

NEUKANTIANISMUS-FORSCHUNG AKTUELL

NEUERSCHEINUNGEN, TAGUNGEN, VERMISCHTES

herausgegeben von *Christian Krijnen* (Tilburg/Amsterdam)

unter Mitarbeit von *Vladimir Belov* (Saratov), *Fabien Capeillères* (Caen/Paris), *Arnaud Dewalque* (Liège), *Ana Thereza Dürmaier* (Paraíba), *Massimo Ferrari* (Turin), *Tomasz Kubalica* (Katowice), *Tapani Laine* (Tampere), *Sebastian Luft* (Milwaukee), *Dermot Moran* (Dublin), *Jacco Verburg* (Amsterdam), *Hartwig Wiedebach* (Frankfurt/M., Zürich)

INHALT

- 1 NEUKANTIANISMUS-FORSCHUNG AKTUELL 2011
- 2 ADDENDA NEUKANTIANISMUS-FORSCHUNG AKTUELL
 - 2.1 Addenda 2009
 - 2.2 Addenda 2010
- 3 FORSCHUNGSBERICHTE UND -ÜBERSICHTEN
 - 3.1 Bibliographie: HEINRICH RICKERT'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY AND ITS RECEPTION 1896-1936

1 NEUKANTIANISMUS-FORSCHUNG 2011

I. VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN 2011

a) Primärliteratur 2011 (Editionen und Übersetzungen)

Cassirer, Ernst: Symbolische Prägnanz, Ausdrucksphänomen und 'Wiener Kreis'. Hrsg. V. Ch. Möckel (= Ernst Cassirer: Nachgelassene Manuskripte und Texte, hg. v. Ch. Köhnke, J. M. Krois und O. Schwemmer, Bd. 4), Meiner Verlag, Hamburg 2011.

Cassirer, Ernst: *Logika nauk o kulturze. Pięć studiów* (= *Zur Logik der Kulturwissenschaften. Fünf Studien*). Übers. v. Przemysław Parszutowicz. Kety: Wydawnictwo M. Derewecki.

Cassirer, Ernst – Nelson, Leonard: *Una controversia sul metodo critico*, a cura di F. Biagioli, Brescia, Morcelliana, 2011.

Paul Natorp, *Tra Kant e Husserl. Scritti 1887-1914*, a cura di M. Ferrari e G. Gigliotti, Firenze, Le Lettere, 2011.

Sesemann V.E.: Die reale Einrichtung und das „reine“ (unverstellbare) Wissen (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlass) (Die Redaktion und die Vorbereitung zur Publikation V.I. Povilajtis), in: *Kantische Sammlung* [Kantovskiji sbornik] 1(35), 88-98.

Sesemann V.E.: Die reale Einrichtung und das „reine“ (unverstellbare) Wissen (aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlass) (Die Redaktion und die Vorbereitung zur Publikation V.I. Povilajtis), in: *Kantische Sammlung* [Kantovskiji sbornik] 2(36), 83-90.

b) Sekundärliteratur 2011

1. Monographien und Dissertationen

Dober, Hans Martin: "Reflektierender Glaube": Die Vernunft der Religion in klassischen Positionen, Königshausen & Neumann, Würzburg.

Hanuszkiewicz, Wojciech: *Filozofia Hermanna Cohena w perspektywie sporu o jedność metody transcendentalnej* (= *Hermann Cohens Philosophie vor dem Hintergrund des Streites über die Einheit der transzendentalen Methode*), Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.

Köhnke, K.: Entstehung und Aufstieg des Neukantianismus. Die deutsche Universitätsphilosophie zwischen Idealismus und Positivismus (Surgimiento y auge del neokantismo. La filosofía universitaria alemana entre el idealismo y el positivismo) Übersetzer: José Andrés Ancona Quiroz. Fondo de Cultura Economica Verlag, Mexiko.

Kubalica, Tomasz: *Wahrheit, Geltung und Wert: Die Wahrheitstheorie der Badischen Schule des Neukantianismus*, Königshausen & Neumann, Würzburg.

Noras, Andrzej J.: *Kant a novokantovstvo – bádenská a marburská škola*. Übers. v. E. Andreanský, V. Leško, P. Tholt. Košice: Filozofická fakulta UPJŠ.

Poma, Andrea: *Die kritische Philosophie Hermann Cohens*. Übersetzung aus dem Italienischen ins Russische von O. Popova. Moskau.

Semenov, Valeriji: *Dominierende Paradigmen des Transzendentalismus in der westeuropäische Philosophie*, Russische Staatliche Humanitären Universität. (Dissertation)

2. Aufsätze (sofern nicht in erwähnten Sammelbänden/Themenhefte usw. enthalten, es sei denn, sie wurden einzeln gemeldet)

Belov, Vladimir: Für die Reinheit des Kantischen Erbes, in: *Kantische Sammlung* [Kantovskiji sbornik] 2(36), 7-11.

- Belov, Vladimir: Cohen über Descartes, in: *Philosophische Erforschungen: Moskauer-St-Petersburger Sammlung*. Ausgabe 2, Moskau, 303-311.
- Dalvani Fernandes, Sylvio: Geographie bei Cassirer: Perspektiven zur Geographie der Religion (Geografia em Cassirer: Perspectivas para a geografia da religião. GeoTextos, Vol. 7, N. 2 (Brasilien).
- Ferrari, Massimo: *Dimitrij Gawronsky und Ernst Cassirer: Zur Geschichte der Marburger Schule zwischen Deutschland und Russland*, in *Gegenstandsbestimmung und Selbstgestaltung. Transzendentalphilosophie im Anschluss an Werner Flach*, hrsg. von Ch. Krijnen und K. Zeidler, Würzburg, Königshausen & Neumann, 2011, S. 89-106.
- Ferrari, Massimo: *Cassirer, Kant e l'Aufklärung*, in *Kant und die Aufklärung. Akten der Kant-Tagung in Sulmona, 24.-28. März 2010*, hrsg. von Luigi Cataldi Madonna und Paola Rumore, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York, Olms, 2011, S. 71-94.
- Ferrari, Massimo: *Das Faktum der Wissenschaft, die transzendente Methode und die Kulturphilosophie bei Ernst Cassirer*, in *Philosophie der Kultur – Kultur des Philosophierens*, hrsg. von B. Recki, Hamburg, Meiner, 2011, S. 299-321.
- Krijnen, Christian: Subjektive Logik als Grundlage von objektiver Logik? Husserls Phänomenologie im Kontext der Transzendentalphilosophie Kants und des Neukantianismus, in: *Analecta Husserliana*, CVIII (2011), 57-78.
- Krijnen, Christian: Selbstbestimmung als Wille? Hegels Lehre vom freien Geist und das axiotische Grundverhältnis kantianisierender Transzendentalphilosophie, auf polnisch in: *Folia Philosophica*, 29 (2011), 67-108.
- Krijnen, Christian: Das Soziale bei Hegel und in der kantianisierenden Transzendentalphilosophie, in: Ch. Krijnen/K.W. Zeidler (Hg.), *Gegenstandsbestimmung und Selbstgestaltung. Transzendentalphilosophie im Anschluss an Werner Flach*, Würzburg 2011, 189-226.
- Orejudo Pedrosa, Juan Carlos: Cassirer und der Humanismus: französisch-kantische Aufklärung? (Cassirer y el Humanismo: La Ilustración franco-kantiana en cuestión). Eikasia. Revista de Filosofía, año VI, 36 (Oviedo, Spanien).
- Povilajtis, V.I.: Die Hauptbegriffe der Geschichtsphilosophie von F.A. Stegun, in: *Kantische Sammlung* [Kantovskiji sbornik] 1(35), 55-60.
- Poma, Andrea: Die kritische Philosophie Hermann Cohens, Kapitel 6. Die Ethik (Übersetzung aus dem Italienischen ins Russische von O. Popova, Vorwort, Redaktion und Vergleich der Zitate in deutscher Sprache von V.N. Belov), in: *Kantische Sammlung* [Kantovskiji sbornik] 1(35), 70-88.

3. Tagungs- und Sammelbände

- Feron, Olivier (Hg.): *Figuren der Rationalität. Neukantianismus und Phänomenologie* [Figuras da Racionalidade. Neokantismo e Fenomenologia]. Lissabon: Centro de Filosofia Universidade de Lisboa Verlag (Portugal).
- Dekoninck, Ralph et Lories, Danielle (éds.), *L'Art en valeurs*, Paris, L'Harmattan, (mehrere Beiträge zur neukantianischen Ästhetik).
- Feron, Olivier (coord.), *Figuras da Racionalidade. Neokantismo e Fenomenologia*, Lisboa, Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa.

4. Sonderausgaben/Themenausgaben von Zeitschriften

- Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale, 2011, Nr. 1: Hermann Cohen. L'idéalisme critique aux prises avec le matérialisme (numero dirigé par M. Bienenstock).
- Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie, Volume 59, Issue 2 (May 2011). Schwerpunkt: *Hermann Cohens Philosophie*. Mit Beiträgen von Ursula Renz, Andrea Esser, Reinier

- Munk, Pierfrancesco Fiorato, Hartwig Wiedebach und einem Gespräch zwischen Ursula Renz, Myriam Bienenstock, Helmut Holzhey und Andrea Poma.
 Rosenzweig-Jahrbuch 6 (2011): *Frieden und Krieg*. Mit Beiträgen zu Cohen von Renate Schindler und Gesine Palmer.
 González Porta, Mario 2011: Neukantianische Studien [Estudos Neokantianos]. São Paulo: Loyola Verlag (Brasilien).
Filozofia Kanta i jej recepcja (= *Kants Philosophie und ihre Rezeption*). Hrsg. v. Andrzej J. Noras, Dariusz Bęben. Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ 2011.
Idea transcendentalizmu. Od Kanta do Wittgensteina (= *Idee des Transzendentalismus. Von Kant bis Wittgenstein*). Hrsg. v. Przemysław Parszutowicz, Maciej Soin. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN 2011.
Neokantyzm badeński i marburski. Antologia tekstów (= *Marburger und Südwestdeutscher Neukantianismus. Anthologie*). Hrsg. v. Andrzej J. Noras, Tomasz Kubalica. Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ 2011.

II. VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN IN VORBEREITUNG

a) Primärliteratur

- Cohen, Hermann: *Kleinere Schriften I* [1865-1869], Werke 12, Hildesheim u.a., Olms 2012.
 Cohen, Hermann: *Kantowska teoria doświadczenia* (= *Kants Theorie der Erfahrung*). Übers. v. Andrzej J. Noras. Kęty: Wydawnictwo M. Derewecki 2012.
 Lask, Emil (2012) *Rechtsphilosophie* (mit kritischer Einführung). *Filosofia do Direito*. Übersetzer: Resende Jr., José, Brasilien.

b) Sekundärliteratur

- Dewalque, Arnaud (trad.), *Platon dans le néokantisme*, avec des textes de Rudolf Hermann Lotze, Hermann Cohen, Paul Natorp, Wilhelm Windelband, Emil Lask et Bruno Bauch, Paris, Vrin
 Dürmaier, Ana Thereza (2012) *Neukantianismus Heute* (Neokantismo hoje) Brasilien.
 Resende Jr., José (2012) *Auf der Suche nach einer Sinntheorie: Rickert, Husserl und Lask* (Em busca de uma teoria do sentido: Rickert, Husserl e Lask), São Paulo: Educ Verlag (Brasilien).

III. TAGUNGEN AB 2011

- Seminar 2011: *Logik, Methode und Subjekt in der Diskussion zwischen Heidegger und dem Neukantianismus* (Lógica, método y sujeto en el debate entre heidegger y el neokantismo). Teilnehmer/Mitglieder - Kant-Forschungsgruppe (Grupo de estudios kantianos- GEK): Dr. Hernán Pringe, Dr. Bernardo Aibinder, Marcos Thisted, Dra. Macarena Marey, Hugo Figueredo, Miguel Herzenbaun, Luciana Martínez, Jacinto Páez, Laura Pelegrín, Javier San Sebastián. Instituto de Filosofía de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentinien.
 Januar 2011 (28/29.01.11) *Anthropology in the eye of Phenomenology and Neo-Kantianism*, Universidade de Évora, Portugal (<http://www.filosofia.uevora.pt>), organized by Olivier Feron, participants: Fabien Capeilleres, Irene Borges Duarte, Olivier Feron, Daniel Giovannangeli, Fernanda Henriques, Irene Pardelha, Maria Luisa Portocarrero, Alexandre Franco de Sá, Jean-Renaud Seba, Denis Trierweiler, Luis Umbelino, José Luís Villacañas.

- Juni / Juli 2011 (30.06.11–02.07.11, Katowice/Ustron), *Marburg versus Südwestdeutschland: Philosophische Differenzen zwischen den beiden Hauptschulen des Neukantianismus*. Veranstalter: A. Noras, T. Kubalica und Ch. Krijnen (www.neukantianismus.us.edu.pl.)
- Juni / Dezember 2011 (Paris/Liège), *L'image pense. Image et langage chez Aby Warburg, Ernst Cassirer et Erwin Panofsky*, coopération du Centre Allemand d'Histoire de l'Art (Paris), du groupe de contact F.R.S.-FNRS « Esthétique et philosophie de l'art » et du groupe de contact F.R.S.-FNRS « Historiographie et épistémologie de l'histoire de l'art » (Belgique).
- September 2011 (1.-2.09), *Bild, Abbild und Wahrheit. Von der Gegenwart des Neukantianismus*, Universität Marburg, veranstaltet von Christoph Demmerling und Tomasz Kubalica. Mit Vorträgen von: Christoph Demmerling, Oliver Scholz, Andrzej J. Noras, Kurt Walter Zeidler, Maja Soboleva, Stephan Nachtsheim, Christian Krijnen, Tomasz Kubalica
- September 2011 (18.-21.09) *Religion aus den Quellen der Vernunft. Hermann Cohen und das evangelische Christentum*, Herman Cohen Gesellschaft (Zürich) in Kooperation mit dem Institutum Judaicum an der Universität Tübingen, Tübingen (www.herman-cohengesellschaft.org).
- Workshop "Resistance against disappearance", The Meaning of the Universalist Philosophy of Hermann Cohen for the Experience of Tolerance in the Cosmopolitical Arena of the Eastern Mediterranean, Thessaloniki, 3. Oktober 2011, organisiert von Renate Schindler.
- November 2011 (25.-27.) *Das Wirklichkeitsproblem in Transzendentalphilosophie und Metaphysik*, veranstaltet von der Heinrich Barth-Gesellschaft, mit Beiträgen zum Neukantianismus von Christian Danz, Christian Krijnen, Ernst-Wolfgang Orth, Renate Schindler (<http://www.heinrich-barth.ch/Tagung%20Wirklichkeitsproblem.html>).
- Dezember 2011 (16-17.12.11), *Lotze et son héritage. Journées d'étude internationales sur la philosophie de Lotze et son influence sur la philosophie du XIX^e et du XX^e siècle*, Université de Liège, Veranstaltung: F. Boccaccini.
- 2012 – 2013: A. Noras und T. Kubalica (Universität Katowice), M. de Launay (ENS Paris), K.-W. Zeidler (Universität Wien), M. Ferrari (Universität Turin), P. Fiorato (Universität Sassari) und Ch. Krijnen (Tilburg University/VU University Amsterdam) veranstalten einen mehrjährigen Tagungszyklus *Desiderata der Neukantianismus-Forschung*. Es handelt sich um einen ersten, auf 4 Tagungen ausgelegten Zyklus, dem sich in Zusammenarbeit mit weiteren Kollegen ein folgender anschließen könnte (Vorschläge an Christian Krijnen sind herzlich willkommen!). Folgende Tagungen sind geplant bzw. haben schon stattgefunden:
- Juni / Juli 2011 (30.06.11–02.07.11, Katowice/Ustron), *Marburg versus Südwestdeutschland: Philosophische Differenzen zwischen den beiden Hauptschulen des Neukantianismus*. Veranstalter: A. Noras, T. Kubalica und Ch. Krijnen.
- März 2012 (22.03.12 – 23.03.12, Paris), *Der Begriff der Geschichte im Marburger und südwestdeutschen Neukantianismus und seine Aktualität*. Veranstalter: M. de Launay und Ch. Krijnen.
- November / Dezember 2012 (Do. 30. November 2012 - Sa. 01. Dezember 2012), *Wissenschaftstheorie im Neukantianismus*. Veranstalter: K.-W. Zeidler und Ch. Krijnen, mit Vorträgen von Massimo Ferrari, Werner Flach, Michael Friedman, Michael Heidelberger Christian Krijnen, Tomasz Kubalica, Peter-Ulrich Merz-Benz, Stanley L. Paulson, Volker Peckhaus, Gregor Schiemann, Wolfdietch Schmed-Kowarzik, Friedrich Stadler, Christian Thiel, Uwe Wolfradt, Kurt Walter Zeidler.
- Turin, September 2013. Thema: *Neukantianismus als Kulturphilosophie*.

Veranstalter: M. Ferrari, P. Fiorato und Ch. Krijnen.

Seminar 2012: Philosophie : die neukantianische Sicht, 18.-19. Juni 2012, João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brasilien. Neukantianismus und Philosophie der Gegenwart Forschungsgruppe (Nationaler Forschungsrat/CNPq, Brasilien). Teilnehmer/Mitglieder: Ana Thereza Dürmaier, José de Resende Jr., Dario Alves Teixeira Filho, Newton de Oliveira Lima, Breno Soares, Leonardo Paulino, Luismar Cardoso, Raniere Fonseca.

Neukantianismus-Tagung in USA (SPAWN-Conference), Syracuse University, veranstaltet von Fred Beiser und Sebastian Luft (vermutlich 2013).

IV. VERMISCHTES

Forschungsprojekt von Nina A. Dmitrieva "Phänomen des Russischen Neukantianismus im Kontext der russischen und europäischen Philosophie des Ende 19. - der ersten Hälfte 20. Jahrhunderts" im Rahmen eines Forschungsstipendiums des Präsidenten der Russischen Föderation für habilitierte junge Wissenschaftler (2011-2012).

2 ADDENDA

2.1 Addenda 2009

I. VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN 2009

b) Sekundärliteratur 2009

2. Aufsätze (sofern nicht in erwähnten Sammelbänden/Themenhefte usw. enthalten, es sei denn, sie wurden einzeln gemeldet)

Akindinova, Tatjana A.: Die Poesie und bildende Kunst: von H/Cohen bis M. Bachtin, in: *Die Ästhetik und die Ethik in transienter Welt*, S-Petersburg, 164-167.

Akindinova, Tatjana A.: H. Cohen als moderner Philosoph, in: *Der Meister und Professional: Die Geschichte und die Gegenwart*, 25-33.

Linevskaj D.O.: F.A. Stepun und die Badener Schule des Neukantianismus, in: *Die Ästhetik und die Ethik in transienter Welt*, S-Petersburg, 158-163.

2.2 Addenda 2010

I. VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN 2010

a) Primärliteratur 2010 (Editionen und Übersetzungen)

Cohen, Hermann: Der Begriff der Religion im System der Philosophie (El concepto de la religión en el sistema de la filosofía) Übersetzer: Quiroz, José Andrés Ancona. Barcelona: Anthropos (Spain).

b) Sekundärliteratur 2010

1. Monographien und Dissertationen

Dufour, Éric, *Paul Natorp. De la Psychologie générale à la Systématique philosophique*, Paris, Vrin.

Peter F. Gordon, *Continental Divide. Heidegger, Cassirer, Davos*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, Harvard University Press.

Janaszczyk, Agata: *Na granicy neokantyzmu. O filozofii Hansa Vaihingera (= An der Grenze des Neukantianismus. Über die Philosophie von Hans Vaihinger)*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria.

Paes, Marcos de Souza: Freiheit und Natur: das Kausalitätsproblem in den 'Kritiken' von Kant und sein Einfluss auf die deutsche neukantianische Geographie (Liberdade e natureza: o problema da causalidade nas críticas de Kant e sua influência na geografia alemã neokantiana). Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (Brasilien).

Rodrigues Garcia, Rafael: Genealogie Der Kulturkritik: Eine Studie Über Ernst Cassirers Philosophie Der Symbolischen Formen (Genealogia Da Crítica Da Cultura: Um Estudo Sobre A Filosofia Das Formas Simbólicas De Ernst Cassirer). Universidade De São Paulo (Brasilien).

2. Aufsätze (sofern nicht in erwähnten Sammelbänden/Themenhefte usw. enthalten, es sei denn, sie wurden einzeln gemeldet)

- Arrese Igor, Hector: Die Rezeption des jüdischen Monotheismus in der philosophischen Ethik des reinen Willens von Hermann Cohen (La recepción filosófica del monoteísmo judío en la Ética de la voluntad pura de Hermann Cohen) in *El Títere y el Enano* Vol. I Revista de Teología Crítica (Argentinien)
- Belov, Vladimir: Das Problem der Rationalität und Irrationalität im System der Philosophie von V. Sesemann, in: *X. Kantisches Lesen. Klassische Vernunft und Herausforderung der modernen Zivilisation: Materialien der internationalen Konferenz*, Kaliningrad, 7-24.
- Belov, Vladimir: A. Losev et le néo-kantisme de Marburg, in: *SLAVICA OCCITANIA, Numéro 30, L'Oeuvre d'Aleksei Losev dans le contexte de la culture européenne*. Édité par Maryse Dennes, Publié avec le soutien du Centre national du livre et de l'Université Michel de Montaigne Bordeaux 3, Toulouse. P. 263-271. [Auf Französisch]
- Belov, Vladimir: B.V. Jakovenko über die Philosophie von H. Cohen als die Synthese der philosophischen Positionen von Kant und Hegel, in: *Die Wissenschaft der Philosophie: die Traditionen und Perspektiven der Entwicklung. Zum 240. Geburtstag von G. W.-F. Hegel*, Krasnodar, 66-71.
- Belov, Vladimir: Der russische Neukantianismus und die russische Religionsphilosophie: ein Versuch der komparativistischen Analyse, in: *Die russische Philosophie: Einheit und Mannigfaltigkeit*, Saratov, 77-91.
- Belov, Vladimir: Sokuler, Z.: Hermann Cohen und Dialogphilosophie (Rezension), in: *Kantische Sammlung* [Kantovskiji sbornik] 4(34), 104-110.
- Dmitrieva, Nina A.: Mensch und Geschichte. Zur 'anthropologischen Wende' im russischen Neukantianismus, in: *Etica & Politica / Ethics & Politics*. Vol. XII, no. 2. P. 82–103.
- Dudyschkin, Vladimir A.: A.I. Vvedenskij und der russische Neukantianismus, in: *Das Informationsblatt der Tambover Universität*. Heft 7, Tambov, 127-131.
- Gigliotti, Gianna: *Neokantismo*, in *L'universo kantiano. Filosofia, scienze, sapere*, a cura di C. La Rocca, S. Besoli, R. Martinelli, Macerata, Quodlibet, S. 709-744.
- Gladkov, I.V.: Die philosophischen Ideen von Tschelpanov im Modus des Kantianismus, in: *Der Mensch, die Kultur, die Verwaltung*. Heft 8, Ekaterinburg, 64-80.
- González Porta, M.: Hermeneutik einer Philosophie der symbolischen Formen (Hermenéutica de una filosofía de las formas simbólicas), Natal: *Princípios*, v.17, n.27, jan./jun. (Brasilien).
- Kantor, V.K.: R. Kroner, N. Bubnov, G. Melis, S. Hessen, F. Stepun. Über Messias. Essay zur Kulturphilosophie (Rezension), in: *Fragen der Philosophie* 11, 181-185.
- Kornilova, M.N.: Der Beitrag des Neukantianismus zur Ausarbeitung der Methodologie der humanitären Wissenschaften, in: *Die Philosophie über das Wissen und die Erkenntnis: die aktuelle Problemen*, Uljanovsk, 261-267.
- Krichevskij, M.V.: Neukantianische Diskussionen in der Literaturwissenschaft, in: *Fragen der Philosophie* 7, 153-158.
- Kubalica, T.: Relative Richtigkeit der Abbildtheorie von Heinrich Rickert (Übersetzung von polnischen V. Prochorov und V. Belov), in: *Kantische Sammlung* [Kantovskiji sbornik] 2(32), 69-80.
- Melich, Ju.B.: F.A. Stepun – Kantianer und Mystiker, in: *Fragen der Philosophie* 7, 102-114.
- Pringe, Hernán: Methode und Subjektivität in Hermann Cohens Neukantianismus (Método y subjetividad en el neokantismo de Hermann Cohen) in *ASSALONE*, a.a.O.
- Rjabov, P.V.: Der russische Kantianismus und Neukantianismus des Anfangs des XX. Jahrhunderts im unveröffentlichten Memoiren von A.A. Borovoj, in: *Kantische Sammlung* [Kantovskiji sbornik] 4(34), 97-104.

- Sesemann, V.E.: Die theoretische Philosophie der Marburger Schule (mit Nachwort von V.I. Povilajtis), in: *Kantische Sammlung* [Kantovskiji sbornik] 4(34), 60-80.
- Stolovich, Leonid: A.Z. Scheinberg und seines Memoiren, in: *Fragen der Philosophie* 7, 114-124.
- Vila Pérez, Juan M.: Logik, Wahrheit und Sache. Eine phänomenologische Kritik na dem neukantianischen Begriff der Logik (Lógica, verdad y cosa. Una crítica fenomenológica al concepto neo-kantiano de la lógica) in ASSALONE, Eduardo u. MISSERI, Lucas (Compiladores): Die subjektivistische Wende in der Philosophie der Neuzeit: historische Perspektiven und aktuelle Debatten (El giro subjetivista de la Filosofía Moderna: perspectivas históricas y debates contemporâneos), Argentinien, Mar del Plata: Ediciones Cátedra de Filosofía Moderna.
- Wu, Roberto: Heidegger und der Neukantianismus von Windelband und Rickert (Heidegger e o neokantismo de Windelband e Rickert) São João Del Rei: Revista Estudos Filosóficos n° 5 (Brasilien).

3. Sonderausgaben/Themenausgaben von Zeitschriften 2010

- Divinatio, Volume 32 (Autumn-Winter 2010). Mit Beiträgen zu Cohen von Tatiana Akindinova, Pierfrancesco Fiorato, Maja Soboleva.
- The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy 18 (2010), 1: Schwerpunkt: Ancients and Moderns in Jewish Philosophy. The Case of Hermann Cohen. Hrsg. von Aaron Hughes. Beiträge von Aaron Hughes, Robert Erlewine, James A. Diamond, George Y. Kohler.
- The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy 18 (2010), 2: Mit einem Beitrag von Hartwig Wiedebach.

3 FORSCHUNGSBERICHTE UND -ÜBERSICHTEN

3.1 Bibliographie zu Rickerts Geschichtsphilosophie (1896-1936)

HEINRICH RICKERT'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY AND ITS RECEPTION 1896-1936:
AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY¹

Arnaud Dewalque (Univ. of Liège)

1. PRIMARY LITERATURE:²

- Rickert, H. 1888 *Zur Lehre von der Definition*, Univ. Straßburg, Phil. Dissertation, 66 p.; Freiburg i. Br.: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1888, 66 p.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), ²1915, 91 p.; ³1929, 76 p. This book prepares the ground for Rickert's further developments on the "theory of science".
- 1894 "Zur Theorie der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung", *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, 18/3, 277-319. Preliminary sketch of the first part of Rickert 1896/1902. Rickert does not deal yet with the formation of historical concepts. However, he added the following note at the beginning of the article: "Es sei bemerkt, dass die vorliegende Abhandlung, obwohl sie einen in sich geschlossenen Gedankengang darzustellen versucht, nur ein Theil einer grösseren Arbeit bildet, in der ich die *Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung* aufzuzeigen beabsichtige, d.h. nachweisen will, auf welchen Gebieten wissenschaftlicher Forschung die naturwissenschaftlicher Art der Begriffsbildung nicht angewendet werden kann" (278, n. 1).
- 1896/1902 *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung. Eine logische Einleitung in die historischen Wissenschaften*, First Half, Freiburg i. Br.: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1896, 1-304; Second Half, Tübingen-Leipzig, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1902, 305-743. As a single volume, Tübingen-Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), ¹1902, 743 p.; ²1913, 644 p.; ³⁻⁴1921, 563 p.; ⁵1929, 776 p. Reprinted with an Introduction by Rainer A. Bast, Hildesheim, Olms, 2007, 776 p.; Nabu Press, 2010, 774 p. Extensive exposition of Rickert's "theory of science" or "methodology" (also called "immanent logic" in his unpublished courses). This is the main reference on the topic. Rickert's purpose is to reject the so-called "naturalistic dogma", that is the view that all sciences have the same *telos* and the same method as natural sciences, namely the discovering of laws and the formation of generic concepts. Against this naturalistic dogma he defends a kind of *methodological* dualism according to which "generalization" and "individualization" are two opposite ways of forming scientific concepts. His central claim is that this methodological criterion is more fundamental than any ontological criterion (e.g. 'the physical' vs 'the mental'). However, insofar as the contrasting methods of concept formation are likely to apply to various kinds of materials (there exists for instance a generalizing approach of cultural phenomena), Rickert himself sometimes describes the final result of his multi-levelled analyses as a "pluralistic" theory of science.³

¹ During the four decades running from 1896 (publication of the first half of Rickert's *Grenzen*) to 1936 (Rickert's death), Rickert's theory of historical sciences has been subject to many discussions by his contemporaries. The following annotated bibliography gives an overview of this first reception. Works published after 1936 have not been taken into consideration. For comments and suggestions please contact a.dewalque[at]ulg.ac.be.

² For a complete bibliography of Rickert's published works, see R. A. Bast, "Bibliographie der publizierten Schriften Henrich Rickerts", in H. Rickert, *Philosophische Aufsätze*, Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999, p. 439-456.

³ See e.g. Rickert's *Nachlass*, Heid. Hs. 2740/114 ("Verschiedene Kollegnotizen"), leaf nr. 24: "Dieser Dualismus [der Methoden; AD] war ein Fortschritt gegenüber dem Monismus und auch gegenüber der Methodenlehre Kants. Aber wir müssen auch über diesen Fortschritt hinaus fortschreiten zu einem Pluralismus der Wissenschaftslehre".

- 1896 Presentation (“Selbstanzeige”) of the first half of *Die Grenzen...* (1896), *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, 20, 516-517. As it is described here, the purpose of the book is to “proof the impossibility to treat historical life in a satisfying way as a natural science” (517). Rickert stresses the fact that this programme is directly connected to the general issues of what a world-vision (*Weltanschauung*).
- 1898 “Berichtigung [anlässlich des Barthschen Litteraturberichts über Rickerts *Grenzen...*]”, *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane*, 17, 397-398. Response to Paul Barth 1898a. Rickert maintains that Barth’s objections are irrelevant. He denies he has applied methodological dualism to psychology. Hence he rejects the distinction between “natural psychology” and “historical psychology”. He also emphasizes the fact that historical sciences are independent from psychology and insists that the concept of “historical” is simply used in the book as the name of a *problem* that has to be solved.
- 1899 *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft. Ein Vortrag*, Freiburg i. Br.-Leipzig-Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 71 p.; 2nd edition without subtitle, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2¹⁹¹⁰, 151 p.; 3¹⁹¹⁵, 163 p.; 4-5¹⁹²¹, 169 p.; 6-7¹⁹²⁶, 144 p. Reprinted with a Postface by Friedrich Vollhardt, Stuttgart: Reclam, 1986, 207 p. Less technical presentation and defence of the conception Rickert argues for in his 1896/1902 (1¹⁹⁰²; 2¹⁹¹³; 3-4¹⁹²¹; 5¹⁹²⁹). Rickert emphasizes the role of values in cultural sciences and answers several objections.
- 1901a “Les quatre modes de l’ ‘universel’ dans l’histoire”, *Revue de synthèse historique*, II/2, n°5, 121-140. Reprinted in *Les Études philosophiques*, 2010/1, 9-23. Original German Text: “Die vier Arten des Allgemeinen in der Geschichte”, published in H. Rickert, *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*, 5¹⁹²⁹, 737-754. Rickert accepts as true the usual premise according to which any science requires some kind of “universality”, but he rejects the usual conclusion that the expression “science of the individual” is self-contradictory. His central claim is that the notion of “universal” is ambiguous (124). When suitably clarified, this notion is in fact fully consistent with the idea that historical sciences are sciences of particular and individual things.
- 1901b Review of A. D. Xénopol, *Les Principes fondamentaux de l’histoire* (Paris, 1899), *Historische Zeitschrift*, 86, 464-470. See Xénopol 1¹⁸⁹⁹.
- 1902 “Über die Aufgaben einer Logik der Geschichte”, *Archiv für Philosophie*, Abt. II: *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, VIII/2, 137-163. Response to Tönnies 1902. Rickert stresses the fact that his approach is first and foremost logical and methodological: it aims at elucidating the scientific method that is consistent with the *telos* of historical sciences. He insists that such a task forms at least a preliminary investigation that is necessary from a philosophical point of view and that throws light on the epistemic procedures factually used by historians.
- 2¹⁹⁰⁴ *Der Gegenstand der Erkenntnis. Einführung in die Transzendentalphilosophie* 244 p. (first edition with the subtitle *Ein Beitrag zum Problem der philosophischen Transcendenz*, Univ. Freiburg i. Br., Phil. Habilitationsschrift, 1892, 91 p.; Freiburg i. Br.: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1892, 91 p.; reprinted by Kessinger, 2010, 102 p.; Nabu Press, 2010, 106 p.); 3¹⁹¹⁵, 456 p.; 4-5¹⁹²¹, 395 p.; 6¹⁹²⁸, 460 p. Critical edition by R. A. Bast, forthcoming. The book is devoted to the foundation of knowledge in general, but Rickert added in 1904 a section including developments on the “methodological knowledge forms”, see 2¹⁹⁰⁴, 219 sq.; 6¹⁹²⁸, 419 sq.
- 1905 “Geschichtsphilosophie”, in W. Windelband (ed.), *Die Philosophie im Beginn des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. Festschrift für Kuno Fischer*, Bd. II, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 51-135; 2¹⁹⁰⁷, 321-422; 3^d edition published separately under the title: *Die Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie. Eine Einführung*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 3¹⁹²⁴, 156 p. Rickert articulates the problems of the philosophy of history around three axes: (a) the logic of historical sciences, that is the methodological approach held in Rickert 1896/1902, (b) the search for a principle of the historical development, and (c) the construction of a universal history [On this programme, see Mehlis 1915].
- 1921 *System der Philosophie*, First Part (more has not been published): *Allgemeine Grundlegung der Philosophie*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1921, Chapter IV, Section IX: “Die Probleme der Naturphilosophie und Geschichtsphilosophie”, 211-232.

- 1924 *Kant als Philosoph der modernen Kultur. Ein Geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 214 p. Some remarks on the “philosophy of history”, 11-15. Rickert refers to his 1896/1902 (³⁻⁴1921) and to his 1905 (³1924).
- 1931 “Geschichte und System der Philosophie”, *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 40, 7-46 (first part) and 403-448 (second part). Reprinted in H. Rickert, *Philosophische Aufsätze*, R. A. Bast ed., Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999, 231-317. See in particular the first section: “Von der Geschichte überhaupt”, 235-240.
- 1934a [“Systematische Selbstdarstellung”], in H. Schwarz (ed.), *Deutsche Systematische Philosophie nach ihren Gestaltern*, Bd. 2, Berlin: Jünker & Dünnhaupt, 237-301. Separate edition under the title “Die Heidelberger Tradition und Kants Kritizismus”. Reprinted in H. Rickert, *Philosophische Aufsätze*, R. A. Bast ed., Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999, 345-411. On historical sciences, see 361 sq. Rickert emphasises his favourite thesis, namely the primacy of the “logical opposition” between natural sciences and historical sciences (361), yet he also insists that this approach is consistent with the “objective difference” between natural sciences and cultural sciences (362).
- 1934b *Grundprobleme der Philosophie. Methodologie, Ontologie, Anthropologie*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 233 p. Some remarks on the topic of history §§ 38 sq. The subhead of the section (“Problems of an anthropological philosophy”) is typical of the new approach Rickert developed at the end of his life.

2. SECONDARY LITERATURE:

- Anonym 1896 Review of *Die Grenze...* (First Half, 1896), *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 4/5, 11-12.
- 1902 Review of *Die Grenze...* (Second Half, 1902), *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 10/6, 8-9.
- Barth, P. 1897 *Die Philosophie der Geschichte als Soziologie*, Teil I: *Einleitung und kritische Übersicht*, Leipzig: Reiland; ²1915, ³⁻⁴1922. On Rickert, see particularly 4-8. Critical discussion of Rickert’s “fully untenable determination of the essence of history” (4). On the basis of the first half of Rickert 1896/1902, the author argues that the rejection of (general) concepts and laws in the sphere of history implies the impossibility to construct a historical *science*, for the “immersion into the individual” is not a matter of scientific research yet rather a matter of “aesthetic intuition” (7).
- 1898a Review of *Die Grenzen...* (First Half, 1896), *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane*, 16, 231-233. The author raises serious objections against Rickert’s methodological division of sciences. He maintains (a) that Wundt’s distinction between the “intuitive” method of psychology and the “deductive” method of natural sciences is central to the methodology, (b) that Rickert’s notion of “historical psychology” is an “impossibility” and a mere “phantom” that results from a scholarly application of the logical contradiction-relationship, (c) that the search for laws is an inescapable “regulative idea” for any scientific activity.
- 1898b “Entgegnung [auf Rickerts Berichtigung, *Zeitschr. f. Psych. u. Physiol. d. Sinnesorg.*, Bd. 17 (1898), S. 397-398]”, *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane*, 17, 399-400. The author quotes several excerpts from the first half of *Die Grenzen* (1896/1902) and regards these excerpts as contradictory with Rickert’s response to his 1898a (see Rickert 1898).
- ²1923 [“Selbstdarstellung”], in R. Schmidt (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, Bd. I, Leipzig: Meiner, 1-20. On Rickert, see 5 sq. The author regards Rickert’s explanations as “quite right” (*ganz richtig*) in respect to historiography (6). But he maintains that they are not relevant to understand what historical *science* really is. On his view, historical science corresponds to a further level of investigation, which focuses on intrinsic “legality” (*Gesetzmässigkeit*) in cultural phenomena. The negation of this intrinsic legality is here described as a damaging feature that is common to most of the German philosophers of the time (with the exception of Karl Lamprecht) (9-10).
- Becher, E. 1921 *Geisteswissenschaften und Naturwissenschaften*, München-Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 335 p. On Rickert, see 125-215. The author provides an extensive critical discussion of the Windelbandian-Rickertian views: taking into consideration the three division principles for the classification of sciences (namely their classification with

- respect to their objects, their methods and their epistemological foundations), he maintains that individualizing and generalizing procedures have “much in common”, and that the methodological division of sciences finally leads to the same result as their objectual division (214-215). Hence the most adequate distinction, on his view, is the Diltheyan opposition between *Naturwissenschaften* and *Geisteswissenschaften* (the last including psychology and cultural sciences).
- 1922 “Berichtigungen”, *Schollers Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft im Deutschen Reiche*, 46, 567-570. Response to Troeltsch 1922.
- ²1923 [“Selbstdarstellung”], in R. Schmidt (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, Bd. I, Leipzig: Meiner, 21-48 (1-28). On Rickert, see 32-34 (12-14). The author remarks that the views held by Windelband and Rickert do not do full justice to the sciences as a whole. He maintains that their methodological dualism is relative and relevant only at a secondary level of investigation.
- Bernheim, E. ³⁻⁴1903 *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie*, Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot (¹1889, 531 p.; ²1894, 624 p.), ³⁻⁴1903, 781 p.; ⁵⁻⁶1908, 842 p. The author regards the Rickertian analyses as a confirmation of his own views: he explicitly agrees that historians in any case deal with something individual, and that they cannot do without value judgements. He nevertheless contents that Rickert’s rejection of a “material” division of sciences “goes to far” (⁵⁻⁶1908, 3). In this respect he refers to Frischeisen-Köhler 1906/07.
- Blunt, H. W. 1914 Review of *Die Grenzen...* (²1913), *Mind*, New Series, 23/91, 425-428. The reviewer recalls the Rickertian division of sciences. He remarks that “the issue between classification by subjects and Prof. Rickert’s classification by methods becomes crucial” (426), and he emphasizes the notion of “substitution”, which applies to natural phenomena but not to historical ones.
- Böhm, F. 1933 *Ontologie der Geschichte*, Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) (*Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte*, E. Hoffmann and H. Rickert eds.), 140 p. In contrast with the epistemological approach adopted by Rickert in *Die Grenzen*, the author develops an “critical-ontological” approach in the vein of Rickert’s treatise *Die Logik des Prädikats und das Problem der Ontologie* (1930) (3). His main concern is not to elucidate how historical science is possible, but rather to address the question, “how history *itself* is possible” (2). In answering this question, the author emphasizes the axiological dimension of historical objects. Contents: I. Kant und das Problem der Geschichte; II. Die metalogische Konstitution der Geschichte; III. Der Wertcharakter der Geschichte.
- Cassirer, E. ¹1910 *Substanzbegriff und Funktionsbegriff. Untersuchungen über die Grundfragen der Erkenntniskritik*, Berlin, Bruno Cassirer, ¹1910 = ²1923, p. 293 sq. Reprinted in *Gesammelte Werke. Hamburger Ausgabe*, Bd. 6, Hamburg, Meiner, 2000. The author discusses the view held by Rickert and agrees with the objections coming from Frischeisen-Köhler 1906/07. A long note (301-303) is also devoted to the discussion of Hessen 1909.
- Dyroff, A. 1915 “Zur Geschichtslogik”, Teil I, *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 36, 725-747. The author develops his own approach of the topic with short references a. o. to Rickert 1896/1902 (²1913) and Mehlis 1915.
- 1917 “Zur Geschichtslogik”, Teil II, *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 38, p. 41-71. Critical discussion of the view held by Rickert. The author notably maintains that history does not deal with individuals as such, but rather with individuals as far as they have a social dimension (43-45).
- Ehrlich, O. 1913 *Wie ist Geschichte als Wissenschaft möglich? Kritische Studien über Comte, Marx, Rickert, Stammler, Simmel, Bernheim, W. Freitag, Ed. Meyer, Gumplowicz, Lamprecht, Breysig, u. a.*, Berlin: Verlag Dr. Basch & Co., 98 p. On Rickert, see 46-49 and 71-74. At the methodological level, the author focuses on the discussion of three scientific methods (individualistic-psychological, teleological, causal). He rejects the Rickertian conception on the basis of Freitag 1900. His main contention is that the reference to values is too a restrictive criterion to capture the totality of historical facts (72, 74).
- Endres, J. A. 1920 *Die Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie* (Vortrag, Regensburg, 6. Dezember 1919), Kempten: Kösel, 17 p.

- Engert, H. 1911 *Teleologie und Kausalität. Ein Grundproblem der Geschichtsphilosophie*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 50 p. The author develops the topic from a Rickertian point of view.
- Eulenburg, F. 1905 *Gesellschaft und Natur*, Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1905, 41 p. On Rickert, see particularly 16 sq. (separate edition from *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, 21, 519-555).
- 1910 *Naturgesetze und soziale Gesetze. Logische Untersuchungen*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) (separate edition from *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, 32).
- 1912 *Über Gesetzmässigkeiten in der Geschichte*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 67 p. (separate edition from *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, 35).
- Faust, A. 1927 *Heinrich Rickert und seine Stellung innerhalb der deutschen Philosophie der Gegenwart*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 51 p. Short comparison of Windelband's and Rickert's methodologies (8 sq.).
- Fling, F. M. 1903 "Historical Synthesis", *American Historical Review*, 9/1, 1-22. The author gives an interesting overview of the main discussions about the nature of historical method (with references to Buckle, Droysen, Lamprecht).
- 1920 *The Writing of History. An Introduction to Historical Method*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 195 p. The author simply mentions Rickert's "great work on the logic of history" (187). He adds that "Droysen's Principles may be read with profit after Rickert has cleared the way" (id.).
- Freytag, W. 1900 "Über Ranke's Geschichtsauffassung und eine zweckmäßige Definition der Geschichte", *Archiv für Philosophie*, II. Abteilung: *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, 6, 129-155 (first part) and 311-340 (second part = "conclusion"). On Rickert, see 313 sq. The author refuses to treat concepts as logical items that could be true or false. Hence he rejects any "confusion" between concepts and judgements. Moreover he maintains that all concepts are general in virtue of their nature, so that it would be absurd to speak of an "individual concept". In order to understand in the right way the logical distinction between natural sciences and historical sciences, he suggests that it would be better to use the subject-predicate distinction: scientists from the natural sciences construct judgements whose subjects are (general) concepts, while historians construct judgements whose subjects are individuals. In any case the predicates they use denote general features (319).
- Frischeisen-Köhler, M. 1906/07 "Über die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung", Teil I, *Archiv für systematische Philosophie* XII/2 (1906), 225-266 ; Teil II, *Archiv für systematische Philosophie* XIII/1 (1907), 1-21. Extensive discussion of Rickert 1896/1902 (¹1902). The author casts doubt on the viability of the Rickertian programme. The first part of the article is devoted to Rickert's conception of the natural sciences. At the beginning of the second part, which is devoted to the logic of historical sciences, the author remarks that Rickert's so-called "logical" theory of historical concepts has nothing to do with the logical essence of these concepts because it is contingent for a concept to denote one single object. Accordingly, the view held by Rickert seems "totally untenable" (2). Moreover the author sees no reason to recognize an "autonomous historical concept formation", for the description of individuals should be possible by means of concepts coming from the natural sciences (16). Like Dilthey, the author nevertheless maintains that the specificity of the psychic material is "decisive" for the theory of science, yet he contents that Rickert's view on this point is far from being satisfying (18-19).
- 1912 *Wissenschaft und Wirklichkeit*, Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 478 p. On Rickert's conception of the historical sciences, see 146 sq. The author gives a new formulation of the objections he raised in his 1906/07. He also discusses the answers given by Rickert in the second edition of Rickert 1899 (²1910).
- Galloway, G. 1907 "The Idea of Development and Its Application to History", *Mind*, New Series, 16/64, 506-534. According to the author, "the difficulty [of Rickert's conception] is that no way is left open of relating the mundane to the supramundane values, so that the latter might be regarded as the fulfilment of the former" (532).
- Grotenfelt, A. 1902 "Über Wertschätzung in der Geschichtsbehandlung", *Archiv für Philosophie*, II. Abteilung: *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, VIII/1, 39-70. The author casts doubt on the relevancy of Rickert's distinction between "valuation" and "value

- relation" (60-62). He maintains that the historian actively proceeds to a valuation of the facts and cannot adopt a passive attitude towards them.
- 1903 *Die Wertschätzung in der Geschichte. Eine kritische Untersuchung*, Leipzig: Veit & Comp., 1903, 227 p. Reprinted by Nabu Press, United States, 2010. On Rickert, see 25-27 and 186-195. The author admits the logical meaning of the generalizing-individualizing opposition, but he does not agree that this opposition provides us with a satisfying division principle for the classification of sciences. He also objects that the historian cannot possibly make a selection among the mass of facts by means of a mere "empirical observation" of their relation to values, for there is no consensus possible with regard to this value relation.
- 1905 *Geschichtliche Wertmaßstäbe in der Geschichtsphilosophie bei Historikern und im Volksbewußtsein*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1905, 211 p. The author focuses on the role of value judgements in historical sciences.
- Haering, Th. 1921 *Die Struktur der Weltgeschichte. Philosophische Grundlegung zu einer jeden Geschichtsphilosophie (in Form einer Kritik Oswald Spenglers)*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 373 p. The book involves a short criticism of the Windelbandian-Rickertian conception. See particularly 246-248. The methodological dualism is here regarded as a secondary distinction that derives from a more fundamental distinction at the level of objects.
- Heidegger, M. 1913 "Zur versuchten Aufhebung der Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung" (Disposition im Rickert-Seminar Wintersemester 1913/14: *Übungen zur Geschichtsphilosophie (Methodenlehre der Kulturwissenschaften)*), in M. Heidegger, H. Rickert, *Briefe 1912 bis 1933 und andere Dokumente*, A. Denker ed., Frankfurt/Main: Klostermann, 77-79. Very short notices. The author refers to Rickert 1896/1902 (²1912), Frischeisen-Köhler 1906/07 and Cassirer 1910.
- 1916 "Der Zeitbegriff in der Geschichtswissenschaft", *Zeitschrift für philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, 161, 173-188 ; reprinted in *Gesamtausgabe*, Bd. I: *Frühe Schriften*, Frankfurt/Main: Klostermann, ¹1978, 413-433. The author discusses the distinction between the natural concept of time and the historical concept of time within the framework of a general theory of science *à la Rickert*.
- 1919 "Phänomenologie und transzendente Wertphilosophie" (Cours du semestre d'été 1919), dans *Gesamtausgabe*, Bd. 56/57, Frankfurt/Main: Klostermann, ¹1987, § 7-8, 169-176. Short summary of the main tenets of Rickert 1899 (³1915). The Rickertian conception is described as a particular moment within the development of the philosophy of values.
- Hessen, S. 1909 *Individuelle Kausalität. Studien zum transzendentalen Empirismus*, Berlin: Reuther & Reichard (*Kant-Studien Ergänzungsheft* 15), 151 p. One of the main references of the time on the topic of historical causality, dedicated to "meinem lieben Lehrer Herrn Prof. Heinrich Rickert in herzlichster Verehrung und Dankbarkeit". The author, who also studied under Cohn and Lask, refers to the Rickertian view that he "presupposes" (see "Vorwort") in his own investigations. His main purpose is to construct the distinction between natural causality and historical causality. Content: Einleitung. Die Voraussetzungen der Problemstellung. – Der transzendente Empirismus; Kapitel I: Die historische Kausalität. – Historischer Idealismus und historischer Begriffsrealismus; Kapitel 2: Die primäre Kausalität. – Der erkenntnistheoretische Wirklichkeitsmonismus; Kapitel 3: Der Kantische Begriff des Regulativen und der Wertbegriff.
- Hönigswald, R. 1912 "Zur Wissenschaftstheorie und -systematik. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Heinrich Rickerts 'Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft'", *Kant-Studien*, XVII, 28-84. One of the most extensive defences of the Rickertian approach. Among other things, the author challenges the objections coming from Cassirer 1910 and Frischeisen-Köhler 1906/07. He also addresses the question: How could methodological dualism be consistent with the unity of the concept of knowledge?
- Hugues, P. 1907 "Concrete Conceptual Synthesis", *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, 4/23, 623-630. The aim of the author is to account for the logical properties of what he calls "concrete concepts" (in contrast with perceptual syntheses and abstract concepts). "Concrete concepts" are concepts "of a particular object"; they may be found in history and geography (624). On the same line as Kant, Hegel and Droysen, Rickert is mentioned because he has rightly distinguished these sciences from "all sciences of generalization" (629).

- Husserl, E. 1927 *Natur und Geist. Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1927* (= *Husserliana* XXXII), M. Weiler (ed.), Dordrecht-Boston-London: Kluwer, 2002, 256 p. On Rickert, see §§ 15-16, 78-102, and the Supplements nr. XVII-XXI, 224-249. The author casts doubt on Rickert's "formal constructions" (90). According to him such constructions need a phenomenological fundament. The author himself tries to establish the essence of sciences in a phenomenological way and, more precisely, from the pre-theoretical world of experience. More particularly he rejects the Rickertian, "pragmatic" view of concepts as mere "means" in order to overcome the infinite multiplicity of experiential data (91 sq.).
- Jankelevitch, S. 1902 Review of *Die Grenzen...* (Second Half, 1902), *Revue philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger*, 54, 164-169. Summary of the view Rickert held in his 1896/1902. The reviewer regards Rickert as one of the main representatives of the so-called "criticisme téléologique".
- Jones, T. W. 1931 *Contemporary Thought of Germany*, 2 vol., New York: Knopf, 278 p. and 198 p. On Rickert, see vol. I, 90 sq, some comments upon *Die Grenzen* (without regard to Rickert's other works).
- Kaufmann, F. 1931 *Geschichtsphilosophie der Gegenwart*, Berlin: Junker & Dünhaupt, 138 p., see particularly 34 sq.; reprinted, Stuttgart: Klett, 1961, 171 p.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967, 138 p. The author criticizes the impersonal dimension of the so-called "value relation". He favours the Diltheyan notion of understanding, which is not separable from the personal attitude of the historian.
- Kroner, R. 1923 "Geschichte und Philosophie", *Logos*, XII/1, 123-144. The author focuses on the material of historical sciences. Against Rickert, who sometimes maintains that the generalizing and individualizing methods could apply to the same "neutral" material, he argues that historical material shows a proper mode of being that he calls *Sinnwirklichkeit*.
- Lacombe, P. 1901 "L'Histoire comme science. À propos d'un article de M. Rickert", *Revue de synthèse historique*, III, 1-9. The author argues that historical reality is not made up of individuals, but involves "more or less common" elements as well. According to him, these elements play an important role in historiography. He thus maintains that there exists a type of historical investigation that implies generalization (8).
- Lamprecht, K. 1900 *Die kulturhistorische Methode*, Berlin: Gaertners Verlagsbuchhandlung, 46 p. The author implicitly rejects Rickert's conception as a piece of "dogmatic" approach, and maintains that it does not even deserve to be criticized (24). This last opinion is challenged by Fling 1902 (10, note).
- Lask, E. 1902 *Fichtes Idealismus und die Geschichte*, Tübingen-Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1902, 271 p.: reprinted Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1914, 271 p.; *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. I, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1923, 1-274. The author reconstructs the philosophy of history in Kant and Fichte against the background of Rickert's idea of a "logic of valuation". He notably emphasizes the Rickertian distinction between "supra-individual generality" and "supra-individual totality" (15, note 1).
- 1913 Review of *Die Grenzen...* (²1913), *Logos*, 4, 246-249. Rickert's book, Lask writes, puts an end to the unilateral generalizing tendency in sciences.
- 1924 "Zum System der Wissenschaften" (undated manuscript), first published in *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. III, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 237-293. Series of notes coming from Lask's archives and focusing on the issue of the articulation of sciences. Lask criticizes the formal division-principle held by Windelband and Rickert.
- Leighton, J. A. 1903 Review of *Die Grenzen...* (Second Half, 1902, 305-743), *The Philosophical Review*, 12/3, p. 330-336. The reviewer notably remarks that Rickert does not provide a satisfying argument for his starting thesis that "reality is non-rational" and that the "real world is one of qualitative differences" (334). He also criticizes Rickert's foundational concept of *ought* (*Sollen*), which appears to him to be nothing but "an emasculated reproduction of Fichte's thought in its first period" (335). Moreover, according to him, Rickert's foundational programme proofs that epistemology culminates with metaphysics. He nevertheless admits that the book is "the best recent discussion of the logic of history" that he knows (336).
- 1904 "The Logic of History", *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, 1/2, 42-45. The author sketches the main points of disagreement between

- Tönnies 1902 and Rickert 1902. He suggests that, “on the whole”, Rickert’s conception is probably “right” (45). But he also maintains that some related issues remain unsolved. This is the case of the “fundamental problem of metaphysics”: What is the “relation of the individual and the universal”? According to the author, this question is left unanswered in the Rickertian conception, which simply suggests that “the real is the individual”, without further precisions about the relationship between the reality of individuals and the validity of universals (id).
- Linke, P. F. 1926 “The Present Status of Logic and Epistemology in Germany”, *The Monist*, 36/2, 222-255.
- Maier, H. 1914 *Das historische Erkennen* (Rede zur Feier des Geburtstages Seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs am 27. Januar 1914 im Namen der Georg-August-Universität gehalten), Göttingen: Univ-Buchdruckerei, 37 p. On Rickert, see particularly 15-18. The author focuses on the “historical selection principle” (10). In this respect he raises several objections against Rickert’s conception, which he refers to as a “fatal” or “disastrous” way of solving the problem (16). His central objection is that the criterion Rickert uses in order to account for the historical selection, namely the relation to “absolute values”, is too an *external* criterion. Rather, the historical selection should be grounded in “historical material” itself (17).
- Marty, A. 1908 *Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung der allgemeinen Grammatik und Sprachphilosophie*, Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 764 p. On Windelband-Rickert, see 48-50. The author briefly rejects the view of “Windelband and his school” in order to secure the idea of a nomological analysis of language. He maintains (a) that there are laws that rule historical and cultural phenomena, and (b) that reference to values is not an intrinsic mark of that kind of phenomena. He nevertheless misunderstands the basic tenets of the neo-Kantian view when saying that, according to this view, historical sciences cannot be nomological because of their interest in “mental individuals” (p. 48).
- Medicus, F. 1903 “Kant und Ranke. Eine Studie über die Anwendung der transzendentalen Methode auf die historischen Wissenschaften”, *Kant-Studien*, 8, 129-192. Contains a short note on the interpretation Rickert gives of Kant’s definition of “nature” (146, note 1).
- Mehlis, G. 1909 *Die Geschichtsphilosophie Auguste Comtes kritisch dargestellt*, Leipzig: Fritz Eckardt, 158 p. The author discusses the logic of science from a Rickertian point of view.
- 1915 *Lehrbuch der Geschichtsphilosophie*, Berlin: Springer, 722 p. The book is dedicated to Rickert (“Seinem verehrten Lehrer Herrn Geheimrat Professor Dr. Heinrich Rickert in Dankbarkeit gewidmet vom Verfasser”). It is probably the most important work that takes place within the framework of the neo-Kantian theory of values and develops a Rickertian account of history and historical sciences. Taking for granted the programme Rickert has suggested in his 1905 (²1907, ³1924), the author attempts to progress from the theory of historical sciences to the construction of a universal history. Content: I. Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie oder Theorie der Geschichte und Universalgeschichte; 1. Geschichtsphilosophische Grundfragen; 2. Geschichtsphilosophische Einzelprobleme; II. Die Geschichte der Geschichtsphilosophie; III. Das System der Geschichtsphilosophie oder inhaltliche Konstruktion der Universalgeschichte (from the beginnings of the humankind to the development of the idea of State in German idealism).
- 1925 “Die gegenwärtige Lage der Geschichtsphilosophie”, *Philosophische Monatshefte der Kant-Studien*, 1/1, 3-9. The author contents that the rejection of a universal, naturalistic method is a well-recognized outcome of the “logic of history”. But he adds that “all the other issues” still wait to be solved. According to him, this is the case of the *foundation* of historical sciences and of the *division* of sciences as well. He suggests that the more promising way to solve such methodological issues is to *combine* the approaches held by Windelband, Dilthey, and Rickert. Beside this research programme, the author also pays attention to the two other branches of the Rickertian philosophy of history (see Rickert 1905), namely the principle of the historical development and the construction of a universal history. He maintains that the concepts of “culture”, “final purpose”, “progress”, and “stages” are central to these research orientations.
- Meinecke, F. 1928 “Kausalität und Werte in der Geschichte”, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 137/1; reprinted in *Werke*, Bd. IV: *Zur Theorie und Philosophie der Geschichte*, E. Kessel ed., Stuttgart,

- Koehler, 1959, 61-89. The author discusses two distinct tendencies that compete in the philosophy of historical sciences: the focus on causality and the focus on values. On Rickert, see particularly 68-69 (note): taking into account the Rickertian distinction between “valuation” (*Werten*) and “value-relation” (*Wertbeziehung*; not *Wertbezeichnung* as it is written, 68), the author maintains that the logic of historical sciences has to deal with the “living historian”, who cannot avoid, sometimes against his will, to proceed to valuations.
- Meyer, E. 1902 *Zur Theorie und Methodik der Geschichte*, Halle: Niemeyer, 1902, 56 p. On Rickert, see 25 and 37. The author rejects the idea of historical laws and agrees with Rickert in this respect. Moreover, without appealing to a philosophy of values as such, he contents that the historian makes a selection among the facts in accordance with what he (the author) calls “historical interest”.
- Münsterberg, H. 1908 *Philosophie der Werte*, Leipzig: Barth, 1908, 486 p. On Rickert, see 127 sq. The author maintains that the opposition between the search for general laws and the study of individuals is not the best way of overcoming naturalism. Rather, he regards this opposition as being a “usual presupposition” (128). He therefore rejects Rickert’s methodological dualism. According to him, the crucial difference between natural sciences and historical sciences lies in the materials they take into consideration: first ones deal with perceptual materials (*das Wahrnehmungsartige*) while other ones deal with volitional materials (*das Willensartige*).
- Natorp, P. 1908 “Über Philosophie, Geschichte und Philosophie der Geschichte” [Mit Bezug auf: *Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele*, P. Hinnenberg hrsg., Teil I/6: *Systematische Philosophie*, Berlin-Leipzig, Teubner, 1907], *Historische Zeitschrift*, 100, Dritte Folge, Bd. 4, Friedrich Meinecke ed., 564-584. On Rickert, see 579-580. The author maintains that “the relationship between law and individuality in history requires a new fundamental investigation” (580). In this respect, he remarks that Rickert’s solution is not satisfying at all, for what is individual cannot be disconnected from what is general and conversely (id.).
- Naville, A. ³1920 *De la Classification des sciences. Les idées maîtresses des sciences et leurs rapports*, Paris, Alcan, 322 p. (First edition, Genève: Georg, 1888, 46 p.). On Rickert, see 168 sq. Reprinted by Kessinger Publishing, 2010 [L’auteur partage l’idée que l’histoire s’occupe de ce qui est « unique » mais conteste que l’historien saisisse cette unicité à l’aide de jugements de valeur].
- Oppenheimer, H. 1925 *Die Logik der soziologischen Begriffsbildung, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Max Weber*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 112 p. (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte, 5, E. Hoffmann and H. Rickert eds.). The view held by the author “presupposes” (4, note 1) the main outcomes of Rickert’s *Grenzen* ⁴⁻⁵1921 and of Rickert 1921. The author describes sociology as a generalizing science of culture.
- Riehl, A. 1907 “Logik und Erkenntnistheorie”, in Hinneberg, P. (ed.), *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, Teil I/6 : *Systematische Philosophie*, Berlin-Leipzig, Teubner, 73-102. On Rickert, see 101-102. The author rejects the idea of a methodological dualism and favours an objectual division of sciences. He maintains that sciences are distinct from one another because of their variety of objects and are unified by their method (86). He also disagrees with the idea that historians make a selection among the facts by putting them in relation to values (101).
- Rosenstock-Hüssy, E. 1935 “The Predicament of History” (Paper read before the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, Washington, D. C., December 28, 1934), *The Journal of Philosophy*, 32/4, 93-100. According to the author, Rickert, like Heussi, do not provide a satisfying, “critical and unprejudiced” conception of history; rather they both “act purely and simply as apologists against the primitive dogmatism of natural science” (99). In particular, Rickert would be wrong in accepting the “misleading notion of ‘fact’”.
- Sabine, G. H. 1907 “The Material of Thought”, *The Philosophical Review*, 16/3, 285-297. The author regards Rickert’s *Grenzen* as representative of the “theory of common sense” (286) about our knowledge procedures. He challenges the “external” relationship Rickert’s has established, in the first part of his treatise, between the real world (conceived as a multiplicity of individual objects that we perceive) and the scientific concepts (conceived as general categories that fail to capture reality as it is) (291). According to

- the author, this conception of scientific knowledge is a mere abstraction. Therefore, it should be rejected as misleading.
- 1914 Review of *Die Grenzen...* (²1913), *The Philosophical Review*, 23/1, 65-70. The reviewer raises serious objections against Rickert's logical foundation, which appears to him to be "unclear and probably untenable" (66). The main objection is that several interesting developments of the book are cut out because of Rickert's claimed "formalism". This formalism is very damaging since it implies that material explanations are disregarded, to the effect that Rickert often "draws conclusions" without being committed to "anything definite" (67). According to the reviewer, this vagueness also affects the notion of "immediate experience", which forms the starting point of the book and is nothing but a mere "fiction" (see also Sabine 1907). In this respect, Rickert's so-called antipsychologistic theory of knowledge finally appears to be a chapter of "'bad psychology'" (68). The reviewer nevertheless regards as "conclusive" the idea that valuation plays a central role in history and in the formation of historical concepts (69).
- Sauerbeck, E. 1913 "Vom Wesen der Wissenschaft, insbesondere der drei Wirklichkeitswissenschaften, der 'Naturwissenschaften', der 'Psychologie' und der 'Geschichte'. Ein Programm", *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie und Soziologie* 37 (Neue Folge, XII), p. 234-252, 423-471, 501-533. Some critical remarks on Rickert can be found on pages 249-250 (Rickert's view of the essence of natural science is rejected as false), 429, and 434. See also the last section on history. Reprinted in a separate edition, Leipzig: Reiland, 1914, 192 p.
- Sawicki, F. 1920 *Geschichtsphilosophie*, Kempten-München-Coblenz: Verlag der Jos. Kösel'schen Buchhandlung, 306 p. Introduction to the main problems of the philosophy of history with several references to Rickert. See in particular 257 sq.
- Schweiger, L. 1899 *Philosophie der Geschichte, Völkerpsychologie und Sociologie in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen* (Inaugural Dissertation, Universität Bern, 25. Januar 1899), Bern: Sturzenegger. On Rickert, 78 p. On Rickert, see 55 sq. The author emphasizes Rickert's distinction between history and sociology. He remarks that, for the one who admits Rickert's premises, the line of argumentation in the *Grenzen* is rather convincing. But he casts doubt on the feasibility of an "individualistic conception of history" and argues for a "collectivistic" approach (57). One of the main reasons he advocates for this approach is that "the social is the basis of the individual", so that "something individual without something general is impossible" (58).
- Smith, W.G. 1899 Review of *Die Grenzen...* (First Half, 1896, 304 p.), *The Philosophical Review*, 8/1, 58-60. Short description of Rickert's "acute and careful investigation" (60). The author suggests that Rickert "misconceives experience and our cognitive relation to it" (id.). He also regrets that Rickert's does not really explain the central concept of "validity" (*Geltung*), and he finally raises some doubts regarding the consistency between Rickert's notion of "perfect science" and experimental method.
- Solovine, M. 1913 Review of *Die Grenzen...* (²1913), *Revue philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger*, 76, 549-550. Very short summary of the second edition of Rickert 1896/1902 (²1913).
- Spranger, E. 1905a *Die erkenntnistheoretischen und psychologischen Grundlagen der Geschichtswissenschaft*, Abschnitt 1: *Erkenntnistheorie und Geschichte*, Univ. Berlin, Phil. Diss.; Göttingen: Dieterich, 29 p. Preliminary sketch of the first section of Spranger 1905b (see below).
- 1905b *Die Grundlagen der Geschichtswissenschaft. Eine erkenntnistheoretisch-psychologische Untersuchung*, Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 146 p. Reprinted by BiblioBazaar, 2009, 162 p. On Rickert, see particularly 1-12 and 63-69. The book is divided into two sections: 1. History and Theory of Knowledge; 2. History and Psychology. The author agrees that the construction of a so-called "logic of history" is a justified requirement, but he rejects Rickert's formal approach as being "unfruitful" (9, n. 1). An important part of the book may be seen as a confrontation between the psychological foundation of the theory of knowledge and the Rickertian, antipsychological approach. In this respect the author maintains that "the problem of value cannot be solved without a psychological analysis" (69).
- 1911 Review of *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft* (²1910), *Historische Zeitschrift*, 107/1, 103-106.

- Stern, E. 1920 "Probleme der Kulturpsychologie", *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft / Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, 75/3, 267-301.
- Stern, W. 1903 Review of *Die Grenzen...* (¹1902), *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane*, 33, 207-213. The author identifies Rickert 1896/1902 as the "first comprehensive conclusion" that results from the anti-naturalistic movement initiated by Dilthey and developed within the framework of the Bade School. Rickert's restrictive approach of psychology is regarded as a radical yet "healthy" reaction against psychologism. The author also maintains that Rickert's deduction of the formation of historical concepts is particularly innovative and fruitful. He nevertheless regards the methodological use of the word "nature" (generalizing sciences = sciences of "nature") as misleading and suggests that it would have been better to use the Windelbandian terminology. Moreover he contents that Rickert does not do full justice to the broad "utility" of psychological researches.
- Sternberg, K. ¹1914 *Zur Logik der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Vortrag, gehalten am 11. März 1914 in der Berliner Abteilung der Kantgesellschaft), Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 61 p.; second, revised edition (with changes in the basic structure of the text): Charlottenburg: Pan Verlag Rolf Heise, ²1925, 88 p. The author focuses on the topic of the "logic of history" from a neo-Kantian point of view, with references a. o. to Rickert 1899 (²1910), Riehl 1907, Höningwald 1912 and Cassirer 1910. He rejects any "diametrical opposition" between natural sciences and historical sciences, and he favours a unitary conception based upon the "unity of the logos" (¹1914, 14; ²1925, 19-20). Hence, according to him, Rickert gives too much weight to the fact that historical sciences deal with individuals while natural sciences deal with general laws (¹1914, 33). The author also rejects the notions of value and valuation, which he regards as irrelevant from a logical-theoretical point of view (¹1914, 52).
- Stoltenberg, H. L. 1930 "Kurzer Abriß einer Geschichte der deutschen Soziologie", *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 31, 53-72.
- Stumpf, C. 1906 "Zur Einteilung der Wissenschaften", *Abhandlungen der Königlich-Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1906, 1-94. On Rickert, see particularly 54-59. The author shortly discusses the opposition introduced by Windelband between idiographic and nomothetic sciences. He contents that this methodological opposition cannot take the place of the old distinction between natural sciences and spiritual sciences; rather, it should coexist with it. Moreover he does not regard the search for laws and the study of individuals as incompatible approaches: even Rickert's science of values might be regarded as a science of "laws". Last but not least, he disagrees that value-reference is a good way of accounting for the formation of historical concepts, because value-reference is only related to the "content" of these concepts (it has nothing to do with their logical status). For a more detailed criticism of the Rickertian view, he refers to Frischeisen-Köhler 1906/07.
- Thyssen, J. ¹1924 *Die Einmaligkeit der Geschichte. Eine geschichtslogische Untersuchung*, Bonn: Cohen, 259 p.; Bonn: Bouvier, ²1965. On Rickert, see particularly the first chapter: "Vorläufige Aufstellung der Zeiteinmaligkeitstheorie durch antithese zu Rickert", ¹1924, 9-66. The author agrees that historical sciences deal with unique objects. His main purpose is to make a distinction between two kinds of "uniqueness", namely the uniqueness with regard to the object axiological "qualities" (called "content uniqueness", *Inhaltseinmaligkeit*) and the uniqueness with regard to the place of the object within the course of time (temporal uniqueness, *Zeiteinmaligkeit*). Against Rickert, he maintains that it is temporal uniqueness that is central to the epistemic procedures of historical sciences (XII).
- Tönnies, F. 1902 "Zur Theorie der Geschichte (Exkurs)", *Archiv für Philosophie*, II. Abteilung : *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, VIII/1, p. 1-38. Criticism of the Rickertian view. See also the response to this criticism in Rickert 1902.
- Troeltsch, E. 1904 "Moderne Geschichtsphilosophie", *Theologische Rundschau*, VI, 1904, reprinted of the 2nd edition, ²1922, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 2 : *Zur religiösen Lage, Religionsphilosophie und Ethik*, Aalen: Scientia, 1981, 673-728. The author focuses on the transcendental conception in Rickert 1896/1902 and takes it as "central basis" and "starting point" (728) in order to construct a philosophy of culture and a philosophy of religion. He contents that this transcendental fundament needs to be supplemented by metaphysical developments.

- 1919a “Über den Begriff einer historischen Dialektik. Windelband-Rickert und Hegel”, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 119, 373-426. The author focuses on the concept of “development” against the background of the Rickertian and Hegelian views.
- 1919b *Die Dynamik der Geschichte nach der Geschichtsphilosophie des Positivismus* (Vortrag, gehalten in der Berliner Abteilung der Kant-Gesellschaft am 22. Januar 1919), Berlin: Reuther & Reichard. Very short references to Rickert. See particularly 72, note 2: Troeltsch comments the Rickert-Wundt opposition. He regards Rickert’s “historical logic” as a “combination of logic of individuality, logic of value and logic of causality” (id.).
- 1921 “Der historische Entwicklungsbegriff in der modernen Geistes- und Lebensphilosophie. II. Die Marburger Schule, die südwestdeutsche Schule, Simmel”, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 124/3, 377-447.
- 1922a “Die Geisteswissenschaften und der Streit um Rickert. Aus Anlaß von Erich Becher, *Geisteswissenschaften und Naturwissenschaften*”, *Schmollers Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft im Deutschen Reiche*, 46/1, 35-64 Confrontation between Becher 1921 and Rickert 1896/1902 sq. The author agrees with the metaphysical view he attaches to Rickert’s theory, but he rejects the “logic of object-production” that hides this metaphysical view. At the logical level, he therefore favours the analyses proposed by Becher.
- 1922b “Erwiderung”, *Schmollers Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft im Deutschen Reiche*, 46, 570 sq. Response to Becher 1922.
- Vierkandt, A. 1902a “Natur und Kultur im sozialen Individuum”, *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie und Soziologie*, 26, New Series, 1/3, 361-382. On Rickert, see particularly the last section, 377-382. The author regards Rickert 1896/1902 as “the only conceptual systematic survey” which has been devoted “up to now” to the delimitation of the concepts of *Natur* and *Geist* (377). He compares his own conceptual views with those of Rickert, and he partially disagrees with him insofar as he maintains that “generality” and “absence of value” also apply to a significant part of human culture (378).
- 1902b Review of *Die Grenzen...* (Second Half, 1902), *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie und Soziologie*, 26, New Series, 1/4, 470-473. Comments on Rickert’s “extraordinary clear” explanations (471). The reviewer simply raises two (unanswered) questions regarding the relevancy of Rickert’s programme: (a) is a formal-logical approach appropriate for the study of historical sciences?, and (b) since the “overcoming of infinite multiplicity” is no more than a “unnoticed effect” of scientific procedures, is it relevant to treat this notion as central, as Rickert does?
- Villa, G. 1902 “Psychology and History”, *The Monist*, 12/2, 215-235. On Rickert, see particularly 225-232. The author briefly sketches the division of sciences proposed by Rickert and focuses his attention on the place devoted to psychology. He maintains that psychological life is not reducible to sensations and, therefore, that psychology cannot be treated as a natural science as Rickert does (230).
- Von Below, G. 1911 “Kulturgeschichte und Kulturgeschichtlicher Unterricht”, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 106/1, 96-105.
- Von Schelting, A. 1935 *Max Webers Wissenschaftslehre. Das logische Problem der historischen Kulturerkenntnis. Die Grenzen der Soziologie des Wissens*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934, 420 p.
- Weber, M. 1904 “Die ‘Objektivität’ sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis”, reprinted in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), ¹1922; ²1951; new page numbering: ³1968, ⁴1973, ⁵1982, ⁶1985, ⁷1988, 146-214. One of the most famous continuations of the Rickertian view. The author uses some outcomes of Rickert 1896/1902 in order to explain the formation of sociological concepts.
- Willy, R. 1987 Review of *Die Grenzen...* (First Half, 1986), *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie und Soziologie*, 21, 530-531. Short summary of Rickert’s book without critical discussions.
- Wundt, W. ¹1901 *Einleitung in die Philosophie*, Leipzig: Engelmann, 466 p.; Leipzig: Kröner, ⁹1922, 448 p. On Rickert, see § 6, ¹1901, 67-74; ⁹1922, 64-71. The author criticizes the formal dimension of the generalizing-individualizing opposition. He also contents that the concept of “cultural sciences” is too restrictive.

- Xénopol, A.-D
Dimitrie 1899
- 1902
- 1914
- Les Principes fondamentaux de l'histoire*; 2nd edition under the title : *La Théorie de l'histoire : Des principes fondamentaux de l'histoire*, Leroux, ²1908, 483 p., see particularly 92 sq.
- Review of *Die Grenzen...* (¹1902), *Revue de synthèse historique*, IV, 282 sq. The author agrees, for the most part, with the Rickertian view. He gives his own formulation of the methodological dualism: natural sciences deal with “coexistent” or “repeated” facts while historical sciences deal with “successive” facts. The only way to account for the foundation of the later is to “complete the logic of repetition by that of succession” (292).
- “Natur und Geschichte [Im Anschluss an die zweite Auflage von Heinrich Rickerts *Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung*, Tübingen, Mohr, 1913]”, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 113/1, 1-21. The author will offer a “careful examination” of Rickert 1896/1902 (²1913).