BIO: Christopher J. Insole is Professor of Philosophical Theology and Ethics at the University of Durham, UK, and Professorial Fellow at the Institute for Religion and Critical Inquiry at the Australian Catholic University.

Free Belief: The Medieval Heritage in Kant's Moral Faith

Abstract: In this article, I argue that when Kant describes faith as a free-choice, he is aligned with the medieval tradition, and with his own sources that mediate this heritage (in particular, Leibniz and Locke). Tradition consistently, affirmatively, and systematically, invokes freedom and the will, with reference to belief in God, without such a dimension of choice implying any deflation in the degree of commitment to this belief. But, in clarifying that it is "human freedom" alone, without divine action, Kant departs from this same tradition, as mediated to him through his sources. Such divine action, Kant is convinced, would destroy significant human freedom. This conviction is the source of Kant's repeated insistence that grace follows rather than precedes moral conversion. It is this claim that departs significantly from the medieval tradition, as mediated to Kant, rather than the suggestion that we *choose* to believe in God.

Keywords: Kant, Aquinas, knowledge, opinion, faith, belief, morality, practical reason

Kant famously rules out the possibility of any knowledge of God's existence or non-existence (A 590/B 618–A 742–44; A 742–44–B 770–72).[1] In denying the possibility of knowledge about God, Kant departs from his rationalist sources, and from his own earlier position (*OPA* 2:63–163). Leibniz,[2] Wolff,[3] Locke,[4] Crusius,[5] Meier,[6] and Baumgarten,[7] all assert that we can have knowledge (*Wissen*) of the existence and properties of God. Although Kant finds that there is an absence of evidence sufficient for knowledge about God's existence, or non-

existence, this is not, for Kant, a disordered or regrettable deficit. Indeed, Kant finds it "providential" that God has not permitted such knowledge. Kant even tells us that we should "thank heaven" that "our faith [*Glaube*] is not knowledge":

<ext>

For divine wisdom is apparent in the very fact that we do not know but rather ought to believe that a God exists. ("*Pölitz*," 28:1084)

</ext>

Kant takes seriously the recommendation that we "ought to believe that a God exists." In the Dialectic of the second *Critique*, Kant argues that not only are we permitted to believe in God, but we are rationally required to do so, because the realization of the highest good, replete with happiness, can *only* be achieved by a "supreme cause of nature having a causality in keeping with the moral disposition" (*CPrR* 5:125). The 'highest good' is the state where everyone obeys the moral law and achieves happiness in proportion to virtue. Belief in God is "necessary" for our practical reason, as the "highest good" is "possible only under the condition of the existence of God," which connects "the presupposition of the existence of God inseparably with duty" (*CPrR* 5:125; see also A 829/B 857; *CJ* 5:444, 469).

The absence of evidence is overcome, for Kant, by a movement of the will, involving a "*free* affirmation" of "I believe in God" (*Progress*, 20:298). This notion of faith as a "free affirmation" is repeated across Kant's texts. In the second *Critique*, Kant writes that belief in God "rests with our choice" (*CPrR* 5:145). "Matters of belief," Kant explains in the *Jäsche Logic*, are "necessarily free" ("*Jäsche*," 9:70). In section §91 of the third *Critique*, Kant explains that "the faith," which is "related to particular objects that are not objects of possible knowledge or opinion," is "entirely moral":

<ext>

It is a free affirmation, not one for which dogmatic proofs for the theoretically determining power of judgment are to be found, nor one to which we hold ourselves to be obligated, but

one which we assume for the sake of an aim in accordance with the laws of freedom. (*CJ* 5:472)

</ext>

      The contention of this article is that Kant's notion of faith/belief (*Glaube*) as a "free affirmation" has a complex relationship with two central elements of the medieval tradition of reflection upon faith, going back to Thomas Aquinas and Hugh of St Victor. These two features are, respectively: the claim that faith is *sui generis*, combining textures that belong to both knowledge and opinion; and, secondly, the conviction that the will assents to the propositions of faith, holding to them with a certainty equivalent to knowledge, even without the evidence sufficient for the state of knowing.

      It is a solid interpretative principle, which alone justifies the practice of the *history* of philosophy, that one can rarely understand the significance and meaning of what any thinker says about a subject, simply by reading what that thinker alone says about this subject. This principle applies in this case: through reading Kant alone on *Glaube*, neglecting his sources, and the wider tradition, we receive only a partial sense of the strands of continuity and rupture with the previous tradition, and so only a limited sense of the extent to which Kant is adopting a traditional, or a "deflationary," position. We find a good example of the potential for such a limited perspective, when we consider Kant's treatment of the relationship between faith, grace, and moral conversion, as set out in the *Conflict of the Faculties*, where Kant engages with the Pietistic theology of Spener and Franck. As we will see, in the first part of this article, Kant identifies common ground with the Pietists, insofar as they associate faith with freedom, and with morality. The key difference that Kant identifies between his account, and that of the Pietists, lies in the identification of the ultimate source of the freedom involved in faith. Kant maintains that such freedom is *supersensible*, and entirely our own. Spener (and Franck) hold that this freedom is *supernatural*, having its origins in divine action. Although from this one understands that Kant disagrees with the Pietists, one might still harbor the suspicion that Kant has a positive, perhaps largely traditional, conception of faith and grace, and of the relationship between divine action and faith. What one can only

ascertain by reading Kant's own sources, in the light of the medieval tradition, is that Kant's account of freedom and faith draws upon traditional themes, but, at a key point, consciously swerves away from an entire tradition of theological reflection, as he would have received it.

Steps are taken to demonstrate this in the second part of the article, which attends to the origins of the notion of faith as a free affirmation. We begin with Hugh of St. Victor and Thomas Aquinas, moving on to track how this tradition is mediated through Kant's own sources, predominantly in texts by Leibniz and Locke, which we know Kant to have studied. Although Meier is often cited as the figure from whom Kant might have received the "opinion, belief, knowledge" trio, it turns out that Meier is not likely to be a source for Kant, on this narrow front. Indeed, in employing the trio, Kant seems explicitly to challenge features of Meier's analysis of *Glaube*.

This provides the necessary background for a detailed anatomy, set out in the third part of the article, of Kant's own treatment of the epistemic category of "faith," as he contrasts it, following his sources, with the categories of opinion and knowledge. On the side of "continuities" with the prior tradition, we are able to confirm that an emphasis upon the voluntary nature of belief in God is perfectly traditional. This is significant, as Kant's language of free-choice with respect to belief in God can be an encouragement to read his religious commitment in rather deflationary terms.[8] Briskly speaking, the suggestion behind such deflationary accounts is that Kant does not recommend belief in God so much as proceeding, for heuristic, or practical, purposes *as if* there is a God. This article demonstrates that Kant's use of the language of free choice and free affirmation, cannot reasonably be used as evidence in support of such deflationary readings. We might, of course, have other reasons for interpreting Kant's belief in God in deflationary terms, about which I say nothing here. Nonetheless, when Kant talks of faith as a free affirmation, in so doing, he aligns himself closely with a traditional understanding, going back to Aquinas, and mediated to Kant through figures such as Leibniz and Locke. This tradition consistently, affirmatively, and systematically invokes freedom and the will, with reference to our belief in God. To a limited extent, then, Kant's invocation of free-will in the context of faith is traditional, and, I will be able to show, Kant would know this.

Equally, though, on the other side, our engagement with the historical sources of the notion of free belief reveals where Kant makes some distinctive intra-theological moves, in terms of how Kant conceives of the role of divine action in relation to human freedom. To say, as both Kant and Aquinas (and others) do, that a belief must be a "free affirmation" is not yet to say very much, until we know what human freedom amounts to, both in itself, and in relation to divine action. On this point, we will see, in the fourth part of this article, that Kant's position constitutes a rupture with all of his theological sources, which sources affirm that faith comes primarily, and originally, from divine action, through grace and revelation. In his insistence that faith must be an act of our own freedom, of our own practical reason, without divine action or intervention, Kant sets his face against the entire prior theological tradition, for reasons that go to the heart of his philosophical project. Nonetheless, as I show in the final section, Kant does develop a positive reinterpretation of the theological categories of grace, and of divine cooperation with human action, which, by his own lights, does not violate significant human freedom.[9]

Curiously, then, by reading Kant alone, without knowing about the historical origins of the association of freedom with faith, we can get things precisely the wrong way around. Kant's emphasis upon the need for a voluntary dimension in the case of belief in God can look rather "post-Christian" and deflationary, relegating such belief to a heuristic category of believing "as if" there is a God. In turn, Kant's discussion of the way in which grace follows moral conversion can look more traditional, with the apparently rather pious association of ethical behavior and religious belief. In truth, as we will see, it is the former that is traditional, and the latter that is revolutionary. It is revolutionary, because of Kant's repeated insistence that grace *follows* rather than *precedes* moral conversion.

There have been, recently, a number of sophisticated treatments of Kant's account of 'belief' (*Glaube*), or, depending upon the translation, 'faith,' to which I am indebted.[10] The existing literature mentions, but does not explore extensively, as I do here, the role of the will in Kant's understanding of religious belief.[11] Some commentators have drawn attention to the similarity between the scholastic analysis of "opinion, belief, and knowledge" and Kant's use of the trio. The precise lines of transmission, from scholastic theology to Kant, tend to be

gestured toward meaningfully, but rather vaguely, often with a nod to Meier.[12] Leslie

Stevenson comments about the "*meinen*, *glauben* and *wissen*" trio that it "seems to have been

part of the conventional wisdom of Kant's day," and that "presumably it had been handed

down from medieval theology," although Stevenson adds, "I do not know by what route."[13]

This article shows precisely what this route might have been. Alix Cohen has done invaluable

work on the role of the will in Kant's wider notion of epistemic responsibility, with an

explicit focus on "empirical beliefs . . . that are always, at least in principle, susceptible of

evidential support."[14] My article undertakes the distinct, but complementary, task of

investigating the shape, and origins, of Kant's conception of the (doxastically responsible)

role of the will, in the context of religious beliefs, which are not, Kant thinks, susceptible to

evidential support.

1. Faith and Grace: Kant and the Pietists

In the *Conflict of the Faculties*, Kant is concerned with the relationship between grace, moral

conversion, and faith. Kant praises Spener, insofar as "the valiant Spener called out fervently

to all ecclesiastical teachers" that

<ext>

The end of religious instruction must be to make us *other* human beings and not merely better

human beings (as if we were already good but only negligent about the degree of our

goodness). (*CF* 7:54)

</ext>

Kant offers two cheers for Spener, insofar as Spener has understood that the proper task is to

ask "not only what Christianity is," but "also how to set about teaching it so that it will really

be present in the hearts of human beings," so that "religious faith will also make human

beings better" (*CF* 7:53). Although Spener is insightful, Kant thinks, in understanding that

"faith" requires a moral conversion, Kant's reservations about Spener arise because of the link that Spener draws between faith (so understood), and "grace," whereby, for Spener, "faith is an effect of grace" (*CF* 7:56).

As I will demonstrate, Kant identifies what he considers to be the key difference between his position and that of Spener, on the specific question of grace in relation to moral conversion: the difference lies in the distinction between the supersensible (*übersinnlich*), and the supernatural (*übernatürlich*). Where Kant invokes the category of the "supersensible," which is to say, the realm of non-spatial and non-temporal noumenal freedom, Spener makes the mistake of thinking in terms of the "supernatural," which involves divine action. Precisely what we should make of Kant's notion of "supersensible" noumenal freedom is highly contested in Kant studies, and I do not propose to settle this issue here.[15] But what everybody has to concede is that, in some sense (deflationary or metaphysical), Kant is committed to the notion of non-temporal and non-spatial freedom. This has to be accepted, just because Kant so often makes recourse to it,[16] with the *Conflict of the Faculties* (from the late 1790s), being one more example. Talking about moral conversion, whereby we become the "new man" (*CF* 7:59), Kant affirms that we need to invoke a "supersensible freedom," because "the means to this end cannot be empirical—since empirical means could undoubtedly affect our actions but not our attitude [*Gesinnung*]" (*CF* 7:54). A problem arises, though, when one thinks that the "*supersensible* [*Übersinnliche*] must also be *supernatural* [*übernatürlich*]," involving "God's direct influence" (*CF* 7:54).

Kant's aversion to this notion of divine action upon us has deep roots in his thought, which go right down to his fundamental conception of what significant human freedom must consist in. "Freedom cannot be divided," Kant insists, such that "the human being is either entirely free or not free at all" (*Refl*., 4229, 17:467). Freedom must be a "faculty of starting . . . events from itself [*sponte*], i.e., without the causality of the cause itself having to begin, and hence without need for any other ground to determine its beginning" (*Prolegomena*, 4:344; see also A 446/B 474). Kant is clear that God acting upon us would be an "alien cause" (*CPrR* 5:95)[17], which would destroy freedom, described by Kant as the "inner value of the world" ("*Moral Mrongovius*," 27:1482). Kant has a zero-sum account of the relationship

between divine action and human freedom. Human freedom is only possible where God withdraws. Accordingly, Kant also explicitly rejects the traditional scholastic conception of *concursus* or "concurrence" (although not, as we will see, all construals), whereby it is maintained (albeit mysteriously) that divine and human action can run together, directly and fully, in single action, such that God is the immediate and direct efficient cause of a free human action:

<ext>

It is not permitted to think of God's concursus with free actions. . . . If God concurs with morality, then the human being has no moral worth, because nothing can be imputed to him.[18] (*DR* 28:1309)

</ext>

Kant does concede that we cannot know that divine cooperation is impossible (*Rel.*, 6:44, 52, 142–43; see also "*Pölitz*," 28:1106, 1110). This has led Pasternack, for example, to talk suggestively of Kant being "agnostic" as to "whether or not we receive any Divine assistance in our efforts to morally improve ourselves."[19] Patrick Kain also writes that Kant leaves "conceptual room for some kind of dependence within creaturely agency and for the possibility of divine concurrence and divine [fore]knowledge of human free actions."[20] Similarly, and correctly, Jacqueline Mariña points out, that "God's supernatural cooperation in our becoming better persons," is not for Kant something that we *know* to be "impossible." But, as Mariña goes onto observe, "its possibility remains inscrutable" such that, "even if it were posited, on a practical level we wouldn't be able to make use of such a supposition."[21] Kant warns that neither theoretical nor practical reason can make any positive use of such a concept of divine action (*Rel.*, 6:53). That said, as I show in section 5, Kant does find an acceptable reinterpretation of the categories of grace, and of divine cooperation with human action, which can be used within the limits of the pure religion of reason. When I write that Kant rejects a "traditional" account of grace and concurrence, this qualifier is vital, as he is willing to recommend a reinterpreted and Kantian account of grace and divine cooperation.[22]

Turning away from *traditional* accounts of divine cooperation and grace, Kant searches for "another principle for solving Spener's problem" (*CF* 7:58), which is to say, the correctly identified need for the human being to turn towards the moral law. We find such a principle when we contemplate "our *ability* so to sacrifice our sensuous nature to morality," so "that we *can* do what we quite readily and clearly conceive we *ought* to do" (*CF* 7:58):

This ascendancy of the *supersensible* human being in us over the *sensible* . . . is an object of the greatest *wonder*; and our wonder at this moral predisposition in us, inseparable from our humanity, only increases the longer we contemplate this true (not fabricated) ideal. (*CF* 7:58–59)

Kant diagnoses the tendency to interpret this capacity in supernatural terms, as understandable, but mistaken:

Since the *supersensible* in us is inconceivable and yet practical, we can well excuse those who are led to consider it *supernatural*—that is, to regard it as the influence of another and higher spirit, something not within our power and not belonging to us as our own. Yet they are greatly mistaken in this, since on their view the effect of this power would not be our deed and could not be imputed to us, and so the power to produce it would not be our own. (*CF* 7:59; see also *Rel.*, 6:51)

As already indicated, Kant's close grappling with Spener and Franck can lead us to see the trees, rather than the forest if we accept Kant's own presentation of his discussion as a critique of a strand of Pietistic theology. When, though, we paint on a larger canvass, we see that Kant's particular appropriation of the notion of faith as dependent upon human freedom

sounds deep traditional harmonics, as well as, on other fronts, announcing a significant rupture with an entire theological tradition. The task of the next section, therefore, is to set out the shape of this tradition.

I suggest that Locke and Leibniz are likely to have been important sources for Kant. Nonetheless, in setting out a possible route through which Kant could have received these traditional conceptions of *Glaube*, my aim is not to rule out the possibility of other influences and sources, more or less diffuse, which may be further unveiled, in due course, by other scholars. The point is, rather, to avoid drawing anachronistic parallels between scholasticism and Kant, by showing how something like the scholastic account was mediated to Kant through more immediate and demonstrably known sources.

2. The Origins of the Notion of Free Belief, Between Opinion and Knowledge

When considering scholastic and early modern treatments of faith, we are particularly concerned to track two commitments, which, we will see in the third part of this article, are features of Kant's own treatment of *Glaube*, in continuity with a tradition of theological reflection. As already outlined, these commitments are as follows: first, that faith combines elements of opinion and knowledge, and, secondly, that the will assents to the propositions of faith, holding to them with a certainty equivalent to knowledge, albeit without evidence sufficient for the state of knowing.

2.1. Thomas Aquinas

The trail begins, for us, with Aquinas, who declares that we are in a state of belief when we have evidence that is sufficient only for opinion, but adhere to the proposition with the certainty appropriate to knowledge. What makes up this absence of evidence is the movement of the will, which chooses to belief. So in the act of believing, of which belief in God is the

paradigm, the believer "settles upon one side of the question," in "virtue of his will [*per voluntatem*]" (*Sum. theol*. IIa–IIae.2.1). This means that the believer becomes "firmly attached to one alternative," and so "is in the same state of mind as one who has science or understanding" (*Sum. theol*. IIa–IIae.2.1), even though belief is "imperfect as knowledge," as it is "without clarity or vision" (*Sum. theol*. Ia–IIae.67.3).

As Debora Shuger explains, Aquinas is able to exploit an ambiguity in the Latin term *certus* ("certainty"), which can mean "(a) established by the evidence, proven," and/or "(b) resolved upon, decided."[23] In a way that will be illuminating for understanding Kant's distinction between what he calls "objective" and "subjective" sufficiency (see section 3), we can distinguish between the certainty of evidence, and the certainty of adherence. It is in the second sense that faith enjoys certainty, inasmuch as such *certus* refers to, and requires, an act of the will. Faith holds a "middle place," surpassing "opinion because its adhesion is firm [*firmam inhaesionem*]," but falling "short of knowledge (*scientia*), because it lacks vision" (*Sum. theol*. Ia–IIae.67.3).[24] This distinction rests upon what Shuger identifies as the central dilemma of "all pre-modern epistemology,"[25] which is that there is an "inverse proportion between the excellence of an object and its knowability: the more excellent the object, the less knowable to us."[26] This goes back to Aristotle, who in the *Posterior Analytics* distinguishes between what is, on the one hand, "prior and more knowable . . . in nature," and, on the other hand, that which is more knowable "in relation to us." It is the lesser objects that are "more knowable" in "relation to us," because they are "nearer to our perception," while the objects "more knowable" in themselves are "further" from our perception:

<ext>
The most universal concepts are furthest from our perception and particulars are nearest to it . . . these are opposite to one another. (*Posterior Analytics*, 1.2, 71b35–72a6)
</ext>

For Aquinas, it is the movement of the will that overcomes this absence of evidence, in this life, with respect to matters of faith, in that it "adheres *totally*" to faith by virtue of the

"*will*, which chooses to assent determinately and precisely to one part because of something that is sufficient to move the will but not sufficient to move the intellect" (*De veritate*, 14.1). Aquinas's position is often summarized as the claim that "faith is mid-way between science and opinion" (*Sum. theol*. IIa–IIae.1.2), which is an English rendering of "fides est media inter scientiam et opinionem" (*Sum. theol*., IIa–IIae.1.2). Aquinas himself derives this statement from the "widely accepted" scholastic "definition of faith"[27] presented by Hugh of St Victor: "faith is a form of mental certitude about distant realities that is greater than opinion and less than science." [28] I have at points mirrored this standard usage, and will continue to do so, talking of belief as being "between" knowledge and opinion. Nonetheless, this phrasing should come with a caveat. It is important for Aquinas, as indeed it will be for Kant, that the conceptual space of being "between" opinion and knowledge is not to be understood as the mean-point of a continuous spectrum, whereby one can, straightforwardly,[29] move, by accumulating evidence, from opinion, through faith, to knowledge. Faith, rather, is "between" in the sense of being *sui generis*, sharing features with both opinion and knowledge, enjoying a certitude that is greater than opinion, yet different to knowledge, because not grounded upon sufficient evidence. Kant does not himself read scholastic sources such as Thomas Aquinas and Hugh of St Victor, but the key features of this theological tradition are demonstrably mediated to Kant through texts that we know he had studied. It is to these texts that we now turn.

2.2. Meier, Leibniz, and Locke

As I remarked above, when commentators draw attention to the traditioned nature of Kant's trio of opinion, belief, and knowledge, they tend to nod in the direction of Meier.[30] In what immediately follows, I will show that although, in broad terms, much of what Meier says about practical reason is indeed influential upon Kant, when we get to the more specific claims about 'belief' (*Glaube*), in the context of religion, we do not find the two distinctive features of the tradition that interest us: faith construed as mid-way between opinion and

knowledge, which involves the will assenting to religious propositions with certainty. Furthermore, when, in section 3, we get into the fine details of the way in which Kant himself distinguishes "opinion" from "belief," in the context of religion, we find that Kant explicitly disagrees with Meier on a range of points. Far from being Kant's main source for the traditional trio of opinion, belief, and knowledge, I will show that by adopting this trio, Kant aligns himself against Meier.

Where Meier does plausibly emerge as a positive influence upon Kant, is in the former's considerable interest in practical reason, and in a type of practical certainty. In the *Auszug*, Meier writes that "all learned cognition is either practical or speculative," and that "cognition is practical, in so far as it is able to move us in a particular way, to do or omit an action."[31] Meier goes on to comment that "whoever wants to improve as much as possible his learned cognition, must aver [*verhüten*] speculation, and seek according to practical reason,"[32] even going as far as to claim that "no true learned cognition is by its nature speculative, but only by virtue of the lack of insight of the learned, who cannot perceive the connection with human action, or will not see it."[33] In the *Vernunftlehre*, Meier goes as far as to proclaim that "moral certainty," which concerns rational and virtuous action, should be estimated to enjoy the equivalent of "mathematical certainty."[34] Much of this resonates strongly with the priority, certainty, and ubiquity of practical reason in Kant's critical philosophy (see A 795/B 823–A 831/B 859).[35] We might also discern the influence of Meier's account of practical reason where Kant talks about *pragmatischer Glaube*, which, for Kant, are beliefs and acceptances that guide practice, such as, for example, the doctor diagnosing an illness, or the businessman striking a deal (see A 824/B 852; "*Jäsche*," 9:67–68n).

Nonetheless, I have not been able to find, in Meier's *Vernunftlehre,* or in the abbreviated version of this text, the *Auszug* (which was heavily used and annotated by Kant), the traditional feature of faith that we will identify in Kant: that faith is somehow a "stage" (*Stufe*) or a hybrid between opinion and knowledge, and that the will assents to the propositions of faith, holding to them with a certainty equivalent to knowledge. In the *Auszug*, where Meier discusses belief, he affirms that "to believe means, to accept

[*annehmen*] something for the sake of a witness," with the scope of such belief limited to "past, present and future things," and not to "other truths."[36] In the longer *Vernunftlehre*, Meier gives a more extensive account of the sort of things which can be witnessed to: not only past, present, and future events,[37] but also that which is good for the soul[38] and our eternal well-being. Religious claims certainly come under this aegis. With respect to such claims, Meier recommends not certainty, but a "happy middle-state which consists of rational belief," avoiding both incredulity (*die Ungläubigkeit*) and credulity (*die Leichtgläubigkeit*).

I have also not been able to find these two distinctive features of scholastic teaching in key texts by Baumgarten[39] or Crusius.[40] Wolff, promisingly, has a chapter title which contains the trio "Wissenschaft, Glauben, Meinungen."[41] But Wolff does not, in this section, describe belief as a stage or hybrid between knowledge and opinion. Also, we do not find Wolff associating belief with an act of the will. By "belief," in this text, Wolff means, simply, "the approval, which one gives to a statement by virtue of the witness of another."[42] Having set out his account of "belief," the remainder of Wolff's discussion of "*Glaube*" is dedicated to setting out grounds for attributing trustworthiness, or not, to a witness.[43]

We get much closer to Kant's treatment of *Glaube*, in relation to *Meinung* and *Wissen*, when we look at the work of John Locke. We know Locke to have been a significant figure for Kant, because of numerous references throughout his corpus (see, for example, Ax, A 86/B 119; A 95/B 127; *Prolegomena*, 4: 257, 289; *CPrR* 5:352; *CF* 7:135), and to the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* in particular (see *Prolegomena*, 4:270). We also know that Kant read Poley's German 1757 translation of Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding*.[44] More significant still, for our purposes, is that Kant explicitly refers to a particular passage from the *Essay*, which sits in precisely the part of Locke's text which lays out the various textures of assent, such as knowledge, belief and opinion.[45] In the translation of Locke that Kant would have read, as I will show, we find the two relevant features of the scholastic discussion: that belief is in some sense between knowledge and opinion, and that the will is involved in belief. Kant may also have received the relevant passages from Locke mediated through Leibniz's French commentary on Locke (*New Essays*), itself based upon a translation (into French) by Pierre Coste.[46] In any case, whether through Locke via Poley (in

German), or Locke via Leibniz (in French), it seems possible that Locke could have been a source for Kant.

Locke introduces the trio in the context of considering cases where we adhere to a truth, but where "the Demonstration, by which it was at first known, is forgot, though a Man may be thought rather to believe his Memory, than really to know." About "this way of entertaining a Truth," Locke says that it "seem'd formerly to me" to be "like something between Opinion and Knowledge, a sort of Assurance which exceeds bare Belief, for that relies on the Testimony of another."[47]

As Kant would have read the passage just set out above, it is rendered by Poley in the following translation:

<ext>

Diese Art, eine Wahrheit anzunehmen, mir vormals etwas zu seyn schien, das fast zwischen der Meinung und der Wissenschaft das Mittel hält, eine Gattung der Gewißheit, die noch über den bloßen Glauben geht, als welcher sich auf das Zeugnis eines andern gründet. (*Versuch*, Bk. IV, Ch.1, §9, 528–29)

</ext>

Locke's estimation of this epistemic texture has increased, as he goes on to say that "upon a due examination I find it comes not short of perfect certainty, and is in effect true Knowledge" (*befinde ich bei einer rechten Untersuchung dennoch, daß die einer vollkommenen Gewißheit nichts nachgiebt, und in der That eine wahre Erkenntniß ist*).[48] Leibniz, following Locke, renders the relevant passage in the following terms:

<ext>

In such a case [of a remembered demonstration] "it seemed to me like something between opinion and knowledge, a sort of assurance which exceeds bare belief [relying] on testimony of another; yet upon a due examination I find it comes not short of perfect certainty."[49] (*New Essays*, IV.1.9)

15

</ext>

In his later text, *Theodicy* (1710), Leibniz, significantly, applies such a "going beyond opinion" not only to the case of remembered demonstrations, but in the context of belief in God:

<ext>
Nevertheless divine faith itself, when it is kindled in the soul, is something more than an opinion [*etwas mehr, als eine blosse Meinung*], and depends not upon the occasions or the motives that have given it birth; it advances beyond the intellect, and takes possession of the will and of the heart, to make us act with zeal and joyfully as the law of God commands. Then we have no further need to think of reasons or to pause over the difficulties of argument which the mind may anticipate. (*Theodicy*, §29, 91)
</ext>

Kant could also have found in Locke (via Poley and/or Leibniz) the notion that belief, as a firm assent of the mind, is often necessary in cases of practical reason. Locke writes that there are cases where "we are forced to determine our selves on the one side or other":

<ext>
The conduct of our Lives, and the management of our great Concerns, will not bear delay: for those depend, for the most part, on the determination of our Judgement in points, wherein we are not capable of certain and demonstrable Knowledge, and wherein it is necessary for us to embrace [*ergreifen müssen*] the one side, or the other.[50] (*Essay*, IV.xvi.3)
</ext>

We find, therefore, that there is often a "necessity of believing, without knowledge" (*ohne gewisse Erkenntniß . . . glauben müssen*), "in this fleeting state of Action and Blindness."[51]

There is a feature of Locke's original discussion which becomes obscured in the German translation, possibly with creative results for Kant. Locke uses two terms ('belief' and 'faith'), where the German translation uses just one (*Glaube*). Locke uses the term 'belief' in the context of "mundane" beliefs, and the word 'faith' only in the context of revelation. Poley uses the term *Glaubensache* (matters of faith) only in the context of revelation, but otherwise will happily use *Glaube* and *glauben* to cover both Locke's mundane "belief" and religious "faith." It is hard to be certain, but the intriguing possibility arises that certain connections in Kant's mind could have been assisted by a number of conflations occurring in the process of translation. Possibly, it might have assisted Kant to come to his position that Locke (as read in the German) uses the same term, *Glaube*, to convey both urgent practical assents, and religious propositions. This may have eased the movement in Kant's mind, from the urgent needs of practical reasons, to the categories of faith. Locke, in the original English, held these two categories apart, but this distinction is obscured in the German translation.

When Locke does discuss explicitly religious "faith" (translated simply as *Glaube*), he describes it as the "Assent [*Beifall*] to any Proposition, not thus made out by Deductions of Reason; but upon the Credit of the Proposer," that is, "as coming from GOD, in some extraordinary way of communication," which "we call *Revelation* [*Offenbarung*]."[52] The scope of "revelation" is heavily circumscribed by Locke: it must not "shake or over-rule plain Knowledge," or be "in a direct contradiction to the clear Evidence" of our "own understanding."[53] Indeed, whether something "be divine Revelation, or no, *Reason* [*Vernunft*] must judge."[54] Nonetheless, "an evident *Revelation*," Locke affirms, "ought to determine our Assent even against Probability":

<ext>

Reason, in that particular Matter, being able to reach no higher than Probability, *Faith* gave the Determination [*der Glaube es bestimmt*], where *Reason* came short; and *Revelation* discovered on which side the Truth lay. (*Essay*, IV.xviii.9, 695)

</ext>

"Faith," informed by revelation, "ought to over-rule all our Opinions, Prejudices, and Interests, and hath a right to be received with full Assent [*mit völligem Beifall*]," in a way that "shakes not the Foundations of Reason, but leaves us that Use of our Faculties, for which they were given us."[55] Describing the "Assent," which is given to "*Faith*," Locke writes that it "absolutely determines our Minds, and as perfectly excludes all wavering as our Knowledge it self":

Faith is a settled and sure Principle of Assent and Assurance, and leaves no manner of room for Doubt and Hesitation. (*Essay*, IV.xvi.14, 667)

As well as locating faith between opinion and knowledge, Locke and Leibniz both support the notion of a legitimate assent (*Beifall*) to religious propositions, where the certainty attached to this assent goes beyond the probable evidence. This "going beyond" is achieved, as it is in the scholastic tradition, by a direct act of the will. Also true to the traditional conception of faith, this act of the will does not lessen the commitment to the truth of what is so believed.

What emerges is that through Locke and Leibniz (and Leibniz reading Locke), we can tentatively identify a possible, albeit delicate, bridge back into the scholastic sources. Locke could have received a traditional account of faith from Richard Hooker, who himself draws upon Thomas Aquinas. We know that Locke read and esteemed Hooker, although precisely how much Hooker Locke read is hard to determine.[56] In any case, Hooker communicates at least two strands of the traditional scholastic account of faith.[57] First, that faith is an action of the will. Secondly, that the "certainty of adherence" is "greater in us" than the certainty of evidence, because "the hart doth cleave and stick unto that which it doth believe," so that "all the world is not able quite and cleane to remove him from it."[58] Accordingly, Locke, possibly

drawing upon Hooker, affirms that "belief" requires an assent of the will, which goes beyond the evidence, which belief is fully committed to the truth of what is assented to.

Now that we have a sense of how the scholastic tradition could have been mediated to Kant, we are well-prepared to consider Kant's various texts about the status of *Glaube*, in relation to opinion and knowledge. We will find that both continuities and discontinuities emerge, between Kant and the medieval heritage that he receives.

3. Kant on Opinion, Belief, and Knowledge

In 1796 Kant summarizes the "three stages of apprehension, down to its disappearance in total ignorance" (*RPT*, 8:396). The three stages are, "knowledge, belief, and opinion" (*RPT* 8:396). Consistently, in a range of other texts, Kant splices this traditional distinction with his own hardly limpid terminology of subjective and objective sufficiency. We find the following in the "Canon" of the first *Critique*:

<ext>
Taking something to be true [*fürwahrhalten*] . . . has the following three stages in relation to conviction [*Überzeugung*] . . . : having an opinion, believing and knowing. Having an opinion [*meinen*] is taking something to be true with the consciousness that it is subjectively [*subjekti*] as well as objectively insufficient [*objektiv unzureichendes*]. If taking something to be true is only subjectively sufficient and is at the same time held to be objectively insufficient, then it is called believing [*glauben*]. Finally, when the taking something to be true is both subjectively and objectively sufficient it is called knowing [*wissen*]. Subjective certainty is called conviction (for myself) [*Überzeugung für mich selbst*], objective sufficiency, certainty (for everyone) [*Gewißheit für jedermann*]. I will not pause for the exposition of such readily grasped concepts. (A 822/B 850)
</ext>

Kant's confidence that he does not need to pause "for the exposition of such readily grasped concepts" (A 822/B 850) has been found by later commentators to be too optimistic. In fact, though, when looking at Kant's wider *oeuvre*,[59] in particular his lectures on logic given in the 1780s and 90s, it is indeed clear and unambiguous what he means by these terms. The best way to understand precisely how Kant construes the role of "subjective sufficiency" in "belief," is to contrast this with how he uses this notion in the alternative states of knowing and opining.

3.1. The State of Knowing

When our "holding-for-true" has the status of knowledge, objective and subjective sufficiency run together:

<ext>
When taking something to be true is both subjectively and objectively sufficient it is called *knowing*. (A 822/B 850)
</ext>

Kant never discusses a texture of "holding-to-be-true" that enjoys objective but not subjective sufficiency. It is worthwhile taking some time to understand why the state of knowing, for Kant, enjoys *both* objective and subjective sufficiency, when one might think it would be enough for knowledge to be "objectively sufficient." The key lies in Kant's insistence that his "science of logic" is concerned not with the truth of propositions, but with the relationship between such truths and our judgement (that is, judgements made by subjects). In the 1790s, Kant explains that while "truth is an *objective property* of cognition . . . the relation to an understanding and thus to a particular subject, *is*, *subjectively*, *holding-to-be-true*" ("*Jäsche*," 9:65–66).[60] Fundamentally, we have here a distinction between evidence and adherence, already explored in section 2: on the one hand, the evidence that belongs to the "object" itself

(Euclid's theorems, for example), and, on the other hand, the 'holding-to-be-true,' which pertains to the assent given by a judging subject.[61] The "ground of determination to approval" is "composed of objective and subjective grounds," although most people, Kant complains, "do not analyse this mixed effect" ("*Jäsche*," 9:73). This distinction, between evidence and adherence, will become important further down, when we come to Kant's account of the role of the will in "belief."

First, though, we need to understand the heavily circumscribed and limited role of the will, for Kant, in the state of knowing. Alix Cohen demonstrates that there is an important contrast, in Kant's writings, between the state of knowing, and the process of acquiring knowledge.[62] In the state of knowing, the will has no immediate role, although in the process of acquiring knowledge, it does have what can be called an indirect role. Kant's distinction between knowing, and the process of acquiring knowledge, circles around a fairly intuitive distinction, shared and refined by recent epistemologists,[63] and encapsulated nicely by Cohen, when she writes that "believing is indeed unlike acting," whereas "*acquiring* a belief is like action insofar as they are both guided by maxims that are under our direct voluntary control."[64]

If, for example, we properly understand the terms involved in a Euclidean or philosophical proof, we must simply accept the demonstration, whether we like it or not. In such a case, Kant writes, "the will does not have any influence immediately [*keinen unmittelbaren Einfluß*] on holding-to-be-true," because "the will cannot struggle *against* convincing proofs of truth that are contrary to its wishes and inclinations" ("*Jäsche*," 9:73–74; see also "*Dohna-Wundlacken Logic*," 24:736; *Refl*., 2508, 16:398). Aquinas, representative of the mainstream scholastic analysis, similarly reports that in such cases of knowledge, the "intellect is determined," with no proper scope for the will to dissent (*De veritate*, 14.1). When something is known in this way, as it is in the case of geometry, we give "absolute adherence" to the proposition in question (*De veritate*, 14.1). The case is different, for Kant, when it comes to undertaking responsible investigations into truth-claims, and developing a well-informed, and critical attitude. Kant explains that although "holding-to-be-true pertains to the understanding," "investigation" belongs "to the faculty of choice"

21

("*Dohna-Wundlacken Logic*," 24:746).[65] In such a case, Kant explains, we would not say that "approval" depends "*immediately*" upon our "choice," but, rather, that it depends "on it *indirectly*, *mediately*":

<ext>
 Since it is according to one's free wish that he seeks out those grounds that could in any way bring about approval for this or that cognition. ("*Blomberg Logic*," 24:158)
</ext>

Kant states that although "for common cognition it is not necessary that we be conscious of these rules and reflect on them," if we wish to ascend to "learned cognition," in contested and complex areas, then "our understanding" must "be conscious of its rules and use them in accordance with reflection, because here common practice is not enough for it" ("*Blomberg Logic*," 24:27). In the state of knowing, the will has an *indirect* role in the process of acquiring knowledge, through the adoption and execution of second-order epistemic principles, which leads to an assent with certainty; whereas in the state of believing, the will has a *direct* role in the assenting with certainty. We will be better equipped to approach this aspect of "belief," in Kant, after we have analyzed the state of "opining," to which I now turn.

3.2. The State of Opining

The state of "opining," for Kant, is beset by a contingency and "insufficiency." Significantly, when we opine, we fail even to enjoy "subjective sufficiency." This indicates that "subjective sufficiency" is an epistemic achievement of some substance:

<ext>

Opining is a holding-to-be-true that is, with consciousness, both subjectively and objectively insufficient. An insufficient holding-to-be-true is what does not suffice to exclude the opposite. He who only opines is still open to opposing grounds. ("*Dohna-Wundlacken Logic*," 24:732; see also A 822/B 850)

</ext>

We are in the state of opining when we hold to a proposition on grounds that are, in their current state, insufficient for knowledge, but where, if more evidence becomes available, the state of opining can become the state of knowing.

<ext>

When something is held true on objective though consciously insufficient grounds, and hence is merely *opinion*, this *opining* can gradually be supplemented by the same kind of grounds and finally become a *knowing*. (*WDO* 8:141)

</ext>

On this point, Kant follows his immediate sources such as Wolff,[66] Meier,[67] and Locke,[68] who themselves trace over lines of thought that can be identified in the scholastic tradition,[69] which itself draws upon Aristotle.[70]

Whereas the state of knowing involves *apodeictic* or *assertoric* certainty, for rational and empirically resourced knowledge respectively, the state of opining only ever involves a "*problematic* judging":

<ext>

For what I merely opine I hold in judging, with consciousness, only to be problematic. ("*Jäsche*," 9:66)

</ext>

Even though both objectively and subjectively insufficient, the state of opining is an unavoidable epistemic state. The state of opining can be preparatory for knowing ("*Jäsche*," 9:66–67; see also *Refl*., 2462, 16:380). The important thing is not to avoid opining, but to "guard oneself against holding an opinion to be something more than mere opinion" ("*Jäsche*," 9:66). Similar warnings against ascribing too much weight to opinions are found in Kant's sources such as Locke[71] and Meier, who again reflect material found in scholastic sources. Meier states that in the case of opining, because one has "no demonstration" (*keine Demonstration*), there remains a "fear" (*so bleibet noch immer die Furcht übrig*), that "things might be other than assumed in the opinion" (*es könne vielleicht auch wohl anders seyn*).[72] The reference to "fear" finds a direct scholastic counterpart, with Aquinas stating that to be in a state of opinion is to "assent to one of two opposite assertions, with fear of the other [*cum formidine alterius*], so that the adherence is not firm" (*Sum. theol*. Ia–IIae.67.3), where, "by definition," "opinion" means that the "object is thought of as able to be otherwise than it is" (*Sum. theol*. IIa–IIae.1.5, ad 4).

3.3. The State of Believing

The state of knowing, we have seen, possesses the certainty of evidence ("objective sufficiency"), which carries automatically the certainty of adherence ("subjective sufficiency"). The state of opining lacks both the certainty of evidence, and the certainty of adherence; adherence would be improper, because the evidence is insufficient. The state of believing, though, involves the adherence (subjective sufficiency), but without the evidence (objective sufficiency):

<ext>
If taking something to be true is only subjectively sufficient and is at the same time held to be objectively insufficient, then it is called *believing*. (A 822/B 850).
</ext>

We have a proper object of "belief" when we are concerned with reason in its practical capacity, which concerns itself with what ought to be done:

<ext>
The meaning of this form of assent, distinct from the opinion and knowledge that are founded on judgment in the theoretical sense, can now be expressed in the term *belief*, whereby we understand an assumption, presupposition or hypothesis, which is necessary only because it is necessarily implied by an objective practical rule of conduct. (*Progress*, 20:297)
</ext>

In this article, I am concerned, specifically, with the category of "moral belief," which, for Kant, is the strict and proper type of "belief." At points, Kant does discuss other types of belief, or, to use a term employed both by Kant and recent epistemology, other types of "acceptance" (*Annehmung*).[73] Kant discusses "pragmatic" (A 824/B 852) and "doctrinal" belief/acceptance (A 826–27/B 854–55), relating, respectively, to beliefs/acceptances that guide practice (for example, the doctor diagnosing an illness), and beliefs/acceptances that guide investigation into the natural world. Belief in God as the intelligent designer of nature is, Kant claims, such a "doctrinal" belief, and is indispensable when seeking systematic patterns of order in the natural world. Moral belief in God is different in kind from doctrinal and pragmatic belief (A 829/B 857). This is clarified in the late 1780s and 90s where Kant explains that "belief in the proper sense" is restricted to "moral belief in God" ("*Jäsche*," 9:72n; see also "*Jäsche*," 9:67–68)[74]:

<ext>
This practical conviction is thus *moral belief of reason*, which alone can be called a belief in the proper sense and be opposed as such to knowledge and to all theoretical or logical conviction in general, because it can never elevate itself to knowledge. ("*Jäsche*," 9:72n)
</ext>

The state of believing "in the proper sense," that is, belief in God and immortality, can never become knowledge:

<ext>
Pure *rational faith* can never be transformed into knowledge by any natural data or reason or experience, because here the ground of holding true is merely subjective, namely a necessary need of reason (and as long as we are human beings it will always remain a need) to *presuppose* the existence of a highest being, but not to demonstrate it. (*WDO* 8:141)
</ext>

In the 1770s, Kant writes that such "moral belief" enjoys "moral certainty," and that this can be asserted "in all conscientiousness" (*Refl.*, 2470, 16:383). It is not that we can choose to "believe" anything we like with "moral certainty." Only where we *need* to believe something, in order to secure the project of morality, are we permitted to do so. In 1786, Kant insists that "*rational faith*," because it "rests on a need of reason's use with a *practical* intent," "is not inferior in degree to knowing, even though it is completely different from it in kind" (*WDO* 8:141–42). With such rational faith, we are properly conscious of the "*firmness*" (*Fertigkeit*) and "*unalterability*" (*Unveränderlichkeit*) of the belief in God (*WDO* 8:141n), even though such belief is not "an insight" which does "justice to all the logical demands for certainty" (*WDO* 8:141).

In his association of *Glaube* with certainty, Kant can be seen to choose one set of sources over another. In particular, by ascribing certainty to *Glaube*, Kant distances himself from Meier. This is significant, because, as I have already commented, Meier is often identified as the most likely "source" for Kant's account of faith.[75] The terms in which Meier discusses "belief" are those that the scholastic tradition (and Kant) would associate with merely probable "opinion." Meier comments that "no mere belief can free us from fear of its opposite [*von aller Furcht des Gegentheils*]."[76] Any belief is in the realm of "probability" (*Wahrscheinlichkeit*).[77] This contrasts with Kant's insistence, in the early 1790s, that the

"expression of probability," in the case of belief in God, is "altogether absurd" (*Progress*, 20:299). This is because the "modality of our assent" (*Progress*, 20:297), to the proposition that there is a God, is not a case of opinion, because the "super-sensible differs in its very species from the sensuously knowable" such that there is "no way at all of reaching it by those very same steps whereby we may hope to arrive at certainty in the field of the sensible":

<ext>
Thus there is no approximation to it either, and therefore no assent whose logical value could be called probability. (*Progress*, 20:299)
</ext>

Kant shows himself to be aware of the identification of belief with probability, writing in 1796 that the term *Glaube* is "used, on occasion," as "a synonym for holding something to be probable" (*RPT* 8:396). Kant is resolute that this is an inappropriate use of the term *Glaube*, because about "that which lies beyond all bounds of possible experience, we can say neither that it is probable, nor that it is improbable" (*RPT* 8:396n). Where the "object is in no way the object of a knowledge possible to us" such as with "the nature of the soul, qua living substance, in the absence of any connection with a body, i.e., as a spirit," then "about its possibility we can judge neither the probability nor the improbability, since we cannot judge at all" (*RPT* 8:396n):

<ext>
For the alleged grounds of knowledge are in a series which comes nowhere near to the sufficient reason, and thus to knowledge itself, since they relate to something super-sensible of which, as such, no theoretical knowledge is possible. (*RPT* 8:396n)
</ext>

Kant goes on to attack another feature of Meier's account of *Glaube*. Meier, as seen above, identifies belief with accepting "something for the sake of a witness,"[78] which can include, for Meier, a witness making (more or less probable) religious statements about the soul.[79] Kant writes that *Glaube* is not, strictly speaking, the correct concept to apply to such "*witness* of another," which "allegedly has reference to something super-sensible" (*RPT* 8:396n). This is because the "authenticity" of any "report" would always be "an empirical matter," and the "person in whose testimony I am to believe must be an object of an experience" (*RPT* 8:396n). The situation is made worse, not better, by claiming that the witness comes from a "super-sensible being," as I "can be taught by no experience" as to the "very existence" of this "being," nor "as to the fact that it is such a being who testifies this to me" (*RPT* 8:396n). The fact that "there is no theoretical belief in the super-sensible" (*RPT* 8:396n), rules out the association of *Glaube* with probability, or testimony, both of which, for Kant, are branches of theoretical reason. It is only "in a practical (morally-practical) sense" that "a belief in the super-sensible is not only possible, but is actually inseparably bound up with that point of view" (*RPT* 8:396n).

Instead, Kant aligns himself with a strand of thought, traced in the last section through Leibniz, Locke, and Hooker, which goes back to the mainstream scholastic account set out by Aquinas. In this account, belief is *sui generis*, sharing features that belong to both opinion and knowledge: like opinion, it lacks the evidence sufficient for knowledge, but unlike opinion, belief is characterized by a willful certainty; the certainly resembles the state of knowing, but unlike knowing, belief requires a free assent of the will. As we saw, in the act of believing, of which belief in God is the paradigm, the believer "settles upon one side of the question," in "virtue of his will [*per voluntatem*]" (*Sum. theol.* IIa–IIae.2.1, ad 3), and becomes "firmly attached to one alternative," and "in this respect the believer is in the same state of mind as one who has science or understanding" (*Sum. theol.* IIa–IIae.2.1), even though belief is "imperfect as knowledge," as it is "without clarity or vision" (*Sum. theol.* Ia–IIae.67.3).

3.4. Conviction (for Myself)

We are now in a position to dispel the apparently "relativistic" associations ("true for me") that might surround Kant's talk of subjective sufficiency providing "conviction (for myself)," (A 822/B 850), "only for me" ("*Jäsche*," 9:66), but not "certainty (for everyone)" (A 822/B 850), which "holds for all" ("*Jäsche*," 9:66). It is helpful to always have in sight the contrast with the states of knowing and opining. As we saw, the state of knowing does not arise from a positive and direct free movement of the will. The will is, as we saw, *mediately* involved, through the selection and execution of second-order epistemic principles of investigation. Nonetheless, in the state of knowing, when presented with a mathematical or philosophical demonstration, for example, there is no role for free choice, as what is known is "universally and objectively necessary (holding for all)" ("*Jäsche*," 9:66). In the state of opining, strictly speaking, we should not be "convinced" (*überzeugt*) at all. The will has, accordingly, a limited role: of adopting (in an unconvinced way) various hypotheses, as and when they are useful, potentially even switching between inconsistent hypotheses, if a project of enquiry is benefitted by so doing. To this extent, there is a degree of freedom in the state of opining, although it is a freedom from assent, not towards it. As Kant puts the contrast, "with belief one accepts something, and one is decided [*entschieden*]. With opinion . . . one is still free" (*Refl.*, 2463, 16:381).[80] It is only in the domain of belief that the will, for Kant, plays a role that is positive and immediate: moving (properly) in freedom to assent with certainty, to that which cannot be known. As we saw in section 2, we find this same commitment paralleled in the scholastic tradition, represented by Aquinas, and mediated to Kant through sources such as Locke and Leibniz.

For Kant, the will is universally summoned to belief, albeit not compelled. Every single individual "I" contemplating the "laws of freedom," which require belief in the possibility of the "highest good in the world," ought, in freedom, to believe in God, on moral grounds. The subjective grounds of moral belief universally require belief, which Kant reflects can "possess practical adequacy for all human beings" (*Refl.*, 2470, 16:383). But these same grounds do not compel assent in the way that Euclid's laws do. When Kant writes

that subjective grounds hold "for me," we need to understand that "me" is a type of "every-me" (along the lines of "everyman"): "me" refers to every moral subject determining their attitude, in freedom, to the moral law. The justification for believing is indexed to these universally binding, but resistible (hence the freedom), demands of practical reason, and not to the particular constitution and temperament of any empirical individual. So when Kant writes that the "free holding-to-be-true" is "necessary for moral purposes for completion of one's ends" ("*Jäsche*," 9:69n), he means the completion of the rational ends of any, and every, moral being, which involves the "necessity" of accepting "the objective reality of a concept (of the highest good)," where "the condition of this possibility" is "God, freedom, and immorality" ("*Jäsche*," 9:68n).

When Kant writes, therefore, that belief "yields a conviction [*Überzeugung*] that is not communicable (because of its subjective ground)" (*Refl.*, 2489, 16:391–92), he is doing no more than stating the (now) obvious point that belief is not knowledge. Only knowledge can be "communicated" in the strong sense of automatically eliciting "universal agreement." This is because, in the state of knowledge, the will has no (proper and direct) choice whether to assent or not, such that no direct work needs to be done by the will. Kant sets out the contrast, between unfree-knowing and free-believing, in precisely these terms:

<ext>
The only objects that are matters of belief are those in which holding-to-be-true is necessarily free [*nothwendig frei*], i.e., is not determined through objective grounds [*objective Gründe*] of truth that are independent of the nature and the interest of the subject. ("*Jäsche*," 9:70)
</ext>

Kant explicitly explains the claim that belief is "free" through the contrast with knowing, where the "objective grounds of truth" simply compel the assent of the judging subject, providing automatically "subjective sufficiency." Whenever Kant talks about the state of believing as only something "for me," the concept of freedom is never far away, and the contrast is always the lack of (immediate and positive) freedom involved with knowing:

What remains here is a *free* holding-to-be-true, which is necessary only in a practical respect given *a priori*, hence a holding-to-be-true of what I accept on *moral* grounds, and in such a way that I am certain that the *opposite* can never be proved. ("*Jäsche*," 9:67)

</ext>

<ext>

Hence I can only say that *I* see myself necessitated through my end, in accordance with laws of freedom, to accept as possible a highest good in the world, but I *cannot necessitate anyone else through grounds* (the belief is free). ("*Jäsche*," 9:69n)

</ext>

In my introductory remarks, I observed that Kant's emphasis upon the need for a voluntary dimension, in the case of belief in God, can look rather "post-Christian" and deflationary, suggesting that such belief is a mere heuristic believing "as if" there is a God. By reading Kant in the context of scholastic accounts of faith, mediated to Kant through early modern sources, we have gained a new perspective: when Kant invokes a voluntary dimension to faith, whereby one chooses to believe something, this does not, in itself, denigrate the degree to which Kant is committed to the truth of what is believed in. Rather, it suggests a traditional notion of faith, whereby there is a positive and immediate role for free choice. This is a significant finding, in that it opens up a subtle epistemic texture, which has been to some degree neglected in the recent literature on epistemology, and, also, by Kant commentators.[81] In the recent literature on epistemology, a direct and positive involvement of the will in an assent tends to be regarded as denigrating the degree of commitment to the truth of the assent, in contrast, say, with its regulative "usefulness."[82] Different terms of art are used, but we tend to find a distinction between 'believing-to-be-true,' or 'holding true,' and a less committed category of 'acceptance-as-true' or 'holding-as-true,' where we adopt an attitude of acting '*as if*' something is the case, without really being committed to this as a

truth-claim. So, for example, if I am a diligent store worker, I might accept, as a guide to action, that "the customer is always right," although I will not, if I am rational, believe this: customers might lie, be mistaken, have unreasonable expectations, and violate or neglect the terms of a warranty. Typically, where there is a direct and positive role for the "will," it is assumed that we can only be dealing with "acceptance-as-true" or "holding as true" (which would correspond to Kant's category of merely pragmatic belief), rather than "belief-in-truth," or "holding true." This is not an unreasonable assumption. It is fairly intuitive to regard the actual state of believing something as involuntary, even if the process of investigating beliefs involves a voluntary dimension. When we really believe something to be true, rather than being useful, the intuition is that there is something non-negotiable about the assent; where there is a degree of choice involved, we seem to be in the realm of heuristic fictions. It is precisely because these are intuitive associations, that engaging in the history of philosophy can be rewarding on this point. In the scholastic account of faith, we find that a strong role for the will, acting in freedom, is in no way an indication that an assent is a merely regulative *as if* acceptance, rather than being a belief in the truth of the matter.[83]

To this extent, then, something that seems deflationary in Kant, turns out to be traditional. In my introductory remarks, I also promised that an aspect of Kant's thought that seems traditional, namely, Kant's association of faith and moral conversion, will turn out to be revolutionary. It is to this that I now turn.

4. Tradition and the Kantian Turn

Both Aquinas and Kant regard faith as certain, even though the degree of "evidence" that we have for faith does not compel the assent of the will, but, rather, the will must choose to assent. For Kant, this certainty arises from the demands of morality. For Aquinas, there is a distinct and different source for this knowledge-like certainty:

<ext>

Just as science is certain, so also is faith—indeed much more so, because science relies for its certainty on human reason, which can be deceived, while faith relies for its certainty on divine reason, which cannot be contradicted. (*In Iob*, 4:42, no.662)[84]
</ext>

For Aquinas, at an ultimate level of explanation, faith is something that God achieves in the believer, as a participation in God's own self-knowledge: "this fact that he loves God is the result in the human being of sanctifying grace" (*Sum. contra gent*. 3.2, ch.151.2). Faith is a "certain participation in . . . and assimilation to God's own knowledge, in that by the faith infused in us we cling to the first truth for its own sake" (*Sup. Boet. De Trin*., 2.2c).[85]

For Aquinas, human freedom is threatened when the will is moved in a way that takes the creature away from God. When, earlier on, I set out the initial similarity between Kant and Aquinas, insofar as they both describe faith as involving a movement of the will, I quoted from Aquinas's *De veritate*, that the will "totally adheres" to faith, albeit that the intellect is not similarly moved (*De veritate*, 14.1). Also in Aquinas's discussion at this point, is a commitment that Kant would certainly avoid:

<ext>
For just taken by itself, the intellect is not satisfied and it is not terminated in one part; rather, it is terminated only *from the outside*. And this is why the intellect of one who believes is said to be captivated. For it is being held fast by something else's terminus and not by its own proper terminus (2 Cor 10:5, "bringing the intellect into captivity"). (*De veritate*, 14.1)
</ext>

For Aquinas, the intellect is not "satisfied" by faith, but it is "captivated." Such "captivation," "from the outside," would be anathema for Kant. Strikingly, for Kant, the only thing that parallels such "captivation" is the submission that the moral law itself requires:

<ext>

Duty! Sublime and mighty name that embraces nothing charming or insinuating but requires

submission (*Unterwerfung*). (*CPrR* 5:86)

</ext>

This "submission," though, is, as Kant goes on immediately to explain, not offered to an

"external" reality. Addressing "duty," Kant goes on to ask, "what origin is there worthy of

you?" (*CPrR* 5:86). He replies that "every person's own will," even when "directed to

himself," is "restricted" to no other condition, except "agreement with the *autonomy* of the

rational being" (*CPrR* 5:87). Consequently, no "rational being" is "subjected to any purpose

that is not possible in accordance with a law that could arise from the will of the affected

subject himself" (*CPrR* 5:87). As rational beings we are bound only to "the sublimity of our

nature (in its vocation)" (*CPrR* 5:87).

In associating human freedom with faith, Kant is aligned with the medieval tradition

and his sources.[86] What human freedom is, though, for Kant, and for the medieval tradition,

is widely divergent. For the medieval tradition, supernatural divine action in no way violates

meaningful human freedom. Indeed, insofar as it brings us closer to God, such supernatural

action constitutes freedom. Not so for Kant, who finds that the "faith which our reason can

develop out of itself" (*CF* 7:59) must arise from human freedom, and from human freedom

alone, without God's inner transformation of our will. This radical departure underlies, and

explains, Kant's insistence that grace follows rather than precedes free moral conversion.

This sets the terms for Kant's positive translation of the categories of grace, and divine-

human cooperation, into notions that are acceptable to the pure religion of reason.

5. Kant's Reinterpretation of Grace and Divine Cooperation

In *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, Kant allows a positive role for a divine

supplement, or assistance, which comes after the person has, in freedom, set their will

towards the moral law.[87] As Mariña puts it, such "divine aid" must "be *laid hold* of by the person,"[88] and, significantly, "does not alter a person's will at the outset" but is:

<ext>

Some historical occurrence—a person or situation—to which the person must *respond* in some way. Only after the practical and existential import of the person or situation has been assessed and interiorised by the individual can it affect a person's character. ("Kant on Grace," 386)

</ext>

Crucial here is the preservation of the "free choice of the individual," which, Kant insists, must be in held in place, if "the concept of grace is not to be one that ignores the agent *qua* agent."[89] Having begun the "journey towards holiness," without supernatural assistance, we might hope for some assistance against "residual consequences of the propensity to evil" that "will still haunt the person," where "growth in virtue will only be achieved through an incessant counteracting of these effects."[90] The individual must "make himself antecedently worthy of receiving" the grace as assistance (*Rel.*, 6:44). The assistance that the individual might then accept consists, Kant states, of the "diminution of obstacles" or some sort of "positive assistance (*Beistand*)" (*Rel.*, 6:44), which might help to "supplement the deficiency" in our "moral capacity" (*Rel.*, 6:174).

What seems to run through Kant's reinterpretation of grace and concurrence is the conviction that divine action must be *reactive* to independent human freedom moving towards moral conversion and its accompanying faith, rather than divine action *proactively* initiating free moral action. We see this in the case of reactive divine supplementation of moral human effort. We can also detect such reactive divine action in Kant's notion of a partnership between God and human beings, in the creation of an "ethical commonwealth." Kant states that we need a "higher moral being" through "whose universal organisation the forces of single individuals, insufficient on their own, are united for a common effect" (*Rel.*, 6:98), such that "a moral people of God is, therefore, a work whose execution cannot be

hoped for from human beings but only from God himself" (*Rel.*, 6:100).[91] Here divine

cooperation is seen as supplementing our inability to "join-up" individual (non-concurring

and free) acts of human moral willing into a significant community.

Although translated into Kant's own terms, this is still a strong commitment on Kant's

part. As Pasternack observes, this is a *distinctive* divine action, in that the integration and

coordination of individual moral efforts into an ethical community is something that only

God can do. As put by Pasternack, "with regards to the Ethical Community in particular,

God's assistance is now taken as necessary":

<ext>

We finally see in Kant a clear commitment to God having a *necessary* soteriological role.

Moreover, our inability to achieve this victory is due to our innate limitations. (*Kant on

Religion*, 256)

</ext>

In a further passage, from the Third Parerga of *Religion*, Kant reflects upon the

inability of the human being to "realise the idea of the supreme good inseparably bound up

with the pure moral disposition," whether that be "with respect to the happiness which is part

of that good or with respect to the union of the human beings necessary to the fulfilment of

the end" (*Rel.*, 6:139). Nonetheless, there is "also in him the duty to promote the idea," so

that "he finds himself driven to believe in the *cooperation* or the management of a moral

ruler of the world, through which alone this end is possible" (*Rel.*, 6:139). Kant goes onto

reflect:

<ext>

And here there opens up before him the abyss of a mystery regarding what God may do,

whether *anything* at all is to be attributed to him and *what* this something might be in

particular, whereas the only thing that a human being learns from a duty is what he himself

must do to become worthy of that fulfilment, of which he has no cognition or at least no possibility of comprehension. (*Rel*., 6:139).

</ext>

Here it is clear that the human being must still act out of their own freedom, doing "what he himself must do," to use his "powers freely" (*Rel*., 6:142–43). God is not envisaged as cooperating directly within the human action, as a supernatural immediate efficient cause. But Kant gestures to the mystery of what God might do *alongside* our non-concurring and supersensible human action, in order to secure the possibility of the highest good.

Rather than saying Kant rejects, or denies, grace and divine cooperation in the context of moral conversion and its accompanying faith, it is more illuminating to say that he offers reinterpretations of the traditional scholastic supernatural accounts, setting out something that is theologically substantial, but which nonetheless respects supersensible human freedom, as Kant understands it.[92]

Bibliography and Abbreviations

Kant's Works

 "Blomberg Logic." In Kant, *Lectures on Logic*, 1–246. ["*Blomberg Logic*"]

Critique of Practical Reason. In Kant, *Practical Philosophy*, 133–271. [*CPrR*]

Critique of Pure Reason. Edited and translated by Paul Guyer and Allen Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

"Dohna-Wundlacken Logic." In Kant, *Lectures in Logic*, 425–516. ["*Dohna-Wundlacken Logic*"]

Danziger Rationaltheologie. In Kant, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 28, 1231–319. [*DR*]

Gesammelte Schriften. Edited by the Akademie der Wissenschaften. Berlin: Georg Reimer (later Walter de Gruyter), 29 vols. 1900–. [*Gesammelte Schriften*]

"Jäsche Logic." In Kant, *Lectures on Logic*, 517–640. ["*Jäsche*"]

Lectures on Logic. Edited and translated by Michael J. Young. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 2004.

Lectures on the Philosophical Doctrine of Religion (*Pölitz* transcription). In Kant, *Religion
and Rational Theology,* 341-451. [“*Pölitz*”]

“*Moral Mrongovius*.” In Kant *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 27, 1395–581.

On a recently prominent tone of superiority in philosophy. In Kant, *Theoretical Philosophy
after 1781*, 425–45. [*RPT*]

Practical Philosophy. Edited and translated by Mary J. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 2008

Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics that Will be Able to Come Forward as Science. In
Kant, *Theoretical Philosophy after 1781*, 29–169. [*Prolegomena*]

Notes and Fragments. Edited by Paul Guyer and translated by Curtis Bowman, Paul Guyer,
and Frederick Rauscher. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). [*Refl*.]

Religion and Rational Theology. Edited and translated by Allen W. Wood and George di
Giovanni. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Religion within the boundaries of mere reason. In Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology,* 39–
216. [*Rel*.]

The Conflict of the Faculties. In Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 233–327. [*CF*]

Theoretical Philosophy after 1781. Edited by Henry Allison and Peter Heath. Translated by
Gary Hatfield and Michael Friedman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

What does it mean to orient oneself in thinking?. In Kant, *Religion and Rational Theology*, 7–
18 [*WDO*]

*What Real Progress Has Metaphysics Made in Germany since the Time of Leibniz and
Wolff?*. In *Theoretical Philosophy after 1781*, 337–424. [*Progress*]

Other Sources

Alston, William. “The deontological conception of epistemic justification.” *Philosophical
Perspectives* 2 (1988): 257–99.

Aristotle. *Posterior Analytics*. Translated by Hugh Tredennick. Loeb Classical Library.
    Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Expositio super Iob ad litteram*. Leonine edition, vol. 26. Rome:
    Typographia polyglota. [*In Iob*]

———. *Expositio super librum Boethii de Trinitate*. Translated by A. Maurer, questions 1–4.
    Toronto: PIMS, 1987. [*Sup. Boet. De Trin.*]

———. *Questiones disputatae de veritate*. Translated by R. W. Mulligan, J. V. McGlynn, R
    W. Schmidt, 3 vols. Chicago: Regnery, 1952-1954. [*De veritate*]

———. *Summa contra Gentiles*, Bk.3:2. Translated by Vernon J. Bourke. Notre Dame,
    Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002. [*Sum. contra Gen.*]

———. *Summa Theologiae*, vol. 31. Translated by T. C. O'Brien. Cambridge: Cambridge
    University Press, 2006. [*Sum. theol.*]

Baumgarten, Alexander. *Metaphysics: A Critical Translation with Kant's Elucidations,
    Selected Notes, and Related Materials*. Translated and edited by Courtney D. Fugate
    and John Hymers. London: Bloomsbury, 2013. [*Metaphysics*]

Baxter, Richard. *Reliquiae Baxterianae*. Edited by Matthew Sylvester. London: Parkhurst,
    1696.

Beiser, Frederick. "Moral Faith and the Highest Good." In *The Cambridge Companion to
    Kant and Modern Philosophy*, edited by Paul Guyer, 588–629. Cambridge:
    Cambridge University Press. ["Moral Faith"]

Chignell, Andrew. "Belief in Kant." *Philosophical Review* 116 (2007), 323–60. ["Belief in
    Kant"]

———. "Kant on Cognition, Givenness, and Ignorance." *Journal of the History of
    Philosophy* 55 (2017): 131–42. ["Kant on Cognition"]

———. "Kant's Concepts of Justification." *Noûs* 41 (2007): 33–63. ["Kant's Concepts"]

———. "Real Repugnance and our Ignorance of Things-in-Themselves: A Lockean Problem
    in Kant and Hegel." In *Internationales Jahrbuch des Deutschen Idealismus* 7, edited
    by F. Rush, K. Ameriks, and J. Stolzenberg, 135–59. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.
    ["Real Repugnance"]

Cohen, Alix. "Kant on Doxastic Voluntarism and its Implications for Epistemic Responsibility." *Kant Yearbook* 2013: 33–55. ["Kant on Doxastic Voluntarism"]

Crusius, Christian. *Entwurf der nothwendige Vernunft*. Leipzig, 1766. [*Entwurf*]

Ferreira, Jamie M. "Hope, Virtue, and the Postulate of God: A Reappraisal of Kant's Pure Practical Rational Belief." *Religious Studies* 50 (2014): 3–26. ["Hope, Virtue, and the Postulate of God"]

Gardner, Patrick. "The Primacy of Practical Reason." In *A Companion to Kant*, edited by Graham Bird, 259–74. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. ["Practical Reason"]

Harrison, J., and Laslett P. eds. *The Library of John Locke*. Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications New Series xiii, 1965.

Insole, Christopher J. *Kant and the Creation of Freedom: Kant's Theological Problem.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. [*Kant and the Creation of Freedom*]

Langton, Rae. *Kantian Humility: Our Ignorance of Things in Themselves*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. [*Kantian Humility*]

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Monadology* (1714). In *Philosophical Essays*, edited by Roger Ariew and Daniel Garber. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 1989.

———. *New Essays on Human Understanding*. Translated and edited by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. [*New Essays*]

———. *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man and the Origin of Evil*. Edited by Austin M. Farrer and translated by E. M. Huggard. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2009. [*Theodicy*]

Lessing, Gottfried Ephraim. *Sämtliche Schriften*, 23 vols. Edited by Karl Lachmann and Franz Muncker, third newly revised and enlarged edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1968. [*Sämtlicher Schriften*]

Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. London: printed by Elizabeth Holt, for Thomas Bassett, 1690.

———. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Peter H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975. [*Essay*]

———. *Locke in Germany: Early German Translations of John Locke 1709–1761*, vols. 4 and 5. Selected and introduced by Konstantin Pollok. Bristol: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004. [*Locke in Germany*]

———. *New Essays on Human Understanding*. Translated and edited by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. [*New Essays*]

———. *Versuch vom menschlichen Verstande*. Translated by Heinrich Poley. Altenburg: Richter, 1757. [*Versuch*]—*Essai philosophique concernant l'entendement humain. Amsterdam: Schelte*, *1700*.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "Richard Hooker's Reputation." In *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by William J. Torrance Kirby, 563–612. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Mariña, Jacqueline. "Kant on Grace: a Reply to His Critics." *Religious Studies* 33 (1997): 379–400. ["Kant on Grace"]

Marshall, Bruce D. "*Quod Scit Una Uetula*: Aquinas on the Nature of Theology." In *The Theology of Thomas Aquinas*, edited by Rik Van Nieuwenhove and Joseph Wawrykow, 1–35. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005. ["Aquinas on the Nature of Theology"]

Meier, Georg Friedrich. *Auszug aus der Vernunftlehre*. Halle: Jusinus Gebauer, 1752. [*Auszug*]

Mourad, Ronney. "Choosing to Believe." *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 63 (2008): 55–69.

Palmquist, Stephen. *Comprehensive Commentary on Kant's Religion Within the Bounds of Bare Reason*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2015. [*Commentary*]

———. "What is Kantian *Gesinnung?* On the Priority of Volition over Metaphysics and Psychology in Kant's Religion." *Kantian Review* 20 (2015): 235–64. ["What is Kantian *Gesinnung?*]

Pasternack, Lawrence. "Kant on Knowledge, Opinion, and the Threshold for Assent." In *Rethinking Kant*, vol. 4, edited by Oliver Thorndike, 55–74. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2014. ["Kant on Knowledge"]

———. "Kant on Opinion: Assent, Hypothesis, and the Norms of General Applied Logic." *Kant-Studien* 105 (2014): 41–82. ["Kant on Opinion"]

———. *Kant on Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*. London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

———. "Regulative Principles and the 'Wise Author of Nature.'" *Religious Studies* 47 (2011): 411–29. ["Regulative Principles"]

———. "The Development and Scope of Kantian Belief: The Highest Good, the Practical Postulates and the Fact of Reason." *Kant-Studien* 102 (2014): 290–315. ["The Development and Scope of Kantian Belief"]

Pojman, Louis P. "Believing, Willing, and the Ethics of Belief." In *The Theory of Knowledge*. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Publishing, 1999.

Shuger, Debora K. "Faith and Assurance." In *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by William J. Torrance Kirby, 221–50. Leiden: Brill, 2008. ["Faith and Assurance"]

Spener, Philip Jacob. *Pia Desideria*, translated and edited by Theodore G. Tappert. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1964. [*Pia Desideria*]

Stevenson, Leslie. "Opinion, Belief or Faith, and Knowledge." *Kantian Review* 7 (2003): 72–101. ["Opinion, Belief, or Faith"].

Trullinger, Joseph S. "Kant's Two Touchstones for Conviction: the Incommunicable Dimension of Moral Faith." *The Review of Metaphysics* 67 (2013): 369–403. ["Kant's Two Touchstones"]

Ullmann-Margalit, Edna and Margalit, Avishai. "Holding True and Holding as True." *Synthese* 92 (1992): 167–87.

Wolff, Christian. *Vernünftige Gedancken von den Kräften des menschlichen Verstandes und ihrem richtigen Gebrauche in Erkäntniss der Wahrheit*. Georg Olms: Hildesheim, 1965. [*Vernünftige Gedanken*]

---

[1] With the exception of the *Critique of Pure Reason,* I cite Kant's texts, in this article, by reference to the Akademie edition, Kant *Gesammelte Schriften*. These references are to

volume and page number, and are prefaced by an abbreviation of the title of the work, as set out in the Bibliography. Citations to the first *Critique* are to the A (first edition) or B (second edition) pages. Translations, unless otherwise stated, are from *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*. The *Reflexionen* are referred to using the numbering system introduced by Erich Adickes and Friedrich Berger, and set out in volumes 15 through 19 of the *Gesammelte Schriften.*

[2] Leibniz, *Monadology*, 268–81.

[3] Wolff, *Vernünftige Gedanken*, §361.

[4] Locke, *Essay*, Book IV, Chapter 10, Section 6, 621. Citations from this book are according to book, chapter, section, and page number in Peter Nidditch's edition published by Oxford.

[5] Crusius, *Entwurf*, see §204–36.

[6] Meier, *Auszug*, §114.

[7] Baumgarten, *Metaphysics*, §811.

[8] See n. 86.

[9] For pushing me to draw out this essential strand of Kant's thought, I am indebted to the insights of an anonymous referee for the *Journal of the History of Philosophy*.

[10] Lawrence Pasternack, "The Development and Scope of Kantian Belief"; "Kant on Opinion"; "Kant on Knowledge"; "Regulative Principles"; Joseph S. Trullinger, "Kant's Two Touchstones"; Frederick Beiser, "Moral Faith"; Leslie Stevenson, "Opinion, Belief or Faith, and Knowledge"; and Andrew Chignell, "Kant's Concepts of Justification," and "Belief in Kant."

[11] See Chignell, "Kant's Concepts of Justification," 36–38, and "Belief in Kant," 342; and Pasternack, "The Development and Scope of Kantian Belief," 293n7.

[12] Chignell, "Kant's Concepts of Justification," 35; Pasternack, "Kant on Opinion," 46n11. Pasternack points to Meier's *Auszug*, §163, §184–86, and §488. I will comment upon what we find in these passages at relevant points in this article. Meier's *Auszug* is available in *Gesammelte Schriften,* 16:4–872.

[13] Stevenson, "Opinion, Belief or Faith," 97n1.

[14] Cohen, "Kant on Doxastic Voluntarism."

[15] For my views on this question, see Insole, *Kant and the Creation of Freedom*, chs.5–6.

[16] See A 445–51; A 531–57/B 559–86; *Prolegomena*, 4:343–44; *CPrR* 5:95–102; and *Rel.*, 6:31.

[17] See also *CPrR* 5:100–1; *Refl.*, 4221, 17:463; 4225, 17:464; 4337, 17:510; 5121, 18:98)

[18] My translation. See also *Refl.*, 4748, 17:696; 5632, 18:263–64; 6019, 18:425; 6118, 18:460–61; 6121, 18:462; 6167, 18:473–74; 6169, 18:474; 8083, 19:623–28; *PP* 8:362. For an extensive discussion of this issue, see my *Kant and the Creation of Freedom*, chs.9–10.

[19] Pasternack, *Kant on Religion*, 232.

[20] Patrick Kain, "Development," 33.

[21] Jacqueline Mariña, "Kant on Grace," 385–86.

[22] Mariña draws attention to this feature of Kant's philosophy, in "Kant on Grace," 385–86, as does Pasternack, *Kant on Religion*, esp. chs.1, 5 and 7.

[23] Debora K. Shuger, "Faith and Assurance," 239. In my discussion in this paragraph, of the Aristotelian roots of the medieval discussion, I am indebted to Shuger.

[24] Translation modified.

[25] Shuger, "Faith and Assurance," 236.

[26] Shuger, "Faith and Assurance," 236.

[27] T. C. O'Brien, in *Sum. theol.* IIa–IIae.1.2, 11n.

[28] Hugh of St Victor, quoted by T. C. O'Brien in *Sum. theol.* IIa–IIae.1.2, 11n.

[29] I qualify this claim with 'straightforwardly,' because, for Aquinas one does move, eventually, although not in this life, from faith to knowledge. It is "not straightforward," in that one does not do this by accumulating evidence, but through a transformative participation in divine action, if and when one is elected by God to enjoy God's own self-knowledge, which is the beatific vision. There is no parallel idea in Kant's philosophy, for reasons that are set out in sect. 4 of this article.

[30] See Chignell, "Kant's Concepts of Justification," 35; and Pasternack, "Kant on Opinion," 46n11.

[31] Meier, *Auszug*, §216. All Meier and Wolff translations are my own.

[32] Meier, *Auszug*, §218.

[33] Meier, *Auszug*, §219.

[34] Meier, *Vernunftlehre*, §207.

[35] See also *CPrR* 5:50–57; 119–46; *WDO* 8:133–46. For a discussion of this theme in Kant, see Patrick Gardner, "Practical Reason." For some of the references to Kant here, I am indebted to Gardner, 259.

[36] Meier, *Auszug*, §206; see "die historischen Glauben," in the *Vernunftlehre*, §236.

[37] Meier, *Vernunftlehre*, §236.

[38] Meier, *Vernunftlehre*, §240.

[39] Baumgarten, *Metaphysics*.

[40] Crusius, *Entwurf*.

[41] Wolff, *Vernünftige Gedancken*, ch.7.

[42] Wolff, *Vernünftige Gedancken*, ch.7, §3.

[43] Wolff, *Vernünftige Gedancken*, ch.7, §19.

[44] Heinrich Poley published a German translation of Locke's *Essay* in 1757, *Versuch vom menschlichen Verstande*. Poley's translation of the *Essay* was based on Elizabeth Holt's 1690 edition. In this article, I refer throughout to the Poley translation, when considering parallels between Kant and Locke. I take the Poley translation from *Locke in Germany*.

[45] In *Pr* 4:270, Kant explicitly cites (giving the reference) IV.iii.9f. The relevant section of the *Essay* for the discussion of types of assent is Bk. IV, Chs.1–28.

[46] John Locke, *Essai philosophique concernant l'entendement humain* (Amsterdam: Schelte, 1700). Leibniz, *New Essays*, Book IV, Chapter.1, §9. Although Leibniz is thought to have completed the manuscript by 1704, the *New Essays* were not published by R.E. Raspe until 1765. Kant may have read this text, it is thought, around 1769. For this detail, I am indebted to Remnant and Bennett, "Introduction," *New Essays*, x.

[47] Locke, *Essay*, IV.i.9, 528–29.

[48] Locke, *Essay*, IV.i.9, 528–29.

[49] Where Locke has "belief, for that relies on," Coste translates this as "croyance qui est fondée su," which in Leibniz becomes "croyance fondée sur." For these details, see Leibniz's *New Essays*, 360n2.

[50] Leibniz also includes this passage from Locke, translated into French, in *New Essays*, IV.16.3, 460.

[51] Locke, *Essay*, IV.xvi.4, 660.

[52] Locke, *Essay*, IV.xviii.2, 689.

[53] Locke, *Essay*, IV.xviii. 5, 691.

[54] Locke, *Essay*, IV.xvii.10, 695.

[55] Locke, *Essay*, IV.xviii.10, 696. Christian August Crusius similarly talks of revelation as God offering a supplement to our knowledge about divine matters, in *Entwurf*, §376, although we do not find in Crusius any explicit lexical linking of *Glaube* with revelation (*Offenbarung*): through "revelation," "it is in many ways possible, that God can add to the natural cognitions of divine truths" (§376).

[56] Estimations of how much Hooker Locke read vary widely. On the most "minimal" account, from Locke's explicit references, we can be sure that Locke read up to the end of Book II of Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastic Polity*. It is not implausible, though, that Locke may have read more widely, when one considers that Locke possessed, at various points, three different editions of Hooker's work. See *The Library of John Locke*, 157, nos. 1490–92. I am indebted here to Diarmaid MacCulloch, "Richard Hooker's Reputation," 596.

[57] On this point, see Shuger, "Faith and Assurance," 239–40.

[58] Shuger, "Faith and Assurance," 239.

[59] In helping to track down some of the references in Kant's works to "subjective and objective sufficiency," which I discuss in the following sections, I am indebted to Pasternack, "Kant on Opinion," 43–44nn4 and 6.

[60] Given this understanding of the distinction between objective and subjective sufficiency, it seems plausible to suggest that the neglected "fourth space" (objective sufficiency but without subjective sufficiency) could be characterized as a state of "ignorance," where we are considering something that in itself would be intelligible, to a competent (perhaps divine) understanding, but which is, perhaps in principle, unavailable to us. In this connection, for an exploration of the significance of our ignorance about the "real possibilities" that govern

things-in-themselves, see Andrew Chignell, "Kant on Cognition," and "Real Repugnance."

See also Rae Langton, *Kantian Humility*.

[61] A possible source for Kant's distinction, in something like these terms, between subjective and objective certainty in relation to religion, is Gottfried Ephraim Lessing. Lessing draws a distinction between "objective and subjective religion" (*unterscheid zwischen objectiver und subjectiver religion*), *Sämtliche Schriften*, 10:234. "Subjective" religion involves a transformation of the adhering subject through the "inner truth" of Christianity, leading to wide-scale implications for ethical practice. Christianity in itself, for Lessing, does enjoy "objective certainty," but this certainty is not available to us, given our epistemic limitations (*Eine Parabel*, *Sämtliche Schriften*, 13:93–96). There is a precedent for using the distinction between 'subjective' and 'objective' certainty in this way (mapping on to the traditional distinction between certainty of evidence and adherence), going back as far as 1696. Richard Baxter, in the context of discussing Richard Hooker, distinguishes "subjective certainty" from "objective evidence," *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, 109–11. For this point, I am indebted to Shuger, "Faith and Assurance," 249–50. The lines of transmission, from such a usage, through to Lessing and Kant, are unclear, but could, perhaps, be traced.

[62] For the account given here of the indirect role of the will in the state of knowing, I am indebted to Cohen, "Kant on Doxastic Voluntarism," 33–55.

[63] See, e.g. Cohen, "Kant on Doxastic Voluntarism," 44, and Pojman, "Believing, Willing, and the Ethics of Belief," 576–79.

[64] Cohen, "Kant on Doxastic Voluntarism," 44.

[65] For this point, I am indebted to Cohen, "Kant on Doxastic Voluntarism," 44.

[66] Wolff, *Vernünftige Gedancken*, ch.7, §19.

[67] Meier, *Auszug*, §183.

[68] Locke, *Essay*, IV.xv.2, 654–55.

[69] Aquinas, *Sum. theol*. IIa–IIae.1.5, ad 4, *Sum. theol*. IIa–IIae.2.1.

[70] Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, I, 33, 89a10–89b10.

[71] Locke warns against holding "opinions with" "stiffness," *Essay*, IV.xvi.3, 659.

[72] Meier, *Auszug*, §22.

[73] Chignell suggests, plausibly, that doctrinal belief, along with "pragmatic" belief (A 824/B 852), maps on to the notion of "acceptance" in contemporary epistemology. As Chignell shows, Kant himself employs the term 'acceptance' (*Annehmung*), describing it as a "contingent approval that has sufficient ground in regard to a certain purpose" (*DWL* 24:735, Chignell, "Belief in Kant," 341).

[74] For a helpful discussion of the development of Kant's conception of "belief," to which I am indebted, see Pasternack, "The Development and Scope of Kantian Belief," 297–304.

[75] See n12.

[76] Meier, *Vernunftlehre*, §245.

[77] Meier, *Vernunftlehre*, §245.

[78] Meier, *Auszug*, §206; see "die historischen Glauben," in the *Vernunftlehre*, §§236–40.

[79] Meier, *Vernunftlehre*, §240.

[80] My translation.

[81] Andrew Chignell, in "Belief in Kant," working from some of the assumptions in recent epistemology discussed here, tends to align voluntariness with a lack of commitment to the truth of what is "held-to-be-true." Jamie Ferreira argues ("Hope, Virtue, and the Postulate of God") that Kant only defends the belief that God's existence is really possible, and not the belief that God exists. A central strand of evidence for Ferreira (although not the only strand) is the way in which Kant employs voluntary notions (such as "subjectively necessary" belief) in his discussion of moral faith. If I am correct, when Kant talks about a voluntary dimension to moral faith, he is within a mainstream tradition of talking about faith, which has live tendrils in Kant's own demonstrable sources.

[82] For approaches that are representative of this tendency, see Edna Ullmann-Margalit and Avishai Margalit, "Holding True and Holding as True," and William Alston, "The deontological conception of epistemic justification." Significantly, where a voluntary dimension to belief is defended, it tends to be in the context of discussing religious commitment. See Mourad, "Choosing to Believe."

[83] Palmquist insightfully draws out links between *Überzeugung* (conviction) in moral contexts, and, therefore, in the context of faith (*Glaube*), and Kant's discussion of religious

Gesinnung, standardly translated as "disposition" or "attitude" (see, for example, *Rel.*, 6:51). Palmquist demonstrates that religious *Gesinnung*, for Kant, describes a free and resolute act of the will, akin to "conviction" (*Überzeugung*), rather than a feeling, psychological tendency, or metaphysical event: see "What is Kantian *Gesinnung?*." Kant's references to the need for "firm resolve" (*feste Vorsatz*) further emphasize the centrality of volition in moral and religious matters (see *Rel.*, 6:24n; 47; 49n).

[84] For this reference, and the translation, I am indebted to Marshall, "Aquinas on the Nature of Theology," 33n82. Citation for this work is given according to chapter, verse, and paragraph in the Leonine edition, vol. 26.

[85] For this reference, I am indebted to Marshall, "Aquinas on the Nature of Theology," 14.

[86] In a less pronounced way, this emphasis upon divine action and initiative survives into Kant's potential sources, such as Locke, Leibniz and Baumgarten. When talking about the "Dominion of *Faith*" Locke states that these "new Discoveries of Truth" are those things that "God hath revealed" (*Essay*, IV.xviii.10, 695). In the passage from Leibniz's *Theodicy* cited above, we see that the "divine faith," which is "more than an opinion," is "kindled in the soul," where the will passively receives a movement from God, whereby there is a "possession of the will and heart, to make us act" with "zeal and joyfully as the law of God commands" (*Theodicy*, §29, 91). Similarly, Baumgarten, when writing about *Glaube* in the context of God, speaks of "holy faith" as the "collection of those things that must be believed regarding revelation [*Offenbarung*]" (*Metaphysics*, §993), where "revelation" in "the strict sense" makes "known to creatures things that they cannot know at all in a natural way" (*Metaphysics*, §998). On this point, Locke, Leibniz, and Baumgarten, are all echoing a movement of thought we find in the tradition. Faith, in relation to divine matters, is a hearing of what is revealed by God. Where Locke strikes a different note from Aquinas, departing also from his own (possible) source, Richard Hooker, is in terms of the *scope* of faith. For Aquinas, even "belief in God" is an "act of faith," which is "not attributable to non-believers," because "in their belief God's existence does not have the same meaning as it does in faith" (*Sum. theol*. IIa–IIae.2.2, ad 3). For Locke, the content of faith is constrained to rather peripheral commitments, such as "that part of the Angels rebelled against GOD"

(*Essay*, IV.xviii.7, 694). Kant goes beyond narrowing the scope of faith, and makes a qualitative shift. For the tradition, God is the source of faith: both of its content (whether the content has central or peripheral significance), and of the movement of the will by which we accept this content. For Kant, faith must arise from our own freedom, without supernatural intervention.

[87] For insightful accounts of the passages drawn on here, see Palmquist, "Commentary," 120–33, 262–73, 355–68.

[88] Mariña, "Kant on Grace," 386. Desmond Hogan provides a more critical discussion of the relationship between grace and *concursus*, finding grounds to support the "traditional verdict" that Kant's mature theory of grace is Pelagian'; "Kant's Theory of Divine and Secondary Causation," 32–34 (33).

[89] Mariña, "Kant on Grace," 388.

[90] Mariña, "Kant on Grace," 388.

[91] Cited by Pasternak, *Kant on Religion*, 255.

[92] I presented a version of this paper to the History of Philosophy Seminar at King's College London, in March 2018. I am grateful for comments and feedback received on this occasion. I am also indebted to anonymous peer-reviewers for the *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, and to Ben DeSpain and David Dwan, for invaluable comments on earlier drafts of the article.