Weatherson, Putnam, Wilson, y Stich, Carnap, Ayer, nelson godmann

Una gran parte de las cosas que atribuimos a la Quina ya están allí clara y explícitamente tanto en Carnap (el holismo), Ayer (el "problema Quine-Duhem"), Chisholm, y otros. (4) El grado en que un filósofo encuentra delicioso el estilo de escritura falso-literario de Quine (por ejemplo, el doloroso uso excesivo de la aliteración) es un muy buen indicador de cuán poca literatura tiene, o va a tener, ese filósofo.

Judith Butler, Gender Trouble (1990)

Allan Gibbard, Wise Choices, Apt Feelings (1990)

Alasdair MacIntyre, Three Rival Versions of Moral Enquiry (1990)

Kendall Walton, Mimesis as Make-Believe (1990)

Timothy Williamson, Identity and Discrimination (1990)

Daniel Dennett, Consciousness Explained (1991)

Cora Diamond, The Realistic Spirit (1991)

Michael Dummett, Frege: Philosophy of Mathematics (1991)

Michael Dummett, The Logical Basis of Metaphysics (1991)

L. Jonathan Cohen, An Essay on Belief and Acceptance (1992)

Tim Crane, The Contents of Experience (1992)

John Searle, The Rediscovery of the Mind (1992)

Charles Taylor, Sources of the Self (1992)

J. J. Valberg, The Puzzle of Experience (1992)

Susan Haack, Evidence and Inquiry (1993)

Alvin Plantinga, Warrant and Proper Function (1993)

John Rawls, Political Liberalism (1993)

Robert Brandom, Making It Explicit (1994)

Gilles Deleuze, Difference and Repetition (1994)

John McDowell, Mind and World (1994)

Timothy Williamson, Vagueness (1994)

Crispin Wright, Truth and Objectivity (1994)

Gerald Cohen, Self-Ownership, Freedom and Equality (1995)

Fred Dretske, Naturalizing The Mind (1995)

Michael Tye, Ten Problems of Consciousness (1995)

David Chalmers, The Conscious Mind (1996)

Jurgen Habermas, Between Facts and Norms (1996)

Axel Honneth, The Struggle for Recognition (1996)

Robert Kane, The Significance of Free Will (1996)

Will Kymlicka, Multicultural Citizenship (1996)

John Roemer, Theories of Distributive Justice (1996)

Sydney Shoemaker, The First-Person Perspective (1996)

Alex Byrne and David Hilbert, Readings on Color (1997)

Wilfrid Sellars, Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind (1997)

John Roemer, Equality of Opportunity (1998)

Charles Siewert, The Significance of Consciousness (1998)

Harry Frankfurt, Necessity, Volition, and Love (1999)

David Lewis, Papers in Metaphysics and Epistemology (1999)

Martha Nussbaum, Women and Human Development (1999)

Ronald Dworkin, Sovereign Virtue (2000)

Timothy Williamson, Knowledge and its Limits (2000)

Rainer Forst, Contexts of Justice (2002)

Serge-Christophe Kolm, Justice and Equity (2002)

Thomas Pogge, World Poverty and Human Rights (2002)

The Most Important Philosophical Books Since 1950?

Reader Tracy Ho sends along the following interesting information:

I am a reader of your blog. Since you recently launched several polls about The Best Philosopher, I thought you might be interested in the following information.

In 2002, Professor Chen Bo (Philosophy, Peking University) was asked by one Chinese publisher about important contemporary philosophical works for publication in Chinese translation. At that time Prof. Chen was visiting at the University of Miami, so he asked Prof. Susan Haack for suggestions. They sent e-mails to sixteen philosophers in USA, England, Australia, Germany, Finland, and Brazil to recommend TEN of the most important and influential philosophical books after 1950. They received recommendations from twelve philosophers, including: Susan Haack, Donald M. Borchert (Ohio U.), Donald Davidson, Jurgen Habermas, Ruth Barcan Marcus, Thomas Nagel, John Searle, Peter F. Strawson, Hilary Putnam, and G. H. von Wright. (Sorry I cannot give you the full list, because their names are typed in Chinese. Two of them I cannot identify.)

The results were as follows:

1. Ludwig Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations. 13 votes go to Wittgenstein. Among them, 9 for "Philosophical Investigation." 2 for "On Certainty." Each of "Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus" and "The Blue and Brown Books" gets one.

2. W. V. Quine, Word and Object. 15 votes go to Quine. 8 for "Word and Object." 5 for "From a Logical Point of View." 2 for "Ontological Relativity."

3. Peter F. Strawson, Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics. 11 votes go to Strawson. 8 for "Individuals." "The Bounds of Sense," "Skepticism and Naturalism: Some Varieties," and "Introduction to Logical Theory" obtain one vote for each.

4. John Rawls, A Theory of Justice. 9 votes go to the same book, "A Theory of Justice."

5. Nelson Goodman, Fact, Fiction and Forecast. 10 votes go to Goodman. 7 for "Fact, Fiction and Forecast." 2 for "Ways of World Making." One for "Languages of Art."

6. Saul Kripke, Naming and Necessity. 8 votes go to Kripke. 6 for "Naming and Necessity." 2 for "Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language."

7. G.E.M. Anscombe, Intention. 8 votes go for Anscombe. 6 for "Intention." One for each of "The Collected Philosophical Papers" and "Metaphysics and the Philosophy of Mind."

8. J. L. Austin, How to do Things with Words. 7 votes go to Austin. 5 for "How to Do Things with Words." One for each of "Sense and Sensibilia" and "Philosophical Papers."

9. Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. 5 votes go to him and this book.

10. M. Dummett, The Logical Basis of Metaphysics. 8 votes go to Dummett. 3 for "The Logical Basis of Metaphysics." 2 for "Frege: Philosophy of Language." One for "Frege: Philosophy of Mathematics" and "Truth and Other Enigmas."

11. Hilary Putnam, The Many Faces of Realism. 8 votes go to him. 3 for "The Many Faces of Realism." Two for "Realism and Reason" and "Philosophical Papers." One for "Meaning and the Moral Sciences."

12. Michel Foucault, The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences. 5 votes go to him. Two for "The Order of Things" and "Discipline and Punishment." One for "An Archaeology of Knowledge."

13. Thomas Nagel, The View From Nowhere. 4 votes go to the same book.

14. Robert Nozick, Anarchy, State and Utopia. 4 votes go to the same book.

15. R. M. Hare obtains 4 votes. Two each for "The Language of Morals" and "Freedom and Reason."

16. John R. Searle obtains 5 votes. Two each for "Intentionality" and "The Rediscovery of the Mind". One for "Speech Acts."

17. Bernard Williams gets 4 votes. Two for "Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy. "One for "Descartes: The Project of Pure Enquiry" and "Moral Luck：Philosophical Papers 1973-1980."

18. Karl Popper gets 4 votes. One for "Conjecture and Refutation". Two for "Logik der Forschung." One for "Open Society and Its Enemies." (The last two were published before 1950)

19. Gilbert Ryle gets 3 votes, all of which go to "The Concept of Mind."

20. Donald Davidson gets 3 votes. Two for "Essays on Action and Event." One for "Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation."

21. John Mcdowell gets 3 votes. All go to "Mind and World." (Prof. Chen notes that Strawson and Putnam voted for him.)

22. Daniel C. Dennett gets 3 votes. Two for "Consciousness explained." One for "The Intentional Stance."

23. Jurgen Habermas gets 3 votes. Two for "Theory of Communicative Action." One for "Between Facts and Norm."

24. Jacques Derrida gets 3 votes. "La Voix et le Phenomene" and "De La Grammatologie" and "introduction a “L’origine de la Geometrie” par Edmund Husserl" get one for each.

25. Paul Ricoeur gets 3 votes. Two for "Le Metaphore Vive." One for "Freedom and Nature."

26. Noam Chomsky gets two votes. Each goes to "Syntactic Structure" and "Cartesian Linguistics."

27. Derek Parfit gets two votes. All go to "Reasons and Persons."

28. Susan Haack gets two votes. All go to "Evidence and Inquiry."

29. D. M. Armstrong gets two votes. Each of them goes to "Materialist Theory of the Mind" and "A Combinatorial Theory of Possibility."

30. Herbert Hart gets two votes. Each of them goes to "The Concept of Law" and "Punishment and Responsibility."

31. Ronald Dworkin gets two votes. Each of them goes to "Taking Rights Seriously" and "Law’s Empire."

Since most of the works on list are analytic philosophy, Prof. Chen asked Habermas to recommend some works in Europe. He recommended Axel Honneth, Kampf um Anerkennung (1992), Rainer Forst, Kontexte der Cerechtigkeit (1994）and Herbert Schnadelbach, Kommentor zu Hegels Rechtephilosophie (2001). [BL comment: Forst was Habermas's student]

Best Anglophone philosophers since 1957?

470 votes were cast, and here's the top ten:

1. W.V.O. Quine (Condorcet winner: wins contests with all other choices)

2. Saul Kripke loses to W.V.O. Quine by 166–163

3. David K. Lewis loses to W.V.O. Quine by 170–139, loses to Saul Kripke by 181–130

4. John Rawls loses to W.V.O. Quine by 181–125, loses to David K. Lewis by 165–151

5. Hilary Putnam loses to W.V.O. Quine by 196–112, loses to John Rawls by 163–146

6. Derek Parfit loses to W.V.O. Quine by 204–103, loses to Hilary Putnam by 190–111

7. Bernard Williams loses to W.V.O. Quine by 208–104, loses to Derek Parfit by 143–134

8. Donald Davidson loses to W.V.O. Quine by 221–63, loses to Bernard Williams by 139–133

9. Thomas Nagel loses to W.V.O. Quine by 218–88, loses to Donald Davidson by 128–123

10. P.F. Strawson loses to W.V.O. Quine by 240–53, loses to Thomas Nagel by 138–117

David Lewis fans were caught rallying votes late in the process, thus displacing Rawls at #3! G.E.M. Anscombe trailed P.F. Strawson by just five votes. Filling out the top 20 were the following philosophers:

11. G.E.M. Anscombe loses to W.V.O. Quine by 238–68, loses to P.F. Strawson by 125–120

12. Wilfrid Sellars loses to W.V.O. Quine by 236–53, loses to G.E.M. Anscombe by 126–107

13. J.L. Austin loses to W.V.O. Quine by 238–49, loses to Wilfrid Sellars by 120–105

14. Thomas Kuhn loses to W.V.O. Quine by 236–44, loses to J.L. Austin by 120–104

15. Noam Chomsky loses to W.V.O. Quine by 242–45, loses to Thomas Kuhn by 114–105

16. Robert Nozick loses to W.V.O. Quine by 246–39, loses to Noam Chomsky by 113–104

17. Nelson Goodman loses to W.V.O. Quine by 244–33, loses to Robert Nozick by 108–92

18. Daniel Dennett loses to W.V.O. Quine by 248–35, loses to Nelson Goodman by 99–98

19. Jerry Fodor loses to W.V.O. Quine by 253–28, loses to Daniel Dennett by 97–86

20. H. Paul Grice loses to W.V.O. Quine by 244–27, loses to Jerry Fodor by 92–84

Best Anglophone philosophers of language since 1945

MOVING TO FRONT FROM YESTERDAY--MORE DISCUSSION WELCOME

With over 300 votes on our latest poll, here's the top 20:

1. Saul Kripke (Condorcet winner: wins contests with all other choices)

2. W.V.O. Quine loses to Saul Kripke by 141–74

3. H. Paul Grice loses to Saul Kripke by 161–51, loses to W.V.O. Quine by 114–88

4. J.L. Austin loses to Saul Kripke by 159–62, loses to H. Paul Grice by 104–91

5. Donald Davidson loses to Saul Kripke by 168–50, loses to J.L. Austin by 104–101

6. David K. Lewis loses to Saul Kripke by 160–42, loses to Donald Davidson by 104–90

7. Noam Chomsky loses to Saul Kripke by 154–60, loses to David K. Lewis by 96–92

8. Hilary Putnam loses to Saul Kripke by 174–41, loses to Noam Chomsky by 100–92

9. Rudolf Carnap loses to Saul Kripke by 162–47, loses to Hilary Putnam by 100–86

10. David Kaplan loses to Saul Kripke by 176–23, loses to Rudolf Carnap by 88–83

11. Michael Dummett loses to Saul Kripke by 175–41, loses to David Kaplan by 89–82

12. P.F. (Peter) Strawson loses to Saul Kripke by 179–37, loses to Michael Dummett by 96–77

13. Alfred Tarski loses to Saul Kripke by 180–21, loses to P.F. (Peter) Strawson by 90–71

14. Tied:

Gareth Evans loses to Saul Kripke by 189–23, loses to Alfred Tarski by 80–75

Robert Stalnaker loses to Saul Kripke by 183–16, loses to Alfred Tarski by 80–68

16. John Searle loses to Saul Kripke by 193–17, loses to Gareth Evans by 87–76

17. Tyler Burge loses to Saul Kripke by 192–12, loses to John Searle by 81–65

18. Keith Donnellan loses to Saul Kripke by 192–10, loses to Tyler Burge by 68–57

19. Peter Geach loses to Saul Kripke by 192–10, loses to Keith Donnellan by 62–57

20. Robert Brandom loses to Saul Kripke by 178–32, loses to Peter Geach by 76–62

The Most Cited Books in Post-WWII Anglophone Philosophy (UPDATED to correct for Popper omission)

According to Google Scholar (in parentheses: total number of on-line articles and books citing the book in question):

1. Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (37,197)

2. John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (26,768)

3. Ronald Dworkin, Taking Rights Seriously (7,892)

4. Ludwig Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations (7,169)

5. Karl Popper, Conjectures and Refutations (6,516)

6. Alasdair MacIntyre, After Virtue (6,579)

7. Gilbert Ryle, The Concept of Mind (6,356)

7. John Rawls, Political Liberalism (6,352)

9. Robert Nozick, Anarchy, State, and Utopia (6,246)

9. H.L.A. Hart, The Concept of Law (6,212)

11. Richard Rorty, Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature (5,616)

12. John Searle, Speech Acts (5,387)

13. Jerry Fodor, Modularity of Mind (5,050)

14. Daniel Dennett, Consciousness Explained (4,810)

15. Karl Popper, Objective Knowledge (4,701)

Runners-up: Saul Kripke, Naming and Necessity (4,535); W.V.O. Quine, Word and Object (4,565); Paul Feyerabend, Against Method (4,420); Richard Rorty, Contingency, Irony and Solidarity (4,011); Charles Taylor, Sources of the Self (3,233); Jerry Fodor, The Language of Thought (3,292); Carl Hempel, Aspects of Scientific Explanation (3,137); David Chalmers, The Conscious Mind (3,065), Daniel Dennett, The Intentional Stance (2,985); Derek Parfit, Reasons and Persons (2,972)

So who should get a Nobel Prize in philosophy?

With over 565 responses to our earlier poll (limited, recall, to living philosophers over age 60), we now know whom readers think are the ten most deserving candidates:

1. Saul Kripke (Condorcet winner: wins contests with all other choices)

2. Noam Chomsky loses to Saul Kripke by 245–142

3. Derek Parfit loses to Saul Kripke by 260–113, loses to Noam Chomsky by 197–164

4. Thomas Nagel loses to Saul Kripke by 278–98, loses to Derek Parfit by 173–148

5. Martha Nussbaum loses to Saul Kripke by 272–110, loses to Thomas Nagel by 176–130

6. Jurgen Habermas loses to Saul Kripke by 273–108, loses to Martha Nussbaum by 154–141

7. Daniel Dennett loses to Saul Kripke by 282–98, loses to Jurgen Habermas by 150–145

8. Jerry Fodor loses to Saul Kripke by 292–64, loses to Daniel Dennett by 148–139

9. John Searle loses to Saul Kripke by 294–63, loses to Jerry Fodor by 142–124

10. Amartya Sen loses to Saul Kripke by 288–81, loses to John Searle by 148–121

The 20 "Most Important" Philosophers of All Time

With nearly 900 votes cast, we now know:

1. Plato (Condorcet winner: wins contests with all other choices)

2. Aristotle loses to Plato by 367–364

3. Kant loses to Plato by 411–328, loses to Aristotle by 454–295

4. Hume loses to Plato by 534–166, loses to Kant by 533–176

5. Descartes loses to Plato by 597–117, loses to Hume by 356–269

6. Socrates loses to Plato by 548–101, loses to Descartes by 327–270

7. Wittgenstein loses to Plato by 610–85, loses to Socrates by 385–193

8. Locke loses to Plato by 659–29, loses to Wittgenstein by 311–239

9. Frege loses to Plato by 611–86, loses to Locke by 279–256

10. Aquinas loses to Plato by 642–57, loses to Frege by 289–284

11. Hegel loses to Plato by 615–82, loses to Aquinas by 288–285

12. Leibniz loses to Plato by 650–36, loses to Hegel by 281–266

13. Spinoza loses to Plato by 653–49, loses to Leibniz by 281–207

14. Mill loses to Plato by 645–39, loses to Spinoza by 272–247

15. Hobbes loses to Plato by 647–47, loses to Spinoza by 269–245

16. Augustine loses to Plato by 663–46, loses to Mill by 296–247

17. Marx loses to Plato by 653–52, loses to Augustine by 305–248

18. Nietzsche loses to Plato by 691–63, loses to Marx by 327–269

19. Kierkegaard loses to Plato by 622–106, loses to Nietzsche by 330–256

20. Rousseau loses to Plato by 638–41, loses to Kierkegaard by 280–209

Berkeley was a close runner-up for the top 20.

So who \*is\* the most important philosopher of the past 200 years?

The poll is now closed; with 600 votes cast, here are the results for "the top 40":

1. Ludwig Wittgenstein (Condorcet winner: wins contests with all other choices)

2. Gottlob Frege loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 261–160

3. Bertrand Russell loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 280–137, loses to Gottlob Frege by 218–156

4. John Stuart Mill loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 280–135, loses to Bertrand Russell by 204–178

5. W.V.O. Quine loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 291–150, loses to John Stuart Mill by 214–198

6. G.W.F. Hegel loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 290–130, loses to W.V.O. Quine by 214–210

7. Saul Kripke loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 314–138, loses to G.W.F. Hegel by 224–213

8. Friedrich Nietzsche loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 290–117, loses to Saul Kripke by 209–207

9. Karl Marx loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 359–95, loses to Friedrich Nietzsche by 254–138

10. Soren Kierkegaard loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 358–124, loses to Karl Marx by 230–213

11. Rudolf Carnap loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 345–90, loses to Soren Kierkegaard by 245–194

12. John Rawls loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 379–80, loses to Rudolf Carnap by 212–175

13. David K. Lewis loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 352–92, loses to John Rawls by 211–166

14. G.E. Moore loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 362–59, loses to David K. Lewis by 188–152

15. Donald Davidson loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 342–50, loses to G.E. Moore by 171–158

16. Martin Heidegger loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 351–63, loses to Donald Davidson by 188–161

17. Edmund Husserl loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 336–51, loses to Martin Heidegger by 169–140

18. Hilary Putnam loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 338–51, loses to Edmund Husserl by 148–138

19. William James loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 347–42, loses to Hilary Putnam by 151–146

20. Charles Sanders Peirce loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 333–40, loses to William James by 145–109

21. Alfred Tarski loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 323–55, loses to Charles Sanders Peirce by 132–109

22. J.L. Austin loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 346–29, loses to Alfred Tarski by 131–126

23. P.F. Strawson loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 339–42, loses to J.L. Austin by 137–127

24. Karl Popper loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 344–47, loses to P.F. Strawson by 135–127

25. G.E.M. Anscombe loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 326–35, loses to Karl Popper by 137–128

26. Jean-Paul Sartre loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 355–54, loses to G.E.M. Anscombe by 145–139

27. John Dewey loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 344–28, loses to Jean-Paul Sartre by 138–134

28. Wilfrid Sellars loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 348–29, loses to John Dewey by 123–116

29. Arthur Schopenhauer loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 352–30, loses to Wilfrid Sellars by 129–117

30. Henry Sidgwick loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 302–29, loses to Arthur Schopenhauer by 108–105

31. Alfred North Whitehead loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 333–24, loses to Henry Sidgwick by 108–86

32. Michel Foucault loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 357–31, loses to Alfred North Whitehead by 123–121

33. Bernard Williams loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 337–29, loses to Michel Foucault by 128–127

34. Gilbert Ryle loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 347–23, loses to Bernard Williams by 113–110

35. Maurice Merleau-Ponty loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 329–32, loses to Gilbert Ryle by 112–107

36. Franz Brentano loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 326–26, loses to Maurice Merleau-Ponty by 111–100

37. Michael Dummett loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 343–26, loses to Franz Brentano by 106–92

38. Jurgen Habermas loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 340–22, loses to Michael Dummett by 115–97

39. Hannah Arendt loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 336–29, loses to Jurgen Habermas by 107–98

40. Simone de Beauvoir loses to Ludwig Wittgenstein by 336–30, loses to Hannah Arendt by 110–100

En el día de hoy dos fueron mis principales pensamientos, el primero la necesidad de aprender más inglés, por lo cual es necesario esforzarme más, el segundo el dejar de perder tiempo en banalidades de redes sociales, además es menester buscar una iglesia en san José, como un gimnasio, no olvidar retomar el horario de diez, y esforzarse en no procrastinar, el Facebook no debe volverse algo diario, de ser posible debe evitarse, y es necesario esforzarme mas en aprovechar el tiempo. 3 de agosto.

Quien es el que puede negar al destino

me es pesado aceptar la dura visión

pero este amargo cariño, lo he sufrido también yo

no es sencillo huir del pretexto de las pocas caricias

y de un ligero beso

Quien es el que puede negar al amor

Mas duro que una piedra forjada por un hado

Dardo de aceptas, escorpión de un solo

Quien multiplica en los cristales sus historias de amor

todos los sufrieron, también lo sufro yo

Quien niega, que, amado, quien niega que ha llorado

Me es pesado aceptarlo, pero hasta yo el veneno he probado

No es posible huir del delirio, ni un acepta lo vence

Hasta el prometeico del huerto quien desconocía a la mujer

capaz fue de soñarlo, dibujarlo al final de este

Propio es de nosotros, de un sapiente