

Fichte-Studien-Supplementa

Band 24

Edited by
Daniel Breazeale and Tom Rockmore

Fichte, German Idealism, and Early Romanticism

im Auftrage der
Internationalen Johann-Gottlieb-Fichte-Gesellschaft

in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Istituto Italiano
per gli Studi Filosofici

herausgegeben von

Helmut Girndt (Duisburg)
Wolfgang Janke (Wuppertal)
Wolfgang H. Schrader (†) (Siegen)
Hartmut Traub (Mülheim a. d. Ruhr)

Rodopi

Amsterdam - New York, NY 2010

Intellectual Intuition: Reconsidering Continuity in Kant, Fichte, and Schelling

Yolanda Estes

Fichte on Kant and Intellectual Intuition: »Kant too had such an intuition, but he did not reflect upon it. Indeed his entire philosophy is a product of this intuition; for he maintains that necessary representations are products of the acting of a rational being and are not passively received. But this is something that he could only have come to realize by means of intuition. Kant recognizes that self-consciousness occurs, i.e. a consciousness of the act of intuiting within time. How could he have arrived at such a recognition? Only by means of an intuition – and such an intuition is certainly intellectual.«¹

1 Abbreviations:

- FTP = *Fichte: Foundations of Transcendental Philosophy (Wissenschaftslehre) nova methodo*, ed. and trans. Daniel Breazeale (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000);
GA = *J. G. Fichte-Gesamtausgabe der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, ed. Reinhard Lauth, Hans Gliwitzky, and Erich Fuchs (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1964ff.);
GS = Immanuel Kant, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Königl. preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1910 ff.);
IWL = *Introductions to the Wissenschaftslehre and Other Writings*, ed. and trans. Daniel Breazeale (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994);
KPV = Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*;
KRV = Immanuel Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*;
SE = *System of Ethics*, ed. and trans. Daniel Breazeale and Günter Zöllner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005);
STI = Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, *System of Transcendental Idealism*, ed. and trans. Peter Heath (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978);

1. Introduction: The Continuity Thesis

In this chapter, I reconsider continuity in Kant's, Fichte's, and Schelling's concepts of intellectual intuition. Moltke S. Gram's influential essay, »Intellectual Intuition: The Continuity Thesis,« discredited the continuity thesis, or the contention that Kant's, Fichte's and Schelling's discussions of intellectual intuition hinged on a single question about the relation between the intellect and things-in-themselves.² Proponents of the continuity thesis believed that Fichte and Schelling affirmed the same concept of intellectual intuition denied by Kant. Gram argued that the continuity thesis was false insofar as no unitary problem of intellectual intuition existed in either Kant's philosophy or German idealism.

I wish to examine Kant's, Fichte's, and Schelling's concepts of intellectual intuition in light of Gram's essay. I would not resurrect the continuity thesis but rather would draw attention to four issues. First, Gram examined only three of the five forms of intellectual intuition considered by

UHK = Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, *The Unconditional in Human Knowledge: Four Early Essays (1794–1796)*, ed. and trans. Fritz Marti (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1980);

W = Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. K. F. A. Schelling (Stuttgart/Augsburg: J. G. Cotta, 1856–61);

WLnm K = *Wissenschaftslehre nova methodo* (»Krause Nachschrift,« 1798/99). FTP, p. 115 (WLnm K 31–2). Note also: »Kant rejected intellectual intuition, but he defined the concept of intuition in such a way that intuitions could only be sensible; and therefore he said that these sensible intuitions cannot be intellectual. [Ibid.] Note also: [Intellectual intuition] is directed toward an acting – and this is something that Kant does not even mention (except perhaps under the name »pure apperception«). Nevertheless, it is still possible to indicate the exact place within Kant's system where he should have discussed this. For Kant would certainly maintain that we are conscious of the Categorical Imperative, would he not? What sort of consciousness is this? Kant neglected to pose this question to himself; for nowhere did he discuss the foundation of all philosophy. Instead in the Critique of Pure Reason he dealt only with theoretical philosophy within the context of which the Categorical Imperative could not appear. And in the Critique of Practical Reason he dealt only with practical philosophy and discussed only the content of this sort of consciousness, and thus the question concerning the very nature of this sort of consciousness could not arise within the content of the Second Critique. [IWL, P. 56 (GA, I, 4: 225)]

² »Intellectual Intuition: The Continuity Thesis,« *Journal of the History of Ideas* 42 (1981), pp. 287–304 [Henceforth = »Intellectual Intuition«]

Kant. Second, he treated the concept of intellectual intuition in Fichte's philosophy as unitary when Fichte used »intellectual intuition« to refer to four distinct acts or concepts. Third, he understated similarities between Schelling's, Fichte's, and Kant's concepts of intellectual intuition. Fourth and finally, although Gram's essay was an invaluable contribution to the contemporary understanding of intellectual intuition, contemporary scholars should acknowledge both discontinuity and continuity within the tradition of German idealism.

2. Overview of Gram's Argument and Contribution

In »Intellectual Intuition: The Continuity Thesis,« Gram contends that intellectual intuition concerned Kant, Fichte, and Schelling for different reasons. Kant addressed the relations between the conditions of knowing and objects whereas Fichte considered the knowing subject's relation to itself and Schelling dealt with cognition of the subjective-objective identity present in phenomena. Kant wanted to show the legitimate application of the conditions necessary for experience to objects and thus, reserved »intellectual intuition« to designate illegitimate application of the categories to objects. Fichte aimed to distinguish between our manner of knowing objects and our mode of acquaintance with the necessary subjective activities that condition experience. Schelling meant to deny the distinction between the conditions of experience and the objects of experience.

According to Gram, Kant rejected three logically independent versions of intellectual intuition: 1) the intuition of the noumenon in the positive sense, 2) the creative intuition of an archetypal intellect, and 3) the intuition of the totality of nature.³ In the *Transcendental Analytic*, Kant defined intellectual intuition as a mode of intuition whereby an intellect knows things-in-themselves. He rejected this version of intellectual intuition because space and time are *a priori* forms of human sensibility and not objective properties of things. In the *Inaugural Dissertation*, Kant discussed an archetypal intellect that creates its objects in the act of cognition, but he rejected this form of intellectual intuition as a possible mode of cognition for our ectypal intellects because it violates the distinction between con-

cepts and things. He also considered a form of intellectual intuition that grasps the sum of all phenomena as a whole, which he rejected because it conflicts with the spatio-temporal organization of intuition.

Gram asserts that Fichte implemented none of the concepts of intellectual intuition rejected by Kant but rather a form of intellectual intuition that collapses the distinction between concepts and objects on which Kant's formulations depend.⁴ Fichtean intellectual intuition involved immediate consciousness of the self's own activity. Because all conceptual awareness involves self-awareness, this intellectual intuition would be non-conceptual. Accordingly, Gram claims that Fichtean intellectual intuition collapsed the distinction between phenomena and noumena insofar as the self-aware subject of this intuition is also the intuited object of awareness and thus, is neither phenomenon nor noumenon. Since Fichte denied any legitimate role for the concept of the thing-in-itself, he also denied any possible knowledge of the thing-in-itself. Likewise, the self-intuition occurs in time and thus, involves no consciousness of things-in-themselves. Moreover, the unity intuited in this act is not a totality of phenomena but an ideal self that »ought but cannot« be produced by us.

Gram argues that the young Schelling's concept of intellectual intuition appears to corroborate the continuity thesis but that the mature Schelling adopted neither Kant's »multiple interpretations« nor Fichte's »single-minded interpretation« of intellectual intuition.⁵ Schelling described intellectual intuition as an insight into nature as a realm of Ideas or archetypes that exist apart from self-consciousness. Although he made only metaphorical allusions to the relation between the archetypal and the phenomenal worlds, he regarded intellectual intuition as knowledge of the subjective-objective identity that underpins experience. This absolute knowledge involves no insight into the self or its activities. Likewise, it does not concern knowledge of things-in-themselves, because its object resides within phenomena. Moreover, it presumes no acquaintance with the totality of phenomena but rather with the archetypes present in individual phenomena.

Gram's invaluable discussion of the continuity thesis rescued Kant, Fichte, and Schelling from an odious myth. Nonetheless, he disregarded

4 »Intellectual Intuition,« p. 300.

5 »Intellectual Intuition,« p. 300. See W, I: 81, 366, 369, 392, 401, and 420.

some significant parallels in Kant's, Fichte's, and Schelling's philosophies. Despite noteworthy differences in their concepts of intellectual intuition, and even more important differences in their interpretation of transcendental philosophy and its boundaries, Kant's legacy is clearly recognizable in Fichte's and Schelling's philosophies and in their interpretations of intellectual intuition.

Recent Fichte scholarship has demonstrated that several types of intellectual intuition play complex roles in Fichte's philosophy. Three decades have passed since Dieter Henrich proposed the developmental thesis to counter the reflection model of self-consciousness and to reconcile the seeming inconsistencies in Fichte's discussion of intellectual intuition.⁶ Other scholars, such as Alexis Philonenko, Claude Piché, Jürgen Stolzenberg, and Xavier Tilliette, have recognized that Henrich's developmental interpretation fails to account for Fichte's use of the term intellectual intuition during any developmental period of the *Wissenschaftslehre*. More recently, Alain Perrinjaquet's discussion of the relation between real and philosophical intellectual intuition has shown that Fichte's concept of intellectual intuition is not unitary in the Jena *Wissenschaftslehre*; and Daniel Braezeale has provided solid evidence that Fichte employs no less than four different forms of intellectual intuition in the later Jena *Wissenschaftslehre*.⁷

3. Kant and Intellectual Intuition

Kant discussed the possibility of five types of intellectual intuition: 1) the intuition of the noumenon in the positive sense, 2) the creative intuition of an archetypal intellect 3) the intuition of the totality of nature 4) the apprehension of the I's self-activity, and 5) the conjoined intuitions of the

6 »Fichte's Original Insight,« trans. David R. Lachterman, pp. 15–53 in *Contemporary German Philosophy*, Vol. I (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 1982).

7 Alain Perrinjaquet, »Wirkliche und philosophische Anschauung: Formen der Intellektuellen Anschauung in Fichtes System der Sittenlehre (1798),« *Fichte-Studien 5: Theoretische Vernunft* (1993), pp. 57–81; Daniel Braezeale, »Fichte's Nova Methodo Phenomenologica: On the methodological role of intellectual intuition« in the later Jena *Wissenschaftslehre*« *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 4 (1988), pp. 587–616.

moral law and freedom. Although Gram ignored and Kant rejected the last two types of intellectual intuition, Fichte accepted both.

As intellects, we are conscious of the power to combine what is given and intuited according to the relations of inner sense. In the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant claims that it follows the self must be more than mere appearance, but we can know it solely as appearance and not as it exists in itself or might be given through a non-sensible intuition, because our sensibility admits no intellectual intuition.⁸ Kant notes that we would not need to presuppose a relation to something external in accounting for experience if we could connect a determination of our existence with consciousness of the self through an intellectual intuition.⁹

In the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant says that the »I think« expresses the act of determining one's own existence, but the manifold pertaining to one's existence is not given in the »I think.« He claims that if the manifold were given by the self's activity, then the corresponding intuition would be intellectual. Although self-intuition is necessary for the manifold to be given, time, as the pure form of intuition, conditions self-intuition. Accordingly, Kant argues we cannot become conscious of ourselves as self-active or self-determining.¹⁰

Only by means of an original spontaneity does the self count as an intellect and thus, we must represent this activity in order to view ourselves as intellects. Nonetheless, we cannot directly grasp, or intellectually intuit, our self-determining activity. The original synthetic unity of apperception yields self-consciousness, but this consciousness entails no knowledge, which requires the determination of the object according to the form of inner intuition.

In the *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant calls our awareness of the moral law a fact of reason, because we have no preceding awareness of

8 KRV B 159.

9 KRV Bxl.a.

10 »Now since I do not have another self-intuition that gives the determining in me (I am conscious only of the spontaneity of it) prior to the act of determination, as time does in the case of the determinable, I cannot determine my existence as that of a self-active being; all that I can do is represent to myself the spontaneity of my thought, that is of the determination and my existence is still only determinable sensibly; that is, as existence of an appearance.« [*Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Norman Kemp Smith (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965), p. 169 (KRV B 158)].

freedom and because what it compels is not based on experience. He argues that if we were given immediate consciousness of freedom of the will, the moral law would be an analytic proposition, but since this immediate consciousness would require an intellectual intuition, which we do not possess, freedom cannot be presupposed. Thus, the moral law is simply the undeniable, and indeed, the »sole fact of pure reason.«¹¹

4. Fichte and Intellectual Intuition

In the Jena *Wissenschaftslehre*, Fichte uses intellectual intuition in reference to four distinct ideas: 1) the real intellectual intuition, 2) the concept of pure I-hood, 3) the philosophical self-reflection, and 4) the methodological inner intuition.¹²

Fichte's term real intellectual intuition refers to an immediate non-sensible awareness of freedom obtained through moral activity. In grasping the moral law, the moral subject becomes conscious of itself as a willing subject with a moral obligation. The immediate coincidence of self-awareness and moral awareness involves a self-reverting activity. Consciousness of the ethical law enjoins an act of self-determination and thus, is itself a determinate self-reverting activity.¹³

Fichte claims that real intellectual intuition is conditioned by a summons to act freely, or an *Aufforderung*, which is directed from one indi-

11 »The consciousness of this fundamental law may be called a fact of reason, since one cannot ferret it out from antecedent data of reason, such as the consciousness of freedom (for that is not antecedently given), and since it forces itself upon us as a synthetic proposition a priori based on no pure or empirical intuition. It would be analytic if the freedom of the will were presupposed, but for this, as a positive concept, an intellectual intuition would be needed, and here we cannot assume it. In order to regard this law without any misinterpretation as given, one must note that it is not an empirical fact but the sole fact of pure reason, which by it proclaims itself as an originating law.« [*Critique of Practical Reason*, trans. Lewis White Beck (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing), p. 31–2 (KPV 31–2)].

12 Alain Perrinjaquet referred to the first form as real intellectual intuition and to the second and third collectively as philosophical intellectual intuition. Daniel Breazeale provided an analysis of the fourth form, the more obscure, inner intuition.

13 SS, GA, I, 5: 147 (SE, p. 139–140).

vidual to another in empirical experience.¹⁴ A feeling of absolute »ought« gives rise to moral self-awareness, or intellectual intuition, wherein the empirical subject recognizes itself as subordinate to the Categorical Imperative and thus, views itself in light of its capacity to act freely rather than in light of its empirically determined nature. Real intellectual intuition is an actual fact of empirical consciousness whereby the empirical subject obtains a concept of itself as a pure will.¹⁵

Fichte says that intellectual intuition as pure I-hood, which the transcendental philosopher presupposes as the immediate consciousness underpinning all mediate consciousness, is the concept of pure self-reverting activity. The philosophical concept of I-hood refers to a being whose essence consists in self-activity. The philosopher infers this concept and posulates it as the ground of consciousness. As the ground of consciousness, it is never an object of the philosopher's direct awareness. The philosophical intellectual intuition, or *Tathandlung*, never enters in empirical consciousness as a fact, because it is simply the structure of spontaneous pure self-consciousness, or I-hood. Pure I-hood is thus an Idea employed hypothetically in order to prevent the theoretical account of consciousness from falling into circularity.¹⁶

According to Fichte, intellectual intuition as philosophical self-reflection is an explicit awareness of self-reverting activity obtained by the transcendental philosopher who abstracts from the objective world, constructs the concept of the »I,« and recognizes that this task involves a self-reverting activity. This self-reverting activity involves an immediate coincidence of self-awareness and thinking activity. When the philosophizing subject

14 WLnmm K, pp. 241–42 (FTP, p. 469).

15 »It is only through the medium of the ethical law that I catch a glimpse of myself and insofar as I view myself through this medium, I necessarily view myself as self-active. In this way an entirely alien ingredient, viz., my consciousness of my own real efficacy, arises for me within a consciousness that otherwise would be nothing but a consciousness of a particular sequence of my representations.« [IWL, p. 49 (GA, I, 4: 219)]

16 »Pure willing at this point is not supposed to be anything other than an explanatory ground of consciousness; it is still a hypothesis, not yet an object of consciousness. {One should think of this determinacy of pure willing in the most indeterminate manner possible – as a mere hypothesis, as a *qualitas occulta*; or however else one may wish – since it does not appear within consciousness at all.}« [FTP, pp. 293–4 (WLnmm K, p. 144; GA, IV: 2, pp. 235–6 9)]

thinks of himself, he engages in self-reverting or self-determining activity, which is itself the concept of the I.¹⁷

The self-awareness revealed in philosophical self-reflection is implicit in empirical consciousness. It becomes a fact of consciousness for the transcendental philosopher, who subjects the simple act of self-reflection to a higher act of reflection. In other words, in order to think of oneself, one must first think of something else and then, wrench oneself therefrom, which requires a free self-reverting activity. Consequently, philosophical self-reflection involves a real act – a *Tathandlung* – resembling, but not identical to, the pure I presupposed as grounding consciousness. Likewise, philosophical self-reflection involves an intuition, resembling, but not identical to, the real intellectual intuition of moral consciousness.

In the *Wissenschaftslehre nova methodo*, Fichte presents inner intuition, which he also calls intellectual intuition, as a method of philosophizing.¹⁸ Inner intuition requires that the philosopher observe carefully both aspects of philosophical self-reflection: the concept of the I and the act of attending to the construction of that concept. The I is asserted in the act of self-reflection as self-positing and thus, the philosopher observes the generation of all the other acts necessary for the I to posit itself as self-positing. In this manner, the philosopher »intuits« the transcendental conditions that constitute the synthetic structure of consciousness, including the *Tathandlung* grounding the philosophical self-reflection.¹⁹

5. Schelling and Intellectual Intuition

Schelling's frenetic development complicates the question of intellectual intuition in his philosophy. His use of intellectual intuition seems to alter with each new work. Moreover, one struggles to describe the role of

17 WLnmm K, p. 98 (FTP, p. 110).

18 WLnmm K, p. 21, 31–35 (FTP, p. 100, 113–20).

19 »We must possess some knowledge of this ultimate ground, for we are able to talk about it. We obtain this knowledge through immediate intuition, and in turn, we immediately intuit our immediate intuition itself. I. e. we have an intuition of an intuition. Pure intuition of the I as subject-object is therefore possible. Since pure intuition of this sort contains no sensible content, the proper name for it is »intellectual intuition.« [FTP, pp. 113–114 (WLnmm K p. 31)]

Schellingian intuition within any single text.²⁰ Nonetheless, Schelling often provides two formulations of intellectual intuition: the philosophical intuition of the I and the creative intuition of an archetypal intellect.

In *On the I as Principle of Philosophy* (1795) and *Letters on Dogmatism and Criticism* (1795), Schelling describes intellectual intuition as an immediate awareness of the unity of the subject and object in self-consciousness.²¹ This freely produced intuition expresses the logical principle of identity that the transcendental philosopher uses as the first principle of philosophy.²² Schelling claims that this subjective intuition of the self exists alongside an objective intuition of the world, which results from a psychological deception whereby the materialist, or dogmatist, projects a priori or self-intuition onto the world. Both the subjective and objective intuitions involve a transition from conscious activity to unconscious repose, which reflection breaks by reintroducing the distinction between subject and object present in ordinary consciousness. Although Schelling describes intellectual intuition as a form of philosophical consciousness, he suggested that other mental states, such as aesthetic consciousness, mimic intellectual intuition.

In the *System of Transcendental Idealism* (1800), Schelling retains the philosophical intuition as a freely postulated ground of idealism. Although he allows that intellectual intuition involves a subjective awareness, he also emphasizes that intellectual intuition includes an unconscious activity. So, intellectual intuition comes to denote the unity of subjective, conscious awareness (or cognition) and objective, unconscious activity (or constitution).

Schelling's postulated unity of cognition and constitution lead to the introduction of intellectual intuition as archetypal knowing, or creative intuition.²³ Creative intuition involves the simultaneous cognition and con-

20 Difficult as this task may be, Michael Vater does an excellent job of fulfilling it in his introductions to Peter Heath's translation of Schelling's *System of Transcendental Idealism* [STI] and to his own translation of Schelling's *Bruno or On the Natural and the Divine Principle of Things*, trans. and ed. Michael G. Vater (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984) [Henceforth = *Bruno*].

21 UHK, pp. 181–184, 216, 285, 317–319.

22 Here, Schelling follows Fichte's early philosophy as expressed in the *Grundlage der gesamten Wissenschaftslehre* (1794).

23 STI, p. 200.

stitution of its objects apart from sensible intuition, empirical consciousness, and philosophical reflection. Creative intuition, or absolute knowing, grasps the archetypes within determinate natural phenomena as well as the teleological determination of the parts of nature through the whole. Nonetheless, transcendental philosophy cannot articulate absolute unity cognitively but must rely on art to express it symbolically and on philosophy of nature to express it teleologically. In *Bruno or On the Natural and the Divine Principle of Things* (1802), Schelling revokes his claim that art serves as the ultimate philosophical organon. However, he offers no discursive account of absolute knowing but rather positive metaphorical descriptions and negative logical descriptions of the absolute.

In *On the I as Principle of Philosophy* (1795) and *Letters on Dogmatism and Criticism* (1795), Schelling associates intellectual intuition with freedom. Nonetheless, he claims that real intuition of the moral law is a subjective principle that falls within the realm of appearances. In the *System of Transcendental Idealism*, he argues that freedom is realized in history through an unconscious teleological principle.²⁴ The very notion of moral striving towards an ideal entails a divided self, which he rejects. So, in *Bruno*, he claims that a self that contains a subjective-objective dichotomy is a relative self, because absolute self-hood requires the indifference of subject and object.²⁵

Conclusion: Reconsidering Continuity in Kant's, Fichte's, and Schelling's Concepts of Intellectual Intuition

Intellectual intuition is one aspect of Kant's legacy that Fichte and Schelling engaged in their unique interpretations of transcendental idealism. Fichte and Schelling considered concepts of intellectual intuition arising within Kant's discussion of the limits of knowledge. Specifically, Kant, Fichte, and Schelling addressed the possibility of a philosophical intuition of the I and of a real intuition of the moral law. Although they disagreed about intellectual intuition, each employed it to define the borders of transcendental philosophy.

For Kant, the limits of knowledge were inseparable from the definition of intuition and the notion of the thing-in-itself. Kant's ambiguity about

24 STI, p. 191 and 200.

25 *Bruno*, p. 68.

things-in-themselves, forced him to deny intellectual intuition. Were intellectual intuitions permitted, things-in-themselves could be objects of intuitions. By defining all intuition as sensible, he precluded both things-in-themselves as objects of knowledge and intellectual intuitions as modes of consciousness. As a result, Kant struggled to describe self-consciousness and moral consciousness. Allowing them as intellectual intuitions would violate the limits of knowledge he imposed but denying them rendered the knowledge he desired impossible.

Insofar as Fichte rejected the very notion of a thing-in-itself as meaningless, Fichtean intellectual intuition involves no consciousness of things-in-themselves. Moreover, since consciousness delimits its own »circle from which we cannot escape,« the boundary of knowledge is not bound to the definition of intuition. When modes of consciousness arose that involved an immediate, non-sensible awareness rather than an immediate, sensible awareness, Fichte called them intellectual intuitions. Nonetheless, intellectual intuition still served to limit his philosophy. The philosophical concept of the I, is a hypothesis or postulate, which the philosopher makes explicit as a philosophical reflection and which, the moral subject realizes as a real intuition of freedom. The real intuition provides an extra-philosophical ground beyond which the philosopher is not permitted to go. So, Fichtean intellectual intuition binds objective knowledge to empirical consciousness.

Schelling employed the philosophical intellectual intuition as a first principle in his early philosophy. Initially, he viewed the philosophical concept of the I in much the same manner as Fichte, but he discovered this principle would not yield a system that satisfied his philosophical goals. As Schelling moved toward monism, he sought a foundation that united the subjective intellectual intuition of the I with an objective intellectual intuition of the world. Moreover, unlike Kant and Fichte, he was not primarily concerned with accounting for consciousness, so he searched for a principle that encompassed conscious awareness and unconscious activity. In his early writings, Schelling associated intellectual intuition with freedom, but individual consciousness of moral freedom was clearly not of paramount importance even in his early works. Indeed, he found the Kantian/Fichtean idea of freedom too confining as a basis for the historical development of man as a species. Ultimately, Schelling abandoned Fichtean intellectual intuition because he rejected the limits it imposed on philosophy; but in attempting to transcend self-consciousness

and moral consciousness, he could not express his knowledge claims discursively.

Schelling used the concept of intellectual intuition to violate the very boundaries set by Kant and Fichte – boundaries that Kant first determined and that Fichte later reinforced by means of the concept. This »betrayal« does not imply that intellectual intuition contains the destruction of transcendental idealism but rather that Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, starting with related concepts of intellectual intuition, moved toward very different interpretations of idealism and its limits, which compelled them to re-define intellectual intuition in different ways.