
Book Section:
Bennett, C.D. (2017) Grace, Freedom, and the Expression of Emotion: Schiller and the Critique of Kant. In: Cohen, A. and Stern, R., (eds.) Thinking about the Emotions: A Philosophical History. Mind Association Occasional Series . Oxford University Press , Oxford , pp. 184-205. ISBN 9780198766858

https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198766858.001.0001

Grace, Freedom and the Expression of Emotion:
Schiller and the Critique of Kant

Christopher Bennett

In this paper I ask what Schiller can tell us about expressive action, specifically the expression of emotion. Schiller's discussion of the expression of emotion takes place in the context of his arguments for the importance of grace, a value he thinks neglected by Kant's writings on ethics. Grace is sometimes thought of as moral beauty, and its interest specifically aesthetic as opposed to ethical.[1] For this reason Schiller's concerns are sometimes regarded as peripheral to the main business of moral and political philosophy. However, I will argue that what is at stake in Schiller's discussion of grace is rather the nature of freedom and the development of a distinctive model of human perfection.

The expressions of emotion that help to constitute grace, on Schiller's view, are not merely physiological changes that accompany emotion; neither are we to understand 'expression of emotion' in the way that later philosophers and artists would see this as relating to the nature of art - at least not in the first instance (there will be a connection with the nature of art to be explored further on).[2] Rather, we are concerned here with expressions of emotion that are gestures. We can think of these as being like the 'arational actions' discussed by Rosalind Hursthouse, for instance, jumping for joy, hitting the table in anger, ruffling a child's hair out of affection, hugging a dead beloved's clothes in grief – in other words the gamut of what we call 'action out of emotion.'[3] The characteristic of such action, we might say, is that it is voluntary, intentional action (unlike blushing or crying) through which the presence of the emotion is manifested; where the intention, however, is not to express the emotion; but where the fact that the emotion is manifested has some formative influence on the resultant action. Another way of putting the point, close to Hursthouse's characterization, is that the action is voluntary, but does not seem to be directed at a further end (even an end such as displaying or communicating or venting the emotion) – rather, the action is expressive. That is why it seems appropriate to explain it as having been done 'out of emotion' rather than with some further end in mind.

I will argue that Schiller notices that actions like this pose a problem for what he takes to be an attractive, Kantian conception of freedom. I don't think that he solves the problem. But his wrestling with it is instructive. We could put the point like this. Either we act freely when acting out of emotion, or we do not. If we do not act freely, it looks as though we must take ourselves to be literally overpowered by emotion. But this does not seem to be correct – many actions out of emotion, as Hursthouse points out, are controlled and intentional actions. Therefore, we might be pushed to view action out of emotion as free action. But if free then, on the Kantian view, this can only be because action out of emotion is responsive to laws of reason that govern the action in question. So, how can we see action out of emotion as governed by rational laws? Two possibilities suggest themselves. Either action out of emotion is subsumed under the already-accepted Kantian principles of practical reason – so, for instance, the way we act when we act out of emotion is governed by principles such as universalizability and nothing more – or else we have to admit further principles of practical reason governing the expression of emotion in particular. Kantians may be tempted to take the first line – but this may simply add to the impression that they cannot explain the rationality of action from emotion. The

second response, by contrast, will lead us to a kind of rationalist phenomenology of the emotions, on which emotions bear a strong relation to judgements and other cognitive attitudes, and which we might see as running through Franz Brentano and Max Scheler, to Charles Taylor and Martha Nussbaum via Anthony Kenny's Action, Emotion and Will.[4] The key claims of this view would be something like this: that justificatory reasons do, in principle, govern emotions and emotional behavior; that this is in part because emotions are complex states with rich intentional content, and emotional behaviour bears some intelligible relation to that content; that these reasons may, indeed, be central to morality; and that, because these reasons are specific to the realm of the emotions, the emotions would be our medium for discovering such reasons.

Schiller does not take this second path. But he does stand at a pivotal point in its history. For he accepts that action out of emotion cannot be explained simply mechanistically, and accepts the Kantian conception of freedom as spontaneity; but he breaks new ground in asking how that view – of spontaneous action as action responsive to principles of practical reason – is to be reconciled with the fact that sometimes we act expressively, out of emotion. The ideal of grace is an ideal where we act expressively yet freely. If grace requires something of us in regards to the emotions we feel and the way we express them then, from Schiller's point of view, this means that only with certain expressive tendencies can we be truly free.

The central topic of the paper, then, is the expression of emotion, but in order to explain the distinctiveness of Schiller's view we must first explain what is at stake in it. Thus in section 1 I give an introduction to Schiller's moral psychology, emphasizing his concern with freedom and, because of that, the distinctive model of human perfection that he introduces. This model of freedom and perfection is examined in more detail in section 2, and Schiller's theory of beauty in art is introduced to help explain it; in section 3 I look at the range of theoretical possibilities for analyzing Schiller's model. In section 4, I defend the view that Schiller's model is a model of expressive action; and section 5 asks what we can learn from Schiller about the study of emotion and its expression. Section 6 concludes.

1. An introduction to Schiller's moral psychology

In this chapter I will concentrate on Schiller's views as expressed in the Kallias Letters, his essay On Grace and Dignity, and his Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man (Aesthetic Letters).[5] Schiller's philosophical writings reveal a concern with a number of related themes. In this section I give a survey of some of Schiller's characteristic concerns and positions.

First of all, Schiller is concerned with the nature of freedom. He takes it that freedom is both, on the one hand, a key value to be realized in a person's life and in political society, and on the other a basic and defining feature of human agency. In a letter to his friend Körner he says: 'Certainly, no greater words have ever been spoken by a mortal human being than these Kantian ones, which at the same time are the content of his whole philosophy: determine yourself!'[6] Thus Schiller seems to agree with the Kantian belief in the possibility of spontaneity, as much as he agrees with Kant's attachment to the nobility of the life in which we gives laws to ourselves rather than receiving them passively from outside. Schiller's conception of freedom appears to change through his life[7] – for instance, there is a conception of freedom as liberation from social rules celebrated in his early play The Robbers, which it might be thought that the older Schiller came to reject. But the attempt to define and capture

the importance of freedom, particularly in opposition to Kant, seems to have been an abiding concern.

Secondly, Schiller follows Kant in accepting an important link between our freedom and our capacity for rational thought and agency. He recognizes that this implies a distinction between those aspects of the self that are capable of rational thought and directly controllable by it, and those that are not. This explains his recognition of some distinction or split between reason and materiality.

However, and this is the third general theme, Schiller rejects what he sees as the Kantian approach of treating these distinctions in too rigid a way. He is concerned, on the one hand, with a range of issues to do with the emotions, taste, the non-arbitrariness of sensible and not merely rational or intellectual responses to the world, and the nature and appreciation of art: the very possibility of such 'educated' or 'fine' sensibility; and its role in the good human life and society. And on the other hand, he is concerned about the effect on the quality of human life of seeing ourselves as definitively split in such a way. We can briefly point to two aspects of this concern. Firstly, Schiller is concerned about the very fact of fragmentation within the individual psyche – as displayed for instance in his concerns about the effects of specialization in modern society in the famous seventh of the Aesthetic Letters.[8] And secondly, he is worried, as we will see, that where there are two intractably distinct faculties, the only way forward is for one to dominate the other. This suggests that Schiller is concerned, not just with harmonious integration of the elements of the psyche, but also that each should have space to develop in its own way, undominated by force external to itself. Only thus, Schiller will suggest, can the human being as a whole be free.

Schiller, therefore, is interested in the way in which the apparent split between reason and sensibility, which we seem forced to accept if we are to explain how and to what extent human beings can subject their behaviour to standards that they could endorse on reflection, can be overcome in certain respects in order to allow for the possibility of harmonious and all-round human development and adequate sensible responses to morality and the arts. His way of thinking about this tends to emphasise, not that the Kantian dichotomies are illusory, or that it is only at a superficial initial level of analysis that reason and sensibility are truly distinct (as later thinkers in the Idealist or Romantic traditions would claim),[9] but rather that there is greater scope for co-operation between the two sides than Kant recognizes. But whether or not we regard that solution as sufficient, it is clear that Schiller is responsible for raising important questions that those following him have also wanted to ask about Kantian ethics. For one thing we can see innovations such as his conception of the 'play-drive' in the Aesthetic Letters, which consists in a proper balance between reason and sensibility, as an early version of the concept of unity-in-difference (or the unity of unity and multiplicity) that would play such an important role in the later history of German philosophy.[10] We can also see his thinking as playing an important role in the development of ideas of freedom and perfection, perhaps making Schiller the first to attempt to develop what Douglas Moggach has called a 'post-Kantian perfectionism.'[11]

2. Schiller's model of freedom

As I have mentioned, Schiller's attempt to overcome the opposition between reason and sensibility involves a commitment to the possibility of unity-in-difference (or the 'unity of unity and multiplicity'); and his way of thinking about this possibility involves thinking of the differentiated elements as having a certain nature that causes

them to behave in potentially conflicting ways, but where this nature is in some way malleable rather than fixed and intractable, and hence open to creative transformation.[12] Frederick Beiser has pointed out that Schiller's ambition for this reconciliation of opposites in unity is exhibited, not just in his moral psychology, but also in his thinking about political arrangements, and in his thinking about the nature of beauty in the work of art.[13] Beiser thinks that there is continuity between Schiller's views on these topics, and that some apparently peculiar claims that Schiller put forward, can be made more intelligible when seen in the light of his early writings.

In 'Grace and Dignity', the psychological reconciliation is illustrated by means of a political analogy. One type of political arrangement comes about when a ruler imposes his will on his subjects in opposition to their inclinations. Another type comes about when the subjects impose their will on the ruler. Both of these are unsatisfactory: the one dictatorial; the other disordered and anarchic. The latter is formless; the former has form but it is harsh and imposed against the will of the populace. But a third possibility is that type of liberal government under which, although ruled over by the will of some particular ruler, each citizen 'can still persuade himself that he is living according to his own lights and simply following his inclinations'.[14] Here, the idea is, there is form that does not do violence to its material, but rather appears to arise spontaneously. On the 'republican' reading of Schiller, this in turn requires that citizens have acquired certain virtues.[15] This is Schiller's model for the rule of reason over sensibility: it is at its best where sensibility appears to be following its own course yet nevertheless does the bidding of reason:

> Humans either suppress the demands of their sensuous nature in order to have a proper relation to the higher demands of their rational nature; or they reverse this and subjugate the rational part of their being to the sensuous …; or the impulses of the sensuous settle into harmony with the rules of the rational and human beings are at one with themselves.[16]

It is perhaps hard to know how to unpack this metaphor. But the basic idea is that, not only our rational nature, but also the matter/particular/content side of things, has a claim that has to be respected; that in some way things are better for a human being, or perhaps the human being herself is better, when this claim is respected; and that the highest form of being is therefore one in which harmony between the two sides of human nature is achieved.[17]

Now this is not just Schiller's view of beauty or human perfection, or the fulfillment of human nature; it is also his view of freedom, properly conceived. His idea is that freedom must be freedom of the whole person; and therefore that a being whose rational nature must coerce and suppress its sensible side cannot be fully free. Schiller is therefore offering an internal critique of Kant's approach to ethics. Kant's conception of autonomy, he takes it, requires only that reason should be unimpeded by sensibility in its determination of the will; specific states of sensibility are at best irrelevant to autonomy.[18] Schiller's claim, by contrast, is that we are not truly free if our rational will is simply imposed on sensibility; it is only when sensibility is somehow respected and integrated that we are free. Since the human being as a whole combines reason and sensibility, the mere imposition of the demands of reason on sensibility must be experienced as brute constraint by some aspect of one's being.[19] But freedom, Schiller reasons, must be increased when one's being is under less constraint. Therefore freedom must be greater when two conditions are met: firstly, one's action and character are such that one behaves rationally without one's sensibility stopping one from doing so; and secondly, at the same time in behaving as reason requires one does not leave sensibility unsatisfied. For genuine freedom to

arise some integration is necessary whereby an agent can satisfy sensibility through, or at least concurrently with, following the demands of reason. The problem of fragmentation is not simply the aesthetic one that we fail to be beautiful when there is no harmony. And neither is it (simply) that when we fail to achieve harmony we fall short of human perfection. Rather Schiller is concerned with the ways in which internal fragmentation and division make us unfree by restricting the free development of one or other central aspect of the self.

However, Schiller is concerned not only with the internal psychological structure of freedom, but also its external appearance. It is for this reason that Schiller's choice of the term 'grace' is not arbitrary, and neither does it imply a concern with the purely aesthetic intruding into his account of moral behaviour.[20] Schiller takes it that there is a deep connection between freedom, beauty and perfection.[21] As we will see in more detail further on, he thinks that when one behaves in such a way as to be truly free – in the sense that one's sensibility is unconstrained and appears to satisfy its own demands yet conforms to morality – one appears as beautiful. One will appear as graceful, or beautiful in a specific respect, when one's actions effortlessly rather than unwillingly comply with morality.

Furthermore, although I have argued that Schiller is concerned with freedom rather than perfection, a more adequate way of putting it might be that, for Schiller, true freedom requires a certain kind of perfection. For Schiller, freedom requires that neither side of human nature should impose constraint on the other; it involves, in other words, an arrangement in which each side should be allowed space for the full development of its demands, while at the same time, the integration of these demands with those of the other side. This is a version of the thought that human perfection involves the full development but also the integration of a human being's faculties and powers: in this case, there are basically two powers, each with its own developmental potential or trajectory; the two powers are potentially conflicting; but when both fully realize themselves yet also cohere, there is the perfection of what, in the Aesthetic Letters, Schiller calls 'play.' And that can be thought of as a distinctive conception of perfection.[22] It is not a view of human perfection on the model of a pre-existing blueprint that appropriately trained inquirers can cognize, apply to their own case and hence realize in their own person. Rather the Schillerian model makes central a certain type of internal relation between the different parts according to which unity can be achieved, a unity that does not require us to posit a pre-existing model of perfection accessible to cognition. However, the model cannot be wholly formal either. This is because both reason and sensibility must be understood as having a certain content or developmental trajectory, such that certain forms of imposition by the other side of the person will amount to a distortion or unfulfilment or transgression of the demands of the oppressed side. In other words, for Schiller to be able to claim that the Kantian model of autonomy is compatible with sensibility being merely coerced or (less metaphorically) frustrated it must be the case that sensibility has an inner tendency towards certain determinate kinds of satisfactions. Thus Schiller's perfectionism emphasizes a formal arrangement of parts, but it requires that these parts have a content of their own in order to make meaningful his requirement that the other side should not interfere with the development of that content.

3. Beauty as the appearance of freedom

We can get a better idea of what this model of freedom involves by looking at Schiller's early writings on the nature of the beautiful work of art. In these early

writings similar concerns about the relation between freedom, perfection (or beauty), form and content are in evidence. And this will also give us a chance to address a concern that might have arisen about the model as explained so far. The concern comes in the form of a dilemma. Certainly, it might be said, it can be understood that practical reason has its requirements, and that sensibility has its own inner tendencies. But the most plausible way in which the tendencies of sensibility should be understood makes it hard to see how the two sides can be reconciled. Desires and emotions have natural ends – food, sex, warmth, reputation, perhaps – but unconstrained by reason and will they lead away from morality and impartial concern for others. The only way out of this is to build moral motivation into sensibility in the first place. But then it is unclear whether we can really talk about sensibility having these motivations as an inner tendency. Schiller's response to this dilemma is complex, and we will look at it in more detail as we go through. Indeed, there is a question whether he has a satisfying response to this dilemma. But as mentioned above, his response has to be to see the content of both reason and sensibility as not fixed and intractable but capable of mutual adjustment. This is what is suggested in his model of freedom in the artwork.

Let us turn, then to Schiller's crucial claim that freedom is not just autonomy but 'heautonomy,' as this idea is developed in relation to artworks in the Kallias Letters. Heautonomy, Schiller claims, is the 'inner principle of the existence of a thing, which can be at the same time seen as the ground of its form: the inner necessity of form.'[23] The idea, as we will develop it below, is that the principles of form relevant for a certain being are not merely laws stemming from the nature of that thing, as (he thinks) they would be in autonomy; rather, they are at the same time freely given, such that the being is freely complying with the demands of its own nature.[24] Let us explore this complex idea in more detail.

First of all, it will come as a surprise to many readers that we look to artworks to discover what Schiller thinks about freedom; so this requires some initial explanation. In this early set of letters to his friend Körner, Schiller aims to provide an "objective criterion of beauty". For Schiller, this criterion is "freedom in appearance": what is beautiful is such because it appears (as it happens, illusorily) to be free or, crucially, self-determining.[25] Furthermore, the structure of self-determination that Schiller ascribes to the artwork is similar in some respects to that exhibited by the self-determining human agent, particularly in the aspect of reconciling two apparently irreconcilable opposites: form and matter (or reason and sensibility).

In brief paraphrase, Schiller's argument seems to go something like this. An artifact is such that it normally draws attention to the purpose for which it is made. In Schiller's terms, this means that it appears to us as having been determined 'from the outside' – that is, according to a purpose or rule extrinsic to itself. This is not to say that it cannot exhibit a kind of perfection. A house or a chair may be perfectly suited to its function. In this case, it perfectly complies with the rule for a thing of that type. But it is not beautiful by virtue of that perfection. Schiller's diagnosis of this is that beauty only arises when the object appears, not merely to have had a certain form given to it (from outside, by a maker, according to a certain further end), however perfectly, but rather to somehow be freely adapting itself to that form.[26] Beauty is 'the inner necessity of form' and arises when the object not only perfectly obeys or conforms to a rule, but appears to have given the rule to itself.[27] As with his account of freedom in human nature, the material of which the artwork is made has its own tendencies and claims that have to be respected. Nevertheless, in the case of the artwork, the freedom in question is only a matter of effect or appearance: the artwork

is not free even in the noumenal realm. An artwork is always created 'from the outside' by a maker who has certain motivations and is abiding by a more or less determinate conception of the thing being made.[28] Thus although in some sense we always know the artwork's origins, beauty is achieved when it is created in such a way that we do not attend to those origins, and thus it compellingly appears self-determining: 'thus a form appears as free as soon as we are neither able nor inclined to search for its ground outside it.'[29]

This might all seem hopelessly metaphorical, but an example might help to illustrate the point:

> A landscape is beautifully composed if all of the particular parts out of which it is constituted play along together so well that they set their own limitations, and the whole becomes the result of the freedom of the particular parts. Everything in a landscape must refer to the whole and yet the particular should only be constrained by its own rule, should only seem to follow its own will. But it is impossible that the process of cohering to a whole should not require some sacrifices on the part of the particular, since a collision of freedoms is unavoidable … Freedom comes about because each restricts its inner freedom such as to allow every other to express its freedom. A tree in the foreground might cover a nice spot in the background; to require of the tree that it not do this would come to close to its freedom and would reveal dilettantism. What does the able artist do? He allows that branch of the tree which threatened to cover the background to sink down under its own weight and thus freely make place for the view behind it; thus the tree fulfils the will of the artist by following its own.[30]

Thus a successful artwork must achieve some arrangement of the whole, an arrangement that will be determined in part by the nature of the medium, the rules of the genre, etc. Furthermore, when we look at the individual components of the work, such as the tree, again there is a sense in which they are as they are to serve the overall purposes of the work. But to be successful these rules should not constrain the work of art; rather the work in its very nature should seem to need precisely those rules and precisely that medium. Thus the tree which needs to allow the view behind it to be seen must be portrayed as sinking down under its own weight.

However we judge its success as an aesthetic theory,[31] Schiller's view is intriguing. It is presumably this view that is in the background of Schiller's claim (or rather assumption) that the appearance of genuine freedom in human behavior – as grace – will necessarily appear beautiful to us. One of the theoretical attractions of the view as a theory of beauty is perhaps that it is in large part a formal conception of beauty. Though, as discussed above in relation to human perfection, it requires the parts to have some content of their own, this substantive aspect is small. For Schiller's model dictates nothing about what the content or claims of the individual elements should be; it simply requires that there should be such content, and that perfection in life and art arises when the claims associated with such content can be made compossible.

I will argue that Schiller's most direct and promising account of what such reconciliation between form and matter would look like when applied to human psychology comes in the case of the expression of emotion. The category of emotion is itself hard to disentangle into cognitive and non-cognitive elements, and rather seems to be a synthesis of the two. Schiller is aware of this, and argues that it is in emotion and its expression that reason and sensibility can be seen as cooperating. Indeed, as I suggested at the outset, we can see Schiller as looking at the phenomenon

of the expression of emotion and arguing that this phenomenon is hard to do justice to on the Kantian assumption that reason and sensibility are radically at odds. But a corollary of this, on Schiller's view, is that it is in and through our capacity for emotion that we are enabled to achieve the balance between reason and sensibility without which the two sides of our nature would merely be at war. Emotion is therefore a crucial mediating category, on Schiller's account. The question, however, is what sort of mediation this represents. Before we look at his analysis in detail, we will look in the next section at the range of theoretical possibilities.

4. On reconciling reason and sensibility: some possibilities

> When the mind expresses itself in the sensuous nature that depends on it [in der von ihm abhängenden sinnlichen Natur] in such a way that nature faithfully carries out the will of the mind and expresses its sentiments clearly, without contravening the demands that the senses make on them as appearances, then there will arise what we call grace. However, one would be equally far from calling it grace if either the mind were to reveal itself forcibly in the sensuous or if the expression of the mind were missing from the free effect of the sensuous. For in the first case there would be no beauty present and in the second it would not be the beauty of play.[32]

Schiller's view here seems to be that there can be expressions of the mind that take place in the 'free play of the sensuous.' Before we look at this view in more detail in the following section, it will be useful to put it in the context of a range of competing views of how reason and sensibility might interact and harmonise.

The central axis on which these views differ is the extent to which, and the means by which, sensibility can be responsive to reason. The first would be a conception of instrumental reason: here sensibility is unresponsive to reason, but reason can harmonise with desire because the only job reason has is to seek means to the satisfaction of desires. In an expansive view, instrumental reason might also have the job of ordering less fundamental desires according to more fundamental desires, however "fundamental" is to be understood. This might end up, as some have argued, giving a close approximation to a more rationalistic account of the will. But however plausible this line might be, we will not pursue it here, since it is clear that Schiller subscribes to a more substantial account of the authority of reason.

Secondly, then, we might instead have a view on which reason and desire harmonise because reason can understand the ends proper to a human being, and can approve of the extent to which desires have been trained to pursue those ends. On the (Aristotelian) view I am imagining,[33] the desires and emotions themselves are non-cognitive as on the instrumental conception, but are more malleable and trainable, and there are rational standards that they have to meet such as some objective standards of flourishing or appropriateness. Reason can recognize these standards and hence approve of the desires which have been brought indirectly into line with those standards, for instance through their cultivation in a good upbringing.

A third form of harmonization would come about where there is a desire to do as reason demands. This interpretation is suggested by Schiller's claim, in 'Grace and Dignity,' that virtue consists in an 'inclination for duty'.[34] In other words, the virtuous person is in a state of harmony because or insofar as her desires cohere with her most fundamental desire, and her most fundamental desire is to do her duty, whatever that turns out to be. Some may think that such an inclination would be a strange one to have. The claim has been put forward by Bernard Williams and Michael Smith that moral desires tend to be for particular ends, such as the welfare of this particular

person, rather than for 'what is right, because it is right.'[35] On the other hand, however, perhaps it does not seem so implausible that a person might have a desire to act rightly on the basis of some recognition of the importance of right. But putting the matter this way leads us to see that there are two ways of thinking about this position. The way I just put it is that the desire arises as a result of some rational apprehension of desirability. Otherwise put, the inclination is responsive to reason or intellectual apprehension. That is one way of thinking about the possibility of harmony between reason and sensibility: that at least some aspects of sensibility are as they are because of our grasp of considerations that are accessible to reason.[36] On the other hand, the second way of understanding this view would be to think of the inclination for duty as simply a desire that is hard-wired into us alongside desires for food, warmth, sex and so on. This position would perhaps look strange; one might be drawn to it if, however, one thinks that reason and sensibility are quite distinct faculties and that sensibility cannot properly be said to be capable of being informed by reason.

Therefore one might have the view that there are forms of sensibility like an inclination for duty, and then think either that the inclinations themselves are cognitive, and responsive to the authority or majesty of duty, or one might have the view that they are non-cognitive and merely coincide with duty.

The view quoted at the start of this section, with its talk of the 'expression of the mind in the sensuous nature that depends on it,' seems to envisage a more intimate connection between reason and sensibility than any of those views that see sensibility as non-cognitive. However, it also seems to gesture towards something more than just an 'inclination for duty,' however that should be understood. Indeed, if one accepts that reason can inform, shape and perhaps initiate forms of sensibility such as an inclination for duty then perhaps there is no principled reason why one should not accept other forms of interaction between reason and sensibility. At any rate one would need to make controversial meta-ethical assumptions to explain why only duty can be the object of those cognitive emotions whose existence one has accepted. Otherwise, by allowing at least one inclination that depends for its nature on existence on the way its object is cognized, one has opened the doors to a wide range of cognitive emotions and desires in which sensibility is responsive to and capable of being directly shaped by cognitive considerations – that is, considerations that can come up in a subject's deliberations, and may continue to appear authoritative on reflection. Hence if this is Schiller's view then perhaps we could see him as an early proponent of something like that cognitivist tradition of the emotions, mentioned earlier, that runs through Brentano to Nussbaum.

That this possibility is envisaged by Schiller is, however, denied by Stephen Houlgate in a recent paper.[37] Houlgate argues that, for Schiller:

> Human actions are beautiful when our sensible nature is not under the direct control of our free reason, but when it accords independently and autonomously with the demands of our free reason. Beauty in human action thus consists in the harmonious coordination and cooperation of two quite distinct autonomies: the autonomy of our sensuous nature and the autonomy of our free, moral reason. Neither directs the other, but each follows (or appears to follow) its own law. Yet the two fit together harmoniously as in an "arabesquely composed English dance.[38]

And Houlgate quotes Schiller's view, from the Kallias Letters, that the image of the dance captures most aptly his image of the cooperation of the two faculties in action:

> Everything has been arranged such that the first has already made room for the second before he arrives, everything comes together so skillfully and yet so

> artlessly that both seem merely to be following their own mind and still never get in the way of the other. Thus is the most fitting picture of maintained person freedom and the spared freedom of the other.[39]

On this picture of their relationship, reason and sensibility interact with one another to the limited extent of setting limits to one another, and cooperate freely with one another in producing action (though how exactly this process is envisaged is pretty mysterious). But what is not taken as a possibility here is that sensibility might actually be directly responsive to the demands of reason. 'What is never considered,' Houlgate claims, is precisely what I want to say that Schiller does recognize and go some way to developing: 'that free reason might actually manifest, express or embody itself directly in the realm of the senses.'[40] This passage is quoted, as Houlgate acknowledges, from an early work. But although he recognizes that later works may be more complex and subtle, Houlgate thinks that Schiller could never significantly assent to this genuinely expressive view. The culprit, he thinks, is that, 'for all his subtlety, Schiller's thought remain in thrall to Kant's distinction between reason and sensibility,' implausibly seeing the two sides as autonomous parties that must learn to cooperate rather than two aspects of a higher unity. However, as we will now see, I think that we can find precisely that expressive view in 'On Grace and Dignity'.

5. Schiller on emotion and expression

We are now ready to look in more detail at Schiller's claims about emotion and its role in the reconciliation of opposites in moral psychology. The reason I would like to look at 'Grace and Dignity' in particular is that here we find a detailed model of how reason and sensibility might cooperate rather than merely dominate one another in human behavior. The model is 'drawn from life' or given in examples, rather than based on the sometimes ponderous metaphysical psychology unveiled in the Aesthetic Letters. I will suggest that the account given here shows that Schiller clearly envisages genuinely expressive action. However, it is also true that many aspects of Schiller's view do seem premised on taking the Kantian dichotomy for granted while at the same time criticizing it.[41] Perhaps we can say that Schiller at least glimpsed the possibility of a psychology that would definitively surpass the Kantian dichotomy, though its full theoretical elaboration would have to wait for a later generation of thinkers.[42]

Schiller begins his analysis by identifying grace as a type of beauty. This seems plausible: graceful action is to be pleasing to the eye. Is it all beauty, or all personal beauty? No, Schiller says, for there are many sorts of beauty. In particular, we need to distinguish grace from what he calls architectonic beauty, which is the beauty of a person considered as a natural being: sheer beauty. Grace (or gracefulness?), on the other hand, is beauty associated with a certain sort of movement. However, grace is not associated with purely natural, instinctive or compulsive movements, Schiller says: it is associated with movements that are voluntary or chosen, hence intentional. It is not associated with movement that is purely intentional or calculated, though: there must be some mixture of sentiment in the cause of the action. Schiller seems therefore to have in mind that category of movements that are on the one hand under our voluntary control in the way that mere reflexes are not, but on the other hand are caused by emotion, and are spontaneous in the sense of not being the result of cold calculation – what we have called expressive actions. However, now Schiller draws a crucial distinction, arguing that grace is associated with emotional expression in which it is the rational and not merely the natural being that acts:

> Grace, then, can only be attributed to [voluntary] movements and only to those that are an expression of moral sentiments. Movements that have no other source than sensuality, despite their [voluntariness], still only belong to nature, which cannot of its own accord ever arrive at grace. If desire or instinct could be expressed as grace, then grace would no longer be capable or worthy of human expression. [43]

Such movements are therefore either, on the one hand, voluntary, intentional and purposive; or on the other hand they can occur:

> without the person's willing, following a law of necessity – but at the behest of a sentiment [Empfindung]; these I call sympathetic movements. Although the latter are instinctive [unwillkührlich] and based in sentiment [Empfindung], one ought not to confuse them with those determined by feelings [sinnliche Gefühlvermögen] and natural instinct [Naturtrieb], since natural instinct is not a free principle, and what it brings about is not an action by the person.[44]

Grace is therefore a property of 'sympathetic movements.' Sympathetic movements can be understood as expressions of sentiments or attitudes, but this is distinct from the outpouring of natural drives. Rather, expressive actions are genuinely free actions, but are not directed at a purpose in the way that most free actions are.[45] Hence Schiller's view is that grace is specifically associated with the expression of emotion that is also a product of free rationality, presumably acting under conditions of spontaneity: "Grace is always only beauty of the physique that freedom sets in motion, and movements that simply belong to nature are not worthy of the name".[46]

The result of this is that some emotions and the behavior that expresses them can be thought of as the product of free agency. An agent need not be thought of as merely determined by nature in performing the actions that constitute such expression. Yet actions that constitute free, spontaneous, unimpeded expressions of emotion also seem to be actions in which sensibility is given free play. Therefore the fact that Schiller chooses this category of action suggests that he has a view of emotion as a good example of the interaction between reason and sensibility.

This seems to show that for Schiller, expressive action is more than just the cooperation or coincidence of reason and sensibility. The claim that non-natural sentiments are expressed in such action would appear to give at least a causal role to reason, on the reading of 'expression' on which something's being expressed is a sign of its presence. On a more ambitious reading of 'expression,' furthermore, the mind's expressing itself in sensuous nature would involve the? mind, not merely causing, but actively shaping, giving form to, the sensuous matter of expressive activity. Schiller here clearly seems to want to go beyond the view represented in the passage on the English dance. In this passage from 'Grace and Dignity,' for instance, the mind is visible in the expression of emotion:

> When people speak, we see their gaze, their facial features, their hands, often their whole body speaking at the same time and the mimetic part of the conversation is frequently considered the most eloquent.[47]

This passage seems precisely to envisage the mind being present or embodied in the sensuous. We might, to be sure, question whether Schiller has the theoretical wherewithal to articulate or develop the idea that reason or cognitive states can be embodied in expressive behavior. For instance, he lacks the idea that expressive behavior can have meaning, that it can symbolize or refer to the content of cognitive states; and he lacks the idea that behavior might form a symbolic system in which such reference could take place. Perhaps it takes these elements to be in place before

we can fully understand how reason and sensibility might satisfactorily be related. But despite this, I would argue that Schiller's conception can be seen as a pivotal point in the development of the idea of expressive behavior as free behaviour.[48]

5. What does Schiller teach us about the expression of emotion?

If we now return to the question that opens this paper – what Schiller can tell us about expressive action, and in particular the expression of emotion – we are now in a position to provide some answers. First of all, Schiller provides a defence of the emotional life. His defence seems to be conditional, in the respect that it takes as its starting point the fact that we are embodied, sensible beings. Given this starting point, however, Schiller argues that the only way to be free is to endorse one's emotional side and to cultivate it. Otherwise one will achieve rationality only at the cost of frustration. In the Aesthetic Letters, he takes this further, arguing that lack of emotionality also leads to a loss of contact with the world. There are two ways in which the human being might 'miss his destiny,' Schiller claims there: one through a preponderance of immediate sense, the other through a preponderance of universal rationality. (In this latter discussion, Schiller talks of sensibility as the faculty of receptivity more generally.) While human beings can never do away with receptivity altogether, they can develop or repress it; and Schiller argues that an insufficiency of such receptivity or openness leads an agent to respond to the world with rationalistic prejudice rather than open-hearted honesty and generosity. The cultivation of sensibility – as well as its subjection to rational thought – emerges as an attractive ideal for human nature:

> The more facets his Receptivity develops [ausbildet], the more labile it is, and the more surface it presents to phenomena, so much more world does man apprehend, and all the more potentialities does he develop in himself. The more power and depth the Personality achieves, and the more freedom reason attains, so much more world does man comprehend, and all the more form does he create outside of himself. His education will therefore consist, firstly, in procuring for the receptive faculty the most manifold contacts with the world, and within the purview of feeling, intensifying passivity to the utmost; secondly, in securing for the determining faculty the highest degree of independence from the receptive, and, within the purview of reason, intensifying activity to the utmost. Where both these aptitudes are conjoined, man will combine the greatest fullness of existence with the highest autonomy [Selbständigkeit] and freedom, and instead of losing himself to the world, will rather draw the latter into himself in all its infinitude of phenomena, and subject it to the unity of his reason.[49]

Secondly, through thinking about the possibility of expressive action as free action, Schiller begins to make a distinction between emotions that are merely instinctive natural feelings, and emotions in the experience of which we are present as free, thinking beings. When it comes to the latter, emotions are not simply brute sensations triggered by events but intelligent responses to those events. With this move, Schiller takes us into the realm of the adequacy or appropriateness of such responses. One way to talk about the fittingness or appropriateness of emotional responses is to see emotions as reflecting a pre-existing normative structure in reality. Schiller, however, provides a sketch of an alternative. For him, appropriateness in emotion would not consist in representing the normative features already present in the situation; rather, appropriateness would be a formal feature. Emotion would be appropriate (or perhaps warranted) where a non-alienated harmony between the claims of sensibility and the

claims of reason could be achieved: where one's intellectual grasp of the situation and one's emotional Gestalt or sense of rightness support and reinforce one another.[50] This criterion of appropriateness, to be plausible, would have to be fairly robust – for instance, it would have to be the case, for an emotion to be appropriate or warranted, that one could not easily be led into a state of disharmony or alienation by the presentation of new evidence, or a change of mood. But there is a distinctive position here that is worth thinking through.

Thirdly, the claim that reason and sensibility are perfectly balanced only in appropriate emotion makes sense of Schiller's otherwise confusing approach to the notion of grace. As those already familiar with Schiller will have noted, his essay is concerned, not just with 'grace' but with 'dignity.' A thorny question for Schiller interpretation has been what to make of the relation between the two: this is thorny because, having attacked Kant in no uncertain terms for overlooking the possibility of grace, Schiller follows his discussion of grace with a much more Kantian-sounding discussion of dignity, where dignity is 'peace in suffering', specifically the suffering born of inappropriate natural desires and emotions.[51] 'Control of impulses through moral strength is spiritual freedom, and its expression in appearance is called dignity'.[52] This has confused many readers, since it appears that Schiller's emphasis on grace is precisely to suggest that human beings can have an attitude to their inclination that goes beyond mere self-control; whereas in the second half of his essay he seems to revert to the Kantian view that such self-control is precisely the best that we can realistically hope for.

However, the interpretation presented here of Schiller's purposes in highlighting the graceful expression of emotion can, I think, be made compatible with this. Schiller's view seems to be that, with respect to (perhaps many, even most) individual instances of emotion and its expression, human beings are capable of grace, where emotion is experienced as free and appropriate. However, he can also recognize that the nature of emotion is such that human beings will be highly unlikely ever to perfectly align emotion and reason, and hence will always also stand prey to impulses that are experienced as rationally ungovernable and uncultivable. The only thing to do when those impulses fail to align with morality is to have dignity: to suppress them and endure them with equanimity as far as possible. Hence both grace and dignity are fundamental virtues of the embodied but imperfect human condition.

On this interpretation, Schiller leaves it open to what extent our nature can be cultivated and brought within the realm of reason; his talk of the 'beautiful soul,' whose temperament is a perfect harmony of reason and sensibility, captures the structure of episodes of human existence rather than a providing an attainable model for life as a whole. However, from the point of view of Schiller's argument with Kant, even the existence of episodes of action where cognitive attitudes are expressed in sensibility is enough to show that Kantian psychology is in trouble. Human beings are capable of appropriate emotion, emotion that will express itself in grace; and this fact needs to be accounted for in our moral psychology, something that Kant's account cannot do. But the idea of a life in which all one's emotions are appropriate is something human beings, because of the ungovernable nature of parts of their embodiment, cannot expect to achieve.

> '[T]his beauty of character [grace], the ripest fruit of humanity, is only an idea that they can vigilantly strive to live up to, yet, despite all efforts, can never fully attain'.[53]

This interpretation accounts for the fact that Schiller, in discussing grace, writes as though he is pointing out a basic and familiar fact of human existence – albeit one that

has not been sufficiently acknowledged in theory – namely that reason and sensibility align in at least some expressive behavior, while in discussing dignity seems to treat the life of grace as an unattainable ideal.

Fourthly, Schiller raises an interesting question about the 'claims of sensibility' that need to be satisfied at the same time as the claims of reason if we are to be fully free. Schiller's point seems to be to recognize that, as embodied agents with susceptibility to pleasure and pain and other feelings, we are subject to felt states that have satisfaction-conditions, and where satisfaction brings a kind of pleasure and dissatisfaction a cost of some felt pain. Earlier I considered a dilemma for Schiller, which stated that the more plausible one's account of the satisfaction of such embodied states, the more difficult it would be to see that satisfaction being responsive to morality. As I said, Schiller's response is to take the view that sensibility is more malleable than the criticism allows. In section 4 we saw that Schiller seems to have the view that sensible states are responsive to the demands of reason; it is not simply that they happen to coincide with the demands of reason, but that they have the satisfaction-conditions they do because of the shaping influence of reason. With the brief discussion of dignity, we have now seen that Schiller is doubtful whether all states of sensibility can be so shaped. But perhaps that is a plausible position, and recognizes the extent to which the supposed dilemma does get at something important.

Conclusion

In this paper I have investigated Schiller's concern with freedom and its bearing on his contribution to our thinking about emotion and its expression. I have claimed that Schiller thinks of freedom as requiring a kind of internal structural perfection that mirrors his conception of the interaction between form and matter in the beautiful work of art. And I have argued that it is in grace, or the fitting expression of emotion, that he gives the most convincing picture of what the joint freedom of reason and sensibility might look like at the level of human psychology. I have also considered some criticisms of Schiller's project, and shown how, although that project is avowedly incomplete, it may have the resources to answer them.

In closing, I would like to offer what I think is a more telling criticism of Schiller's programme. The malleability of sensibility is not the only way to reach reconciliation between reason and sensibility. One might think that reason would also have to be malleable, and not present itself as an intractable opposite to sensibility. However, if this is right then it seems that a limiting criterion for the validity or rational appropriateness of some moral standard, for Schiller, would have to be its possibility of being the object of appropriate emotion for a human being. If this limiting criterion were not in place then it would be at least possible, depending on the content of morality, that there could be moral standards our compliance with which could never be achieved by someone possessing perfect grace. However, if on the other hand this limiting criterion were in place then it would mean that moral standards were hostage to the contingencies of the psychology of human agents: the content of moral standards would be constrained by the extent to which acting in that way can 'feel right' to us given our emotional make-up. This is something accepted, for instance, by David Wiggins in his 'sensible subjectivism;' [54] but it conflicts with Schiller's Kantian claim that the demands of the sensuous are 'completely rejected in the sphere of pure reason and moral legislation' and that 'the part played by inclination demonstrates nothing about the purely dutiful nature of the action'.[55] Alternatively, then, perhaps Schiller does intend to argue that dignity is necessary, not

only because of the ungovernable nature of our natural inclinations, but also because of the inhuman nature of some moral obligations, the binding nature of which is unaffected by the fact that no human being could comply with them gracefully. Which view is more Schillerian is not something we can resolve in this paper. But if the claims of this paper are correct, it does raise a central issue for Schiller interpretation.[56]

---

[1] Though it has also been argued that Schiller was part of a tradition that collapses this distinction by arguing that 'moral beauty' is a literal description, and that physical beauty is tied to wisdom and virtue. This tradition goes back at least to Plato's Symposium, and its appropriation by Plotinus, but there is also a wider discussion about the Ancient Greek notion of kalokagathia, a notion that seems to have pre-dated Plato. This is picked up by, amongst others, Shaftesbury, by whom we know Schiller was influenced, at least indirectly. For some discussion, see R. E. Norton, The Beautiful Soul: Aesthetic Morality in the Eighteenth Century (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995).

[2] See e.g. Wordsworth's preface to the Lyrical Ballads (1798); and for a more developed view, R. G. Collingwood, Principles of Art (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938).

[3] R. Hursthouse, 'Arational Actions,' Journal of Philosophy vol. 88 (1991), pp. 57-68.

[4] For Brentano, see e.g., The Origin of the Knowledge of Right and Wrong, trans. R. Chisholm and E. Schneewind (London: Routledge, 1969). For Scheler, see e.g. 'Repentance and Rebirth' in Scheler, On the Eternal in Man, trans. B. Noble (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2010), pp. 33-65. For Charles Taylor, see e.g. the opening Part of C. Taylor, Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). See Martha Nussbaum, Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) and Anthony Kenny, Action, Emotion and Will (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963).

[5] Friedrich Schiller, 'Kallias or Concerning Beauty: Letters to Gottfried Körner', trans. S. Bird-Pollan, in J. M. Bernstein (ed.), Classic and Romantic German Aesthetics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 145-183; 'On Grace and Dignity/Ueber Anmuth und Würde', trans. J. V. Curran, in J. V. Curran and C. Fricker (eds), *Schiller's 'On Grace and Dignity' in Its Cultural Context: Essays and a* New Translation (Woodbridge: Camden House, 2005), pp. 123-170 (references to GD in the text are to this work); On the Aesthetic Education of Man, ed. and trans. E. M. Wilkinson and L. A. Willoughby (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

[6] Quoted in Frederick Beiser, Schiller as Philosopher: A Re-Examination (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 214.

[7] For an overview, see Beiser, Schiller as Philosopher, Ch. 7; also, Sabine Roehr, 'Freedom and Autonomy in Schiller,' Journal of the History of Ideas vol. 64 (2003), pp. 119-134.

[8] For discussion, see Patrick J. Kain, Schiller, Hegel and Marx: State, Society and the Aesthetic Ideal of Ancient Greece (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1982), Ch. 1; L. P. Wessell, Jr., 'The Aesthetics of Living Form in Hegel and Marx,' Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism vol. 37 (1978), pp. 189-201.

[9] Though see: 'Human nature is a more coherent whole in reality than a philosopher, who can only achieve results through separation [der nur durch Trennen was vermag], is permitted to reveal' (GD, p. 152; NA 286).
[10] Beiser, Schiller as Philosopher, p. 216.
[11] Douglas Moggach, 'Post-Kantian Perfectionism' in D. Moggach (ed.), Politics, Religion and Art: Hegelian Debates (Evanston IL: Northwestern University Press, 2011), pp. 179-200.
[12] Douglas Moggach, 'Schiller, Scots and Germans: Freedom and Diversity in The Aesthetic Education of Man', Inquiry vol. 51 (2008), pp. 16-36.
[13] Beiser, Schiller as Philosopher, pp. 143-4; 150-3.
[14] Schiller, GD, p. 146.
[15] Beiser, Schiller as Philosopher, pp. 123-9.
[16] Schiller, GD, p. 147.
[17] See Robert Stern, Understanding Moral Obligation: Kant, Hegel, Kierkegaard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Ch. 4.
[18] See Schiller's criticisms of Kant at GD pp. 148-151 (NA 282-6). Whether this view of Kant is adequate is of course a matter of controversy. For a good recent discussion, see Carla Bagnoli, 'Emotions and the Categorical Authority of Moral Reason' in C. Bagnoli (ed.), Morality and the Emotions (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 62-81. For a Kantian response to Schiller's criticisms in 'On Grace and Dignity,' see Paul Guyer, 'The Ideal of Beauty and the Necessity of Grace: Kant and Schiller on Ethics and Aesthetics' in W. Hinderer (ed.), Friedrich Schiller und der Weg in die Moderne (Würzburg: Könighausen & Neumann, 2006), pp. 187-204.
[19] Cf. Beiser, Schiller as Philosopher, p. 217.
[20] Anne Margaret Baxley, 'Pleasure, Freedom and Grace: Schiller's "Completion" of Kant's Ethics,' Inquiry vol. 51 (2008), pp. 1-15 (p. 6).
[21] For a good background to the conception of 'moral beauty' that informs Schiller's view, and its development through Kant and Schiller to Hegel and Goethe, see Norton, The Beautiful Soul.
[22] I am grateful to Robert Stern for this way of categorizing models of perfection. See his 'The Ethics of the British Idealists: Perfectionism After Kant' in his Kantian Ethics: Value, Agency and Obligation (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 190-201.
[23] Schiller, 'Kallias Letters', p. 166.
[24] See Beiser, Schiller as Philosopher, pp. 67-8; Roehr, 'Freedom and Autonomy in Schiller,' pp. 120-1.
[25] Schiller accepts the Kantian view that freedom cannot actually appear in the realm of causality. On the ambiguity in the term 'appearance of freedom' – depending on whether to give 'appearance' a veridical or non-veridical reading – and the correct way to read it within Schiller's theory, see Beiser, Schiller as Philosopher, p. 64.
[26] It might be said that this is Schiller's interpretation of Kant's idea in the Critique of Judgement that beauty involves 'purposiveness without purpose.'
[27] Schiller, 'Kallias Letters', p. 166.
[28] Having said this, artists do sometimes say that they are unable to get the artwork right until it begins to take on a life of its own and dictate its own terms: for instance, the common novelistic conceit that the characters spring off the page and the writer is only following them rather than creating them. This might also be a theme worth exploring in relation to Schiller's view and its effect on later thinkers.
[29] Schiller, 'Kallias Letters,' p. 155.

[30] Schiller, 'Kallias Letters', pp. 171-2. The most helpful discussion I have found of Schiller's view on this point is Stephen Houlgate, 'Schiller and the Dance of Beauty,' Inquiry vol. 51 (2008), pp. 37-49.
[31] For some sympathetic skepticism about its ultimate value, see Eva Schaper, 'Friedrich Schiller: Adventures of a Kantian,' British Journal of Aesthetics vol. 4 (1964), pp. 348-362.
[32] Schiller, GD, p. 146.
[33] See for instance Mike Burnyeat, 'Aristotle on Learning to be Good' in A. O. Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 69-92.
[34] Schiller, GD, p. 149. For discussion, see Stern, Understanding Moral Obligation, Ch. 4.
[35] This is the notorious 'one thought too many' criticism. See Bernard Williams, 'Persons, Character and Morality' in Moral Luck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 20-39; Michael Smith, The Moral Problem (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), pp. 71-6.
[36] In other words, they are what Thomas Nagel calls 'motivated desires.' See his The Possibility of Altruism (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970).
[37] Houlgate, 'Schiller and the Dance of Beauty'.
[38] Houlgate, 'Schiller and the Dance of Beauty', p. 46.
[39] Schiller, 'Kallias Letters', p. 174. Quoted by Houlgate, 'Schiller and the Dance of Beauty', p. 46.
[40] Houlgate, 'Schiller and the Dance of Beauty', p. 47.
[41] As Schaper puts it in the context of the Aesthetic Letters, Schiller 'plays fast and loose with the Kantian view he ostensibly defended but could not but drastically modify in the process' (Eva Schaper, 'Towards the Aesthetic: A Journey with Friedrich Schiller,' British Journal of Aesthetics vol. 25 (1985), pp. 153-168 (162)).
[42] A full assessment of Schiller's view would also have to pay attention to the suggestive discussion of the 'aesthetic condition' and the 'play-drive' in the Aesthetic Letters in the light of what I will go on to say here – though that would require another paper. For some discussion, see the sensitive reading of the aesthetic condition and the play-drive in Jeffrey Barnouw, '"Aesthetic" for Schiller and Peirce: A Neglected Origin of Pragmatism,' Journal of the History of Ideas vol. 49 (1988), pp. 607-632.
[43] Schiller, GD, p. 126. I have altered the translation slightly here. Schiller uses "willkuerlich" to signify both "intentional" in the sense of the property of being not-a-mere-reflex and "intentional" in the sense of "serving some end, or being done for the sake of some further end"; the Curran translation solves this problem by reserving "intentional" for "serving some end" and using "arbitrary" for merely "not a reflex", but the latter term, though presumably meant to conjure up the idea of being subject to choice rather than natural necessity, hardly seems appropriate; as a result I have replaced it with 'intentional.'
[44] Schiller, GD, p. 135.
[45] Cf. the view taken in Hursthouse, 'Arational Actions', and discussed earlier.
[46] Schiller, GD, p. 134
[47] Schiller, GD, p. 136.
[48] It is perhaps a final irony to close on that, in order to further the inquiry that has been launched in this paper, one would have to look at the development of the tradition of thinking about symbols in this sense that Kant begins with his discussion

of the human being as a symbol in the third Critique. I am grateful to Chris Janaway for helping me to draw this connection.

[49] Schiller, Aesthetic Letters, pp. 88-9.

[50] See the remarks on the epistemological role of 'spontaneity of feeling,' with a long footnote referring to Schiller, in John Skorupski, 'Propositions about Reasons,' European Journal of Philosophy vol. 14 (2006), p. 37 and n. 23. See also John Skorupski, The Domain of Reasons (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 416-7.

[51] Schiller, GD, p. 160.

[52] Schiller, GD, p. 158.

[53] Schiller, GD, p. 154.

[54] David Wiggins, 'A Sensible Subjectivism?' in his Needs, Values, Truth, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 185-214.

[55] Schiller, GD, p. 149. For this point, see also Katerina Deligiorgi, 'Grace as a Guide to Morals? Schiller's Aesthetic Turn in Ethics,' History of Philosophy Quarterly vol. 23 (2006), pp. 1-20 (6).

[56] An ancestor of this paper was given at the inaugural conference of the White Rose Centre for the History of Philosophy at the University of York in 2011. I presented a more recent version to an audience in Sheffield in 2013. I am grateful to those who attended these events for comments that have been helpful in strengthening the paper, particularly Bob Stern, Christopher Janaway, Simon Blackburn, Gerald Lang, Alix Cohen and Jan Kandiyali; and also to two anonymous readers for this volume.