

A. Kharitonova

THE CONCEPT OF BODY  
AND THE PROBLEM  
OF DEMARCATION  
IN NEW EUROPEAN  
METAPHYSICS:  
FROM DESCARTES TO KANT

*The formation of science and its separation from metaphysics are among the key characteristics of the early modern period. This separation faces a particular problem with conceptualization of body, which, while being a physical body, is closely bound up with spirit. Different ways of explaining the interaction between mind and body form a complex tradition, which has significantly influenced Kant's pre-Critical writings. Reducing that crucial distinction between two substances to the empirical sphere and the interpretation of soul and body as homogeneous phenomena are the main peculiarities of Kant's position.*

*Key words:* mind-body problem, Cartesian dualism, Occasionalism, Physical Influx, Pre-established Harmony, Wolffianism, anti-Wolffianism, Kant's pre-Critical period.

**1. Matter: Between Physics  
and Metaphysics**

The development of philosophy during the early modern period was strongly orientated towards scientific methodology. This caused the transformation of its subject and self-grounding strategies. Since antiquity mathematics was considered to be the classic model of scientific knowledge. The early modern period saw significant progress in natural science, which used to develop within the frame of metaphysics and during this period aimed at becoming a separate discipline. This progress was made mainly due to adoption of mathematical methods, and metaphysics was forced to redefine its scientific status. The discussion provoked by the theme offered by the Berlin Academy of Sciences for essay contest in 1763 can be mentioned as an example of such attempts. In brief, the proposed question was the following: are metaphysical sciences capable to provide the same degree of certainty as mathematical sciences? Most of the contestants' essays gave negative answers (among the authors who entered the competition were M. Mendels-

sohn, I. Kant, J.H. Lambert). However, they pointed out that metaphysics was a science of a different kind in comparison with mathematics, so metaphysical truths had another kind of certainty. The present article sets a goal to examine the demarcation of philosophy and natural sciences in discussing the notion of body. This discussion has a long history that interchanges with natural science and presents the contest of different metaphysical and physical conceptions.

### *1.1. New Interpretation of Matter: Mathematization of Nature*

The process of the so-called mathematization of nature was the foundation for modern science. Material nature was the main subject of physics<sup>1</sup>, and the breakthrough made by natural science in the 17th century was provided by revised interpretation of the notion of matter, which gained a brand new understanding different from one given by the authors of Antiquity<sup>2</sup>. Revolution was started by G. Galilei who aimed to eliminate "impassable gap between mathematical construction and physical object" [3, p. 102], in other words to ground mathematical physics. He reconsidered features that used to be applied to matter in the tradition of Antiquity (such as mutability and instability) and reckoned invariability and self-identity among its main qualities.

### *1.2. Descartes: Extended and Passive Matter*

The decisive step towards overcoming the difficulties that Galilei faced establishing the identity of mathematical and physical knowledge<sup>3</sup> was taken by R. Descartes. Matter in his theory is identical to space. Descartes was the first to postulate the existence of two substances<sup>4</sup> which were not just different but mutually exclusive. He claims: "Similarly, from the mere fact that each of us understands himself to be a thinking thing and is capable, in thought, of excluding from himself every other substance, whether thinking or extended, it is certain that each of us, regarded in this way, is really distinct from every other thinking substance and from every corporeal substance" [8, p.180]. Descartes' strict dualism is remarkable for making it possible to grasp nature as a mechanism which supposes the possibility of its complete rational cognition. That has two crucial consequences. For metaphysics that means a reduction of such notions as "mind", "soul" or "spirit" (which differ in the ancient and medieval philosophy) to the notion of "thinking thing". For physics that means not only identification of matter and space, but also rejection of vacuum. This thesis leads to the assumption that an action can be transferred only by a direct interaction of two bodies and raises a thorny issue of explanation how mind and body interact.

### *1.3. Newton: Matter's Inertness*

Identification of matter and spatial extent was strongly criticized, especially by I. Newton and G.W. Leibniz. Newton's famous statement "hypotheses non fingo" appeared as criticism of Cartesian physics. Experience and experiments

---

<sup>1</sup> See [30, S. 277].

<sup>2</sup> See [12].

<sup>3</sup> See [12, p. 105–106].

<sup>4</sup> According to some researchers, Descartes can not be seen as a rigorous dualist because thinking and corporeal substances are secondary to God, infinite substance.

must precede hypotheses, general and self-evident statements – contrary to what Descartes had claimed. Newton's physics is important for us in two aspects. Firstly, it contains the idea of force as a non-mechanical cause. Secondly, it implies an idea that the first cause concerns rather metaphysics than physics<sup>5</sup>. Introducing such notions as force, universal gravitation, absolute and relative space and time, Newton makes Cartesian notion of matter, which included both space and bodies, incongruous. However, there exists a certain similarity between physics of Newton and Descartes. Both consider matter as lifeless (Descartes) or less radical as inert (Newton) which demands impact of external forces, whose nature is not completely defined and can be bound with divine intervention<sup>6</sup>.

#### **1.4. Leibniz: Animated Matter**

The position of Leibniz concerning the correlation of spiritual and corporeal is not unambiguous one. Unlike Descartes' and Newton's, his notion of matter includes an idea of activeness. He claims that two kinds of substances exist: simple substances with no parts (monads) and composite substances that consist of simple ones (bodies). Monads differ according to the degree of perception: they can be either distinct or confused (common physical bodies)<sup>7</sup>. According to Leibniz, nothing in nature is incapable of perception, so Cartesian understanding of matter is unacceptable. Leibniz distinguishes between two types of matter: primary matter ("mass") is passive, impenetrable and extended, and is not a complete substance, whereas secondary matter is substantial and includes active force. Exactly this matter is the subject of examination in physics. Thus real bodies that surround us can be seen as mass (since they are partible and impenetrable), but at the same time they contain active force. In Cartesian system soul as thinking and perceptive substance is placed outside and isolated from corporeal world, while Leibniz places it at the basis of the whole nature. However, the difficulty concerning the fact how immaterial monads form the base of any body remained unsettled.

## **2. Cartesian Anthropology: Dualism of Human Nature**

The key demand that metaphysics made to itself during the new modern period was for conforming to the criteria of science. Descartes made headway in finding the common ground for metaphysics and natural science. However, his interpretation of human nature constituted the crucial problem for metaphysics. The main peculiarity of Cartesian dualism is the claim that there are two essentially different and independent substances: mind and body. The whole idea of human being is based on this assumption and apparently a man is the only example of two substances bound<sup>8</sup>. According to Cartesian model, various phenomena and processes in human being proceed independently and can be clearly referred to one or the other substance. There is a certain parallelism between these processes but they are not connected<sup>9</sup>. There occurs a gradual and

---

<sup>5</sup> See [29, p. 369].

<sup>6</sup> Leibniz criticizes that position for being a kind of occultism.

<sup>7</sup> See [27, p. 207].

<sup>8</sup> See [6, p. 45].

<sup>9</sup> See [7, p. 113].

important shift in grasping human nature, which is nothing else but the nature of mind, as a man is considered first of all as “thinking thing”. Descartes writes: “...as regards reason or sense, since it is the only thing that makes us men and distinguishes us from the beasts, I am inclined to believe that it exists whole and complete in each of us” [6, p. 21]. That testifies to evidently stated substance hierarchy, where thinking substance has implicit superiority over corporeal one. Although human being presents a certain unity of mind and body, only mind as the definitive feature distinguishing him from other creatures is essential.

Descartes faces an essential problem: how the interaction between two substances is enabled if they are entirely self-sufficient. Therefore a special organ (pineal gland), which provides coherent actions of mind and body, is introduced. This gland in particular enables perception, the process that demonstrates coherent parallel action of two different substances<sup>10</sup>. Many philosophers later criticized Descartes’ position in that question emphasizing that soul was joined to the whole body and not placed just within one part of the brain<sup>11</sup>, although he expressed the same idea as well: “... we need to recognize that the soul is really joined to the whole body, and that we cannot properly say that it exists in any one part of the body to the exclusion of the others” [9, p. 229]. Nevertheless, his reference to the gland does not seem to be a convincing solution. Firstly, the data available in contemporary physiology and anatomy testified the existence of that gland with animals, and that clearly contradicted Descartes’ idea to consider animals as merely mechanisms not capable of thinking. Secondly, Descartes’ views on the place and functioning of the pineal gland did not correspond to scientific facts known at that time. Last but not least, such concept is rather doubtful as it interferes with the primary principles of dualism. So, the consistent theory concerning the interaction between mind and body is hardly presented in Descartes’ writings. Although the number of interpretations in research literature is overwhelming, each of them fits one passage or another but barely one grasps all his statements on the problem.

### 3. Body as a Problem: View of Wolff

After Descartes, the problem of representing human being becomes crucial for metaphysics. On the one hand, human being is a “thinking thing” and cognizes the world. On the other hand, human being is embodied, which means the localization of thinking in the material world and makes it rather difficult to give a homogenous representation of a man. Metaphysics has to deal with a particular type of bodies correlated with thinking, which disrupts the homogeneity of material bodies studied in physics.

---

<sup>10</sup> The gland and its functioning are discussed in “Treatise on Man” (written in the first half of the 1630s but published posthumously) and in “The Passions of the Soul” (1649). According to some researchers, the latter can be considered as a sequel of “Treatise”, see [13, p. XXIX; 28]. Despite the widespread opinion, Descartes’ classic writings do not contain the “pineal gland” term: in “Treatise” he writes about “gland H” [10, p. 143] and in “The Passions” no special term can be found. “Pineal gland” appears only in letters of 1640, see [11, S. 145].

<sup>11</sup> For example, see [16, p. 312]. They quite likely appealed to the following statement: “...apart from this gland, there cannot be any other place in the whole body where the soul directly exercises its functions” [9, p. 230].

### 3.1. Dualism Problem: Exposition and Various Solutions

A lot of thinkers attempted to overcome inconsistency in Cartesian theory. Main solutions are presented on the basis of the so-called "German Metaphysics" by Chr. Wolff ("Rational Thoughts on God, the World and the Soul of Man, and on All Things Whatsoever") that was first published in 1720 and reissued many times with amendments and additions by the author<sup>12</sup>. It contains a chapter, which describes soul essence and different types of spirits in general. Wolff claims it is essential to understand how thought correlates with body motions, so the considerable part of that chapter scrutinizes main conceptions clearing the question that had been shaped by that time.

The first hypothesis called Physical Influx states that "unity (Gemeinschaft) of body (Leib) and soul is based on the natural influence of one thing on the other" (§ 761). Wolff gives the following comment: "And this opinion of common people was shared for some time even by philosophers, although nowadays only few agree with it" (§ 761). Although this hypothesis agrees with common sense and everyday experience most of all, one cannot say there are any evidences in favour of it in experience because we do not have any clear notion of soul activity which causes body motions (Leib)<sup>13</sup>.

Then Wolff presents Descartes' point of view. According to it, the only basis of mind-body unity is the will of God: "... it is rather God causes thoughts in soul with motions in body (Körper) and on the other hand – motions in body (Leib) with soul and its desires" (§ 763). Although that point of view still has a lot of supporters, there are quite a few counterarguments. It should be mentioned that Wolff presents this theory not accurately enough as the explanation of mind-body interaction exceptionally by the God's will belongs not to Descartes himself, but first of all to N. Malebranche<sup>14</sup>. Although it is not a simple task to reconstruct the point of view of Descartes himself, the assumption that he proposes the solution in terms of unsophisticated Occasionalism seems to be rather awkward.

Pre-established Harmony is the last of the hypotheses, and Wolff tends to support it. According to it, only the interaction between substances of one type is possible, while semblance of interaction between different substances is provided by pre-established harmony existing in the world. All possible changes are inherent in each monad, and the harmony means that God has created substances so that each of them completely reflects others in its internal changes like in a mirror. It is inappropriate to talk about interaction as we deal with some simultaneous and pre-established changes. Despite some common ideas with Occasionalism, this hypothesis has more advantages, especially in its implementation in physics: divine intervention has occurred just once by world creation and there is no need to appeal to it on each interaction. Thus, matter is endowed with particular independence and the problem concerning the status of beasts, which, according to Descartes and Malebranche, have neither soul nor consciousness, is solved as well.

---

<sup>12</sup> Reference to this writing is caused by the fact that this compendium on metaphysics was the most authoritative one for a long time and was a prototype for the majority of such textbooks outside Germany, see [16, p. 38–48]. There is no translation of this work in English and the following quotations from [34] are translated by the author.

<sup>13</sup> See [34, S. 327, § 536].

<sup>14</sup> See [4, S. 756].

### 3.2. Dualism Problem: Further Prospects

Although Wolff presents Pre-established Harmony created by Leibniz, some aspects have been modified<sup>15</sup>. At the same time all three theories are exaggeratedly presented just as hypotheses. Research literature contains different appraisals of that fact. According to R. Blackwell, such presentation temporarily brought down the sharpness of the question. However, J. Zamitto claims that the publication of “German Metaphysics” led to a new wave of discussions and initiated argumentation for Physical Influx and against Pre-established Harmony. Intense debates ensued, and Physical Influx took a revenge on other theories in quite a short time<sup>16</sup>.

Each of the described theories presents its own way of bringing metaphysics to the scientific basis. Physical Influx solves that problem by peculiarly equating mind and all types of bodies as they all have something in common in their structure, namely forces [32, p. 196]. For Occasionalism the problem is solved beyond our knowledge and does not demand any special explanation. As for Leibniz, the spiritualistic interpretation of all existing things gains priority along with the thesis that each body is animated and no soul can exist on its own.

### 4. Körper vs Leib: Notion Correlation

The hypotheses examined by Wolff aim to give a scientific explanation for all possible substance interactions, which can be either physical (between bodies), or psychological (between spirits), or psychophysical. The latter becomes a stumbling block to all theories, as it involves body which demands a scientific rather than mystic or irrational explanation.

German writings that belong to the considered period, unlike Latin ones, contain two different terms to denote body. When it comes to any material body that is considered in physics or geometry, it is called “Körper”. The term “Leib” is used to mark those bodies that are bound with soul, namely human bodies. In Latin texts the term “corpus” is mainly used in both cases. However, that distinction in the usage is not always maintained<sup>17</sup>. The following reconstruction of the Wolffian system aims to establish the correlation of these two terms.

Wolff claims that the world is the range of changing things, therefore it is a composite thing itself. Besides, “the world is also a machine” [34, S. 337, § 557]. Any physical body exposed outside ourselves is a composite thing – “Körper” – can be called machine as well. “Among these bodies there is one we recognize as our own *body* (Leib) because according to it our thoughts concerning other bodies are directed and because it always exists along with us while all other bodies change”, says § 218. Despite these peculiarities, the main of which is the compliance (Übereinstimmung) of some bodies with soul, this kind of body can be grasped with the “machine” notion as well because “Leib” is “just a machine devoid of reason” [34, S. 487, § 781]<sup>18</sup>. The notion of machine itself can help clear

<sup>15</sup> See [31, p. 61–68; 14, S. 17–29, 70; 32, p. 139].

<sup>16</sup> See [32].

<sup>17</sup> As in the quotation mentioned above, § 763.

<sup>18</sup> § 781 states human body (Leib) is merely a machine and refers to § 617 which says about all physical bodies (Körper) that are purely machines [34, S. 380, § 617].

up why it is essential for Wolff to equalize the usage of two body terms by giving them a common equivalent: "From mentioned above it is possible to conclude... that bodies are purely (lauter) machines and that is why there is truth in them (§ 142) and they can be clearly explained (§ 77)". As the whole world is a machine, "... all events in it happen to be reliable" (§ 561). The equivalence between body notions and machine notion eliminates the lack of regularity in the concept of human body. Defining truth in contrast to dream Wolff follows Leibniz and points out consistency and sequence of changes happening to a thing as the criteria<sup>19</sup>. Postulated sequence functioning of human body aims to disguise the absence of reliable idea of how mind and body interact. Being bound with soul but still remaining "purely a machine", human body sets the general problem: how can we inscribe activity of mind into universal physical laws? Human body should be similar to any other body in the world, and it cannot just provide dreams, affects or passions, thus the presentation of human being is constituted so that it will not contradict the rational sway, the distinctive feature of human being.

Although the formal distinction between two notions is rather clear, it would not be correct to talk about strict and systematic usage of these terms in writings of the 18th century due to their equivalence to "machine" notion. Moreover, the term "Körper" prevails<sup>20</sup> not accidentally: whatever differences can be found in theories explaining mind-body interaction, all of them are still orientated towards Cartesian interpretation of any body as a mechanism, more or less complicated configuration of passive matter.

## 5. Kant's pre-Critical Writings

For Kant the problem of grounding the scientific character of metaphysics was rather vivid throughout all periods of his work (however, its interpretation was not necessarily the same as we are used to see it nowadays). Previous thinkers who tried to solve the above mentioned task inevitably faced the mind-body problem, which never constitutes the main theme in Kant's writings. The connection between these two problems does not exist any longer and the mind-body problem turns out to be eliminated. Nevertheless, it could not be totally ignored and arose in different writings in pre-Critical, Critical and even quite late writings (for example, "Anthropology" or "Pedagogics"). In his Critical writings Kant deals with the question "How is metaphysics possible as science?" in a rather different way and claims that objects must conform to our cognition and not vice versa, as it was before. As for his pre-Critical writings, they were merely influenced by previous discussions, so some of them do contain passages presenting Kant's attitude to the mind-body problem.

### 5.1. Rationalism and Common Sense

Kant expresses his opinion on the mind-body problem rather carefully. The treatise "Dreams of a Spirit-Seer Elucidated by Dreams of Metaphysics" (1766) is of special interest, as it contains perhaps the largest amount of reasoning con-

---

<sup>19</sup> See [3].

<sup>20</sup> At the same time, "Körper" as well as "Leib" are understood as machines first of all. In Zedler's Encyclopedia both notions ("Menschlicher Körper" and "Menschlicher Leib") refer to the same article "Menschliche Maschine" [36, Sp. 815].

cerning human body, soul, other spirits and relations between them. This writing is aimed at critique of E. Swedenborg, Kant's well-known contemporary. The second part contains critique and even mockery of his position, though the content of the first one is not so unambiguous. It can be interpreted as a specially constructed model, which demonstrates theoretical groundings of Swedenborg's position, opposed in the second part, but another interpretation is possible as well. According to it, the reasoning in the first part presents those few things which can be said definitely about the nature of soul and body. So they can be seen as proper Kant's position, and this interpretation in particular will be the basis for further analysis of that writing.

The question "where is the place of this human soul in the world of bodies?" [16, p. 312] arises as merely hypothetical and can become valid only when we prove that soul is a spirit. Kant strongly criticizes Cartesian point of view, for it may only be based on "imaginary interferences". At the same time he quotes J.G. Daries: "My soul is wholly in my whole body, and wholly in each of its parts" [16, p. 313]. So, according to Kant, when it comes to vague questions, which nevertheless have to be somehow solved, it is necessary to rely on ordinary experience and common sense rather than on sophisticated reasoning. That is likely connected to the idea that soul and spirits cannot be cognized in experience<sup>21</sup>. Even if we venture to decide where soul is situated, the most plausible answer will be the following: "where I feel, it is there that *I am*" [16, p. 312] as soul permeates the whole body that is allocated to it. The allocation of a particular body means that it must alter along with me and have the same place as I have – the similar idea was presented earlier by Wolff. It is worth mentioning that Kant, like Wolff, does not state clearly, how exactly a body becomes my body. There is no description of any specific features of a body that can be connected with soul and therefore can be called 'Leib'.

## 5.2. Changes in the Notion of Substance

Kant's attitude to the mind-body problem was formed not only by the above influences, but also with consideration of Hume's sceptical philosophy, so different substance questions (definition, classification etc.) appear to be in the background. It does not mean that Kant avoids this term: it appears rather often in his pre-Critical writings when he presents his own version of Physical Influx; in "Critique of Pure Reason" it also plays an important role in parts concerning the table of categories and analogies of experience. However, it cannot be said that the usage of this notion was fully adopted from the preceding tradition. Kant's position on the substance notion underwent some essential changes already in the pre-Critical period, but the general tendency led towards the loss of significance of the term<sup>22</sup>. In Critical writings the substance notion finally loses its fundamental ontological status, as it concerns phenomena and not noumena<sup>23</sup>.

Thus the crucial boundary between soul and body is not an obvious thesis for Kant. Although nearly all human actions can be referred to either cognition or material processes, our everyday experience can hardly be presented as a se-

---

<sup>21</sup> See [16, p. 308, Note].

<sup>22</sup> See [14, p. 53-59, 73].

<sup>23</sup> See [18, p. 313, B 251; 14, S. 179, 182].

quence of mental and material phenomena. Besides, Kant refuses to consider the substance question as a prior one. These changes weaken traditional dualistic hierarchy that was presupposed in all theories explaining the mind-body problem.

### **5.3. *Soul and Body: Demolition of Hierarchy***

The transformations initiated by Kant lead to overcoming the statement that the relation between soul and body is asymmetrical, which causes a change in presenting the outer and the inner of human being. A traditional model of man considers soul activity to be inner and matter activity to be outer, whereas joint activity of soul and body emphasized by Kant displaces that bound as well.

"Thoughts on the True Estimation of Living Forces" contain the following argumentation: "... the soul must be able to act externally by reason of the fact that it is in a location". At the same time, "... matter that has been set in motion acts on everything that is spatially connected with it, and hence also on the soul", "... it changes the internal state of the soul insofar as this state is related to what is external to it"<sup>24</sup>. Moreover, the inner state of soul can be also counted to the outer as "... the entire internal state of the soul is nothing other than the summation of all its representations and concepts" [20, p. 25]. Thus, as the whole content of soul activity refers to the outer, soul cannot be seen as a "bastion" of inner. Kant rejects that soul can be found in one particular part of human body; on the contrary, the whole body can be presented as the location of the soul because it is situated in each part of it equally. Furthermore, bodily activity influences and even determinates the condition of soul. Another proof of that thesis can be found in the third part of "Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens" (1755): "... it is nonetheless certain that the human being, who derives all his concepts and ideas from the impressions the universe stimulates in his soul through his body, depends totally on the constitution of this matter to which the creator has bound him for both their clarity as well as the skill to connect and compare them, which we call the faculty to think" [20, p. 298]. In a range of pre-Critical writings (including lectures on anthropology) Kant mentions that people's capacity to think differs a lot, so it can be concluded that this capacity depends on physical qualities and constitution.

### **5.4. *Premises of Transformation***

Another school of the preceding philosophical tradition is essential to be mentioned with reference to Kant's early writings, namely anti-Wolffianism. The way of grounding Physical Influx presented by Kant in his early writings has experienced a strong influence of statements found in writings by Chr. A. Crusius, one of the most significant representatives of the anti-Wolffian school<sup>25</sup>. In many respects that was his writings, which enabled the expansion and acknowledgement of Physical Influx<sup>26</sup>. The demolition of hierarchy of thinking and material substance is coherent with redefinition of such notions as 'body', 'matter' and 'soul' made by Crusius.

---

<sup>24</sup> That thesis is supported in [19].

<sup>25</sup> [33, p. 289-305]

<sup>26</sup> [15, S. 143-150]

Another important figure is M. Knutzen (contacts with whom influenced young Kant a lot), although he is often considered among Wolffian thinkers. His treatise devoted to the research of the nature of soul and the struggle against materialists contains a number of abstracts that can be considered as a premise of changes made by Kant. The two-part structure of "Dreams" is similar to the structure of "Philosophical Treatise on the Immaterial Nature of the Soul" (1744). Although Knutzen stands up for the essential difference between soul and body, his reasoning nevertheless demonstrates the necessity of body which is a "dwelling" and an "instrument" of soul. Body has a particular influence on soul as it guides it in the material world. This influence has a limiting character, though, as due to imperfection of the instrument soul can not act as deftly as it is prescribed. Souls differ a lot but act similarly, as they are bound to bodies (which have a higher degree of similarity) and adjust themselves to them. The reciprocal impact is considered to be not immediate, but is explained by existence of force as a common element (the similar strategy was elaborated by Crusius).

It can be seen that Kant's early writings were influenced by three different views. The first one is Wolffianism that made the mind-body problem of current importance again and demonstrated a variety of solution strategies. Wolffianism inherited problems that had been aroused by Cartesian dualism and along with that referred to natural science as Wolff himself evidently supported Pre-established Harmony as the most proper solution. Therefore polemics within natural science (in the first place the polemic between Newton and Leibniz) influenced Kant as well, especially as concerns terminology and the range of considered physical problems. The third impulse was anti-Wolffian objections presented first of all in the writings by Crusius. The essentially different interpretation of such notions as matter, body, spirit, soul, substance or force provided a resource to recede from rigorous opposition of mind and body and enabled the spread and acknowledgement of Physical Influx. Thus, first two views determined in many respects the themes and terminology of Kant's pre-Critical writings, and the third one supplied the conceptual resource for new attitude towards inherited problems.

## 6. Transcendental Autonomy of Metaphysics

As a result, in Kant's writings the identification of human body and other physical bodies is not necessary any more. Moreover, heterogeneity within human bodies becomes possible as well. Different impressions provided by body form the necessary condition of thought. Kant asserts that the influence of body on soul is inevitable. Soul is deeply embodied and rooted into matter and cannot impact the body as easily as the body impacts it. While Leibniz just erases the boundary between body and soul, claiming that existence of incorporeal spirits and inanimate bodies is impossible, Kant with such thesis makes the next step in dismantling the hierarchy of thought and physical processes<sup>27</sup>.

Kant's Critical philosophy presents the entirely different way of grounding the scientific character of metaphysics and does not concern psychophysical dualism. His transcendental philosophy presents other solution which enables conceptual and disciplinary sufficiency "to gain exhaustive acquaintance" [18, p. 102, A XIV] with the help of pure thinking, free of any experience. That means

---

<sup>27</sup> Other interpretation assumes such Kant's position to be a result of influence of "popular philosophy" which opposed itself to "school philosophy" [35].

that although experience data are inevitable, we escape the dictates of objects that appear to our sensibility as they do not have the fundamental ontological status any longer. Therefore the whole complex of problems concerning the body is eliminated because all various physical bodies are seen as phenomena, and such attitude provides their homogeneity. Although Critical writings present human being without a mind-body split, a certain duality still remains: human being can be grasped either as a phenomenon and in this case it is possible to cognize him, or as a noumenon that is absolutely incognizable.

## 7. Conclusion

All things existing in the world are divided by science of the new modern period into two unequal parts. On the one hand, there is human being who is endowed with reason and is able to cognize. On the other hand, there are all other things external to him as subjects of his cognition. Human being is grasped as *thinking I* that is detached, self-dependent and to a certain extent self-sufficient<sup>28</sup>, as soul's ability to be self-conscious is assumed to be its main feature. However, cognition of human nature remains to be an unsolved problem. Soul can be seen in two different perspectives. Firstly, it is liable to affects and passions, and in this case its connection to body is emphasized inevitably. Secondly, soul is a thinking substance and therefore a human being is capable to cognize rationally. The second tendency appears to be a prior one, and determinism is ascribed to the whole variety of physical processes (that means all these processes can be repeated and cognized). Determinism cannot be ascribed to thinking because of the presupposition that the nature of mind differs essentially from the nature of subjects that are being cognized, and does not comply with laws of nature discovered by it<sup>29</sup>. Rationalism postulates that all existing things can be cognized. Moreover, soul "... indeed is easier to know than the body", as exactly soul is something "... by which I am what I am" [6, p. 36]. Such conception leads to a contradiction, as cognizing thinking I is not able to cognize the nature of human being adequately. It appears not to be possible to disregard the connection of mind and body. Therefore, researches of the nature of soul range between two poles, materialism and mysticism.

## Bibliography

1. Blackwell R.J. Christian Wolff's Doctrine of the Soul // Journal of the History of Ideas. 1961. № 3.
2. Borsche T., Kaulbach F. Leib, Körper // Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie / Hrsg. von J. Ritter, K. Gründer. Bd. 5. Basel, 1980.
3. Carboncini S. Transzendente Wahrheit und Traum. Christian Wolffs Antwort auf die Herausforderung durch den Cartesianischen Zweifel. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1991.
4. Corr Ch.A. Variations and Annotations // Wolff Chr. Vernünftige Gedanken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt. Halle, 1751. ND: Gesammelte Werke / Hrsg. und bearbeitet von J. École. Abt. 1, Bd. 2. Hildesheim, 2009.

<sup>28</sup> See [22, S. 12, 25–26; 24; 34, S. 110, § 197].

<sup>29</sup> Few thinkers followed J.O. de La Mettrie and defended the thesis that thought was fully determined by physical organization of human being, J. Ch. Lossius can be mentioned as an example [25, p. 278].

5. *Crusius Chr.A.* Entwurf der nothwendigen Vernunft-Wahrheiten, wiefern sie den zufälligen entgegen gesetzt werden. Leipzig, 1766.
6. *Descartes R.* Discourse on the Method // *Descartes : Selected Philosophical Writings.* / Tr. by J. Cottingham, R. Stoothoff, D. Murdoch. Cambridge, 1988.
7. *Descartes R.* Meditations on First Philosophy // *Ibid.*
8. *Descartes R.* Principles of Philosophy // *Ibid.*
9. *Descartes R.* The Passions of Soul // *Ibid.*
10. *Descartes R.* Treatise on Man // *René Descartes: The World and Other Writings* / Ed. by S. Gaukroger. Cambridge, 2004.
11. *Dmitriev T.A.* Machine of Human Body in "Treatise on Man" // *Descartes R. Man. M., 2012.*
12. *Gaidenko P.P.* A History of European Philosophy of the Modern Age in its Relation to Science. Moscow, 2000.
13. *Gaukroger S.* Introduction // *René Descartes, The World and other writings* / Ed. by S. Gaukroger. Cambridge, 2004.
14. *Hahmann A.* Kritische Metaphysik der Substanz. Berlin, 2009.
15. *Heimsoeth H.* Metaphysik und Kritik bei Chr. A. Crusius. Ein Beitrag zur ontologischen Vorgeschichte der Kritik der reinen Vernunft im 18. Jahrhundert // *Studien zur Philosophie Immanuel Kants. Metaphysische Ursprünge und ontologische Grundlagen.* Köln, 1956.
16. *Kant I.* Dreams of a Spirit-Seer Elucidated by Dreams of Metaphysics // *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant. Theoretical Philosophy, 1755–1770* / Tr. and ed. by D. Walford, R. Meerbote. Cambridge, 1992.
17. *Kant I.* A New Elucidation of the First Principles of Metaphysical Cognition // *Ibid.*
18. *Kant I.* Critique of Pure Reason // *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant* / Tr. and ed. by P. Guyer, A.W. Wood. Cambridge, 1998.
19. *Kant I.* Essays on the Maladies of the Head // *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant in Translation. Anthropology, History, and Education* / Ed. by G. Zöllner, R.B. Loudon. Cambridge, 2007.
20. *Kant I.* Thoughts on the True Estimation of Living Forces // *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant in Translation. Natural Science* / Ed. by E. Watkins. Cambridge, 2012.
21. *Kant I.* Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens // *Ibid.*
22. *Knutzen M.* Philosophische Abhandlung von der immateriellen Natur der Seele, darinnen theils überhaupt erwiesen wird, daß die Seele uncörperlich sei, theils die vornehmsten Einwürffe der Materialisten deutlich beantwortet werden. Königsberg, 1744.
23. *Krotov A.A.* Philosophy of Malebranche. M., 2003.
24. *Krouglov A.N.* Sulla nascita dell'espressione «meramente soggettivo» nella filosofia tedesca del XVIII secolo e sul suo significato // *Soggettività e autocoscienza. Prospettive storico-critiche* / A cura di P. Palumbo, A. Le Moli. Milano, 2011.
25. *Krouglov A.N.* Tetens, Kant and Discussion on Metaphysics in Germany of the second half of the 18th century. M., 2008.
26. *Leibniz G.W.* A New System of the Nature and Communication of Substances, and of the Union of the Soul and Body // *G.W. Leibniz: Philosophical Essays* / Tr. and ed. by R. Ariew, D. Garber. Indianapolis, 1989.
27. *Leibniz G.W.* Principles of Nature and Grace, Based on Reason // *Ibid.*
28. *Lokhorst G.-J.* Descartes and the Pineal Gland // E.N. Zalta (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2011 Edition). URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/pineal-gland/> (date of access: 21.01.2013).
29. *Newton I.* Opticks or a Treatise of the Reflections, Refractions, Inflections and Colours of Light (based on the fourth edition London, 1730). N. Y., 1979.
30. *Onomasticon philosophicum. Latinoteutonicum et teutonicolatinum* / Hrsg. von K. Aso, M. Kurosaki, T. Otabe, S. Yamauchi. Tokio, 1989.

31. *Vasilyev V.* Philosophical Psychology in the Age of Enlightenment. M., 2010.
32. *Watkins E.* From Pre-established Harmony to Physical Influx: Leibniz's Reception in Eighteenth Century Germany // Perspectives on Science. 1998. № 6.
33. *Watkins E.* Kant's Theory of Physical Influx // Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie. 1995. № 77.
34. *Wolff Chr.* Vernünftige Gedanken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt. Halle, 1751. ND: Gesammelte Werke / Hrsg. und bearbeitet von J. École. Abt. 1, Bd. 2. Hildesheim, 2009.
35. *Zammito J.H.* Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology. Chicago, 2002.
36. *Zedler J.H.* Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexicon. Bd. 20. Halle, 1739.

#### **About the author**

*Alyona Kharitonova*, PhD student at the Faculty of Philosophy (Department of Western Philosophy), Russian State University for the Humanities, e-mail: kha.aliona@gmail.com