained in light of the categories.”

<sup>246</sup> “Kant’s discussion of the feeling of respect presents a puzzle regarding both the precise nature of this feeling and its role in his moral theory as an incentive that motivates us to follow the moral law. If it is a feeling that motivates us to follow the law, this would contradict Kant’s view that moral obligation is based on reason alone. I argue that Kant has an account of respect as feeling that is nevertheless not separate from the use of reason, but is intrinsic to willing. I demonstrate this by taking literally Kant’s references to force in the second Critique. By referring to Kant’s pre-critical essay on Negative Magnitudes (1763), I show that Kant’s account of how the moral law effects in us a feeling of respect is underpinned by his view that

- 2008 [1650] Zobrist, Marc (2008): Kants Lehre vom höchsten Gut und die Frage moralischer Motivation, *Kant-Studien* 99, S. 285–311.
- 1998 [1651] Zoglauer, Thomas (1998): *Normenkonflikte – zur Logik und Rationalität ethischen Argumentierens*, Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt, S. 151–60 („Das Lügenverbot bei Kant“).
- 2013 [1652] Zöllner, Günter (2013): Idee und Notwendigkeit einer Metaphysik der Sitten (MS 6: 205–209, 214–218 und TL 6: 375–378), in *Kant's "Tugendlehre". A Comprehensive Commentary*, hrsg. von Andreas Trampota, Oliver Sensen und Jens Timmermann, Berlin, S. 11–24.
- 2000 [1653] Zupančič, Alenka (2000): *Ethics of the Real. Kant, Lacan*, London, New York.
- 2009 [1654] Zweig, Arnulf (2009): Reflections on the Enduring Value of Kant's Ethics, in *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*, hrsg. von Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Malden, MA, S. 255–63.

---

the will is a kind of negative magnitude, or force. I conclude by noting some of the implications of my discussion for Kant's account of virtue.”