

**Philosophy as a Continual Unfolding: Interpretation and Expansion of Community:
Moving Forward with A Royce Agenda**

Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley

As we gather again to explore the thought and life of Josiah Royce let us embody his own spirit in such an endeavor, namely, to understand that a self, a life, and a philosophy is an ongoing task of interpretation. This means that each should involve the following characteristics: temporality and process, historicity, context, and relationship, and a plan of action. Temporality is a prime characteristic, for Royce, of self, indeed, of all reality.¹ About the self he says, “In brief, my idea of myself is an interpretation of my past—linked also with an interpretation of my hopes and my intentions as to my future.”² Selfhood, a life, and a philosophy are open-ended affairs; the meaning of each continues to develop; each is potentially a deep and complex sign that can grow richer in meaning; further meaning is always possible. Perice captures this fecundity of a self when he writes: “No son of Adam has ever fully manifested what there was in him.”³ Joseph Margolis nicely states what it means to speak of a life in this context when he writes: “Once admit that persons are texts, have or are histories themselves; it becomes quite impossible to fix the ontological or intentional closure of their careers and natures—even *after their physical death.*”⁴ Finally, as for a philosophy or for philosophy in general it is appropriate here to cite Whitehead’s claim that all philosophy is a footnote on Plato. The content of Plato’s thought is continually being reinterpreted and the questions raised by him and even by those who preceded him are the ongoing philosophical and life questions that must be

explored in every time, and place and by many different individuals and groups. Our task as Royce scholars is to join the ongoing process of interpretation of Royce's thought, seeking to deepen understanding, refine thought, discover new relationships, and to use the results to address in fresh ways perennial philosophical and life problems. It is always a profoundly temporal process.

In addition to temporality, self, a life, and a philosophy are about history; they are embedded in an irrevocable past, a history, even as there is movement forward into the future. Royce was strongly dedicated to a historical grounding for all philosophy; he had a keen sense of the historical and he argued that good philosophy must respect the past: "[No fresh beginning is worth making, unless the ages have fertilized the forest soil where the new saplings are to grow."⁵ History of philosophy was, for Royce, a crucial aspect of philosophy and understanding and mining history's riches was essential for the forward movement of philosophy, as well as for self and a life. He asserts: "Faithfulness to history is the beginning of creative wisdom."⁶ Indeed, as a teacher, Royce was known for his scathing criticism of views that betray a culpable ignorance of the history of philosophy. Royce knew the history of philosophy intimately and was an astute interpreter of its figures. One of Royce's students provides the ultimate compliment in this regard: "No other teacher of philosophy in my time has carried into his seminaries so full and living a consciousness of the historic stream of philosophic thought."⁷

Context is equally important for developing a self, and understanding a life and a philosophy. For Royce, self could not be understood other than in its social grounding; in its communal context; in order to achieve a self and a life-plan, one needed the models of others, the encouragement of the community, and a cause that one could share with others

in a deep and self-shaping loyalty. As for understanding a life, one needed to see it in context; the context would be broad –family, province, nation, international relationships, ideas, movements, geography, climate, and nature in general. Philosophy, for Royce, was both personal and representative. Thus, in his tribute to his beloved William James, Royce writes: “A great philosophy expresses an interpretation of the life of a man and a view of the universe which is at once personal and, if representative of his people, national in its significance.”⁸ In doing our interpretative work, we should seek always to be sensitive to the context of Royce’s ideas and to the problems and vexations of his life, place, and moment. This is, of course, true for any interpretations of the work of philosophers of the past.

Just as context is important for a self, a life, and a philosophy, so is relationship. For Royce, growth occurs through our interactions with others, through active exchange of values, ideas, and causes; others stretch me by criticizing or stimulating me to develop myself and my life in new directions. In my judgment, one of Royce’s finest statements about the role of others in our lives is the following:

Our fellows are known to be real and have their own inner life, because they are for each of us, the endless treasury of *more ideas*. They answer our questions, they tell us news, they make comments, they pass judgments, they express novel combinations of feelings, they relate to us stories, they argue with us, and take counsel with us. . . .*Our fellows furnish us the constantly needed supplement to our own fragmentary meanings.*⁹

The importance of the role of others, and the communal, in our lives, and in our philosophy is highlighted by Royce’s very compelling argument that knowledge of the external world is dependent upon others. He writes:

Our belief in the reality of Nature, when nature is taken to mean the realm of physical phenomenon known to common sense *is inseparably bound up with our belief in the existence of our fellow men.* . . . Nature is a realm, which we conceive as known or knowable to various men in precisely the general sense in which we regard it as known or knowable to our private selves.¹⁰

The scientific community argued Royce, was an exemplar for “community” when it operated at its best. As philosophers this dependence on community, on others for fuller meaning, for greater understanding, and for any grasp of truth about the world, of course, demands that we seek broad insight from our fellows- whether they be other philosophers or those engaged in other disciplines or professions or vocations or just neighbors and friends or even strangers. Thus, as a young undergraduate, Royce argued for a close interrelationship between science and literature.¹¹ Very precious to Royce, and I believe to James, was the wonderful critical and respectful exchange of ideas that they carried on during their lives together as colleagues, neighbors and friends. While at Harvard, Royce greatly enriched the intellectual life of the community by inviting scientists into his seminars to share ideas and critical interchange. Upon his death, these scholars paid a great tribute to Royce:

. . . His most notable tribute to the teaching of the university was made through his seminar in logic, which became a veritable clearing house of science. Men of widely different training and technique—chemists, physiologists, statisticians, pathologists, mathematicians—who could not understand each other were interpreted to one another by Royce who understood them all. He would do even more than that. He could interpret each man to himself, divine his half-thoughts and render them articulate.¹²

Finally, for Royce, a self was a life-plan, ideas were “plans of action,” a life was active and embodied thought, feeling, and imagination, and philosophy must be an active engagement with the ideas of and experiences of many and with human affairs in all its

depth and breadth. Philosophy, for Royce, was about clarifying issues of human life so that more effective solutions to personal and social problems would be found. It was also about clarifying loyalties and building enriching and fulfilling communities, including a satisfactory world community and a universal community of interpretation and shared reality—a beloved community. Philosophy, for Royce, among other things, was a philosophy of life, the task of “learning to see life as it is, to know the world as we men know it, and to guide our purposes as we ought to guide them.”¹³ And, a philosophy of life, philosophy ultimately for Royce has as its aim to “Be loyal; [to] grow in loyalty.”¹⁴

In what follows, I set out a plan of action for our interpretative task as Royce scholars, while also recounting briefly some of the excellent interpretative work already accomplished. The overview may well display my ignorance of work done and the action plan is, of course, my fallible and limited vision. In a Royce spirit I invite criticism, correction, suggestions, cooperation, and joint action. The themes of temporality and process, historicity, context, and relationship, and action will serve as an organizing scheme for my remarks.

Temporality and Process

As early as 1874, Royce declared his intention to develop a new phenomenology in which the opening contention would be “Every man lives in the present and contemplates a past and future...the future and the past are shadows both, the present is the only real.” For Royce, all human experience is essentially temporal, transpiring in a “living present,” a “specious present,” which is the characteristic human time-span. In addition to affirming the fundamental temporal nature of human consciousness, Royce also affirms the priority of the future in the development of coherent meaning. Even more he asserts the intentionality of

consciousness both in its “awareness of something,” and in the sense that consciousness is essentially *teleological* in character. Human beings encounter the world in terms of interests and concerns and ideas are plans for actions, proposals for how one intends to act toward the world. Time thus becomes the ground for the formation of the self; it is the medium by which self expresses and develops its own creativity, uniqueness, individuality, goals and life plan. It is also the medium for communities to develop their uniqueness. In this regard, Royce gives us this fecund insight. : “. . . the community is a being that attempts to accomplish something in time through the deeds of its members.”¹⁵ Time then is the locus of all human meaning as each self and each community seeks to unite the various aspects of time into a coherent narrative. Further, in time, “reality passes through a series of changes which constitute the history of the world”¹⁶ and thus human meaning establishes itself on the world stage.

For Royce, time is also the crucible for the ethical development and actions of each human self. Our human experience of temporal succession is an experience of a pursuit directed toward a goal. Human experience as essentially temporal is thus also purposive and willful. Royce declares: “the future depends for its meaning only as a process expectant of the future.”¹⁷ Time, for Royce, is “the form of the Will.”¹⁸ In pursuing its goals, the self lives and acts in time and constitutes itself as a ethical self, its actions impacting on itself and others, since, for Royce, “sociality,” or “inter-subjectivity” is also an essential characteristic of the human world. The self develops as self and acts only in the context of others. For Royce, as for Bergson and others, time contains a series of events everywhere characterized by novelty, “by the constant appearance of what never has happened before.”¹⁹ This allows for each self to develop a unique life plan and to

engage in individual unique acts, acts of will, as we shall see. Royce writes: “In pursuing its goals, the Self lives in time.”²⁰ However, time also contains “the passing away of each event into the irrevocable past that can never happen again.”²¹ Herein lays the stain of sin, and guilt and the demand for forgiveness and reconciliation. Once a deed is done it cannot be recalled; only some form of reconciliation can bring about changes in the stained and injured human relations that a hurtful and traitorous individual and/or communal act has caused.

And finally, time is, for Royce, the form of the Real as well. The time order as a totality is, for Royce, “the order in which the world will is conceived to live out the whole of its life, to do the totality of its deeds.”²² The whole of the time order has its own reality as a whole. This notion of a time-inclusive totality is what Royce means by an eternal reality. He writes: “By the eternal I mean not in the least the timeless, but the totality of temporal events viewed precisely as a totality.”²³ Just as in human time consciousness the present constitutes a dynamic time-span in which what is literally past is presently held in the same view as the immediate present and the developing future so too is there a universal perspective of the same nature. Royce asserts: “If God is God, he views the future and the past as we do the present as a dynamic stretch of process.”²⁴

Royce’s “temporalism” has been explored extensively and insightfully in Randy Auxier’s new book,²⁵ but I believe there is much yet to be gleaned in Royce’s work on the concept of “time,” on intentionality, and especially in regard to his 1910 essay, “The Reality of the Temporal.”²⁶ Other areas of Royce’s thought, somewhat related to his notions of temporality, are explored in a volume in the *Personalist Forum* in spring 1999 centered on “The Conception of God Debate and the Relevance of Royce.”²⁷ It contains a wealth of ideas and many exemplars of interpretation including excellent explorations of Royce’s idealism in the context of other idealistic philosophies of

the time such as those of George Holmes Howison and Borden Parker Bowne.²⁸ Especially interesting are two explorations of Royce's understanding of nature, one by Thomas W. Price and another by Jason M. Bell, which demonstrates the relevance of Royce's understanding to environmentalist thought as well as to its relation to process philosophy.²⁹ A few philosophers in the past have explored the relevance of Royce's thought for environmentalist concerns, but given the increased importance of these issues in our time, there is much more to be done. Bell's article strikes me as especially important for those philosophers searching for a more reasonable approach to animal rights concerns than those of the standard utilitarian "suffering" arguments and Kant's unfortunate exclusion of supposed "non-rational" beings from ethical consideration.

An interactive interpretation between Royce and process philosophy is, in my judgment, another exciting and unexplored field. Marc Anderson, in his recently completed doctoral project provides a wonderful beginning in his astute comparison of Royce and Whitehead.³⁰ Marc also addresses organizations and/or forms of life in terms of interpretive communities with responsibilities to be supportive and ethical beings. In exploring Royce and his relationship to process thought, we recall that Royce's philosophy, as would be expected, was always changing, refining, and developing in relation to the shifts toward pragmatism, process thought, and phenomenology that were occurring between 1895 and 1905, as well as major paradigm changes in the world of physics and biology. In terms of the changes in physics, a fruitful comparison for scholars of both Royce and Meade would be to explore the similarities and differences between Whitehead and other process thinkers and the work of Royce and Meade on Cosmic Philosophy. Another area for interesting exploration and comparison might be the topic of evolutionary theory, which was fundamental for many intellectuals in Royce's time and certainly for Dewey. I urge investigation of Royce's writing on this topic.³¹ Given the increased emphasis in contemporary philosophy on evolutionary theory, an insertion of a more reasoned view on the impact of evolutionary theory for philosophical issues can be found, I believe, in the work of a number of

philosophers considered part of the American tradition. Even the point that this was not a new topic for philosophy might be worth making.

Historicity and Context

Turning to Royce's concern for the history of philosophy as well as his excellent interpretations of historical philosophical figures, we honor the work of our dear, late colleague, John E. Smith. Smith helped bring to prominence and respectability, the study and interpretation of philosophy's own history, including the work of the traditional American pragmatists as well as that of Jonathan Edwards and Josiah Royce.³² In the words of George Lucas, "Smith's original and constructive interpretations of the thought of Jonathan Edwards³³ and John Dewey as well as of William James and of C.S. Peirce were informed by a larger conviction that American philosophy issues from a unique and important cultural tradition."³⁴ Smith also provided the groundwork for interpreting the European philosophical tradition from the standpoint of the "American approach to experience."³⁵ By interpreting the work of Kant and Hegel as well as Wittgenstein in this manner, he helped build bridges of understanding between the history of American philosophy and that of Europe. Others on the contemporary scene are carrying on this work.

Royce's own work on the history of philosophy was fairly extensive, beginning with an 1880 essay on Spinoza,³⁶ followed by two essays on Kant in 1881.³⁷ In 1891, he published a paper comparing Hegel and Schopenhauer.³⁸ This material appeared in his excellent *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy* in 1892.³⁹ Near the end of his career we find his essay on Nietzsche.⁴⁰ His relationship to Nietzsche and his thought most definitely needs further exploration. And, then, there is Royce's own historical work—his numerous essays on California's history and his own history of California⁴¹ This too is a relatively unexplored area, though some contemporary historians have praised Royce's work as presaging later historiography and historian Patricia Nelson Limerick

calls Royce “the father of western history.”⁴² Historian Kevin Starr, State Librarian of California and winner of a National Humanities medal, has included aspects of Royce’s career and writings in a number of his works on California.⁴³ Further interpretation of Royce’s historical writings would continue our desire to connect with other disciplines including American studies. And in the context of the history of Royce’s own thought, we must recognize the work of John Clendenning and others who have written biographies and/or provided us with some of Royce’s letters.⁴⁴

Historicity, of course, is closely related to context because the historical time and places of a philosophy are crucial to an adequate understanding and interpretation. Certain key problems were occupying intellectuals of his time and these were often addressed by Royce, but in doing so he usually took for granted the assumptions and work of others. The importance of context has been especially brought home in the recent discussion of Royce’s essay on race⁴⁵ with an urging by Marilyn Fischer that , in any historical recovery, we especially need to pay attention to changes in the meaning of key words between one’s own time and that of the philosopher whose work one is exploring. This point was also stressed in the excellent Coss lecture at meetings of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy in Charlotte, North Carolina March 11-13, 2010⁴⁶ which focused on subtle changes in the meaning, in American thought, of the term “immigrant.” In her response essay, Marilyn Fischer writes: “‘The past is a foreign country’ is a cliché among historians, but something that philosophers working with texts by classical American pragmatists should keep in mind. As contemporary English speakers reading century-old texts, we sometimes forget how encoded language was and is.”⁴⁷ Fischer then cites three examples of the use of a word by contemporary philosophers to discuss an aspect of an earlier philosophy which had changed meaning in a significant enough manner that it impacted on the interpretation of that philosopher’s thought being set forth today. One such phrase was “international mind” used by George Herbert Mead which Mitchell Abouafia interprets to be in line with Kant’s *sensus communis*, Adam Smith’s impartial spectator, and Arendt’s inclusive community.⁴⁸ Fischer argues that neglecting

the difference in meaning in Mead's time makes Meade appear much less conservative than he really was as a philosopher and on these issues; he was not as cosmopolitan or inclusive as Aboulafia claims.⁴⁹ She also discusses Royce's use of the word "antipathies" and the use of the word "social control" by Jane Addams.⁵⁰ This work by Fischer provides us all with a word of caution about interpretation and counsels us to consider carefully the context of time and place for the essay or book we choose to discuss, and to pay special attention to the subtle changes of meaning of key terms.

In emphasizing context and history, we move to relationships. Frank Oppenheim's excellent book comparing the thought of Royce on various topics with that of Peirce, James and Dewey⁵¹ reminds us again of Royce's stress on critical interchange of ideas as crucial to developing one's own thought. We have already mentioned the fine *Pluralist* issue on comparing Royce and other idealists as well as Personalists; and the work on Whitehead and Royce done by Marc Anderson. Some years ago I proposed similarities between the thought of Royce and Husserl and now Jason Bell has proven a clear historical connection between these two authors and continues to explore the similarities and differences between their philosophies.⁵² Robert Burch has explored some similarities and differences between the thought of Royce and Wittgenstein.⁵³

A very fertile field for exploring intricacies of relationship is to focus on various students of Royce. Some work is being done here including some discussion of similarities and differences between the work of Mead and Royce.⁵⁴ It tickles my imagination to know if any such exploration has been undertaken in relation to such interesting students of Royce as Herbert Weiner, T.S. Eliot, C.I. Lewis, and, of course, Santayana. Recent exciting and excellent work has been done on the similarities and differences between the "Beloved Community," concept of Royce and Martin Luther King.⁵⁵ In terms of relationships to contemporary philosophical issues, both Kara Barnette

and Celia T. Bardwell Jones have done excellent work on how Royce's epistemology could contribute to feminist epistemology.⁵⁶

In recovering aspects of Royce's work, the reissuing of previously unavailable texts and publishing previously unpublished materials is a hugely important work. The reissuing of an expanded edition of *Race Questions, Provincialism and Other American Problems*⁵⁷ has stimulated a great flurry of discussion as well as some new work on the race question.⁵⁸ Another exciting development is depth exploration of some major works of Royce such as that of Mathew A. Foust on Royce's *Philosophy of Loyalty*.⁵⁹ This leads me to promote exploration of a number of fruitful and somewhat neglected areas of philosophy reflected on by Royce. The first is literature. Royce wrote extensively on literature, including essays written as an undergraduate at Berkeley including his B.A. thesis on Aeschylus.⁶⁰ And, of course, Royce produced two literary works, his delightful piece written when he was 8 years of age, "Pussy Blackie," and his novel on California.⁶¹ This aspect of Royce's career has been little explored although Richard Hall has done several very nice pieces and is working on a book on this topic.⁶² Another area for exploration is Royce's extensive work in the area of education, including his series of lectures given at Harvard on "Topics in Psychology of Interest to Teachers," which were reported extensively in the *Journal of Education*.⁶³ Two scholars from the Faculty of Education at the University of Oulu in Finland are exploring these lectures.⁶⁴ In my first book on Royce I used Royce's work to explore implications for contemporary education problems.⁶⁵ This leads on to our next section and discussion of the relevance of Royce to contemporary public problems as well as problems in contemporary philosophy. First, however, I must give credit and praise to those who are exploring Royce's outstanding work on logic—Scott Pratt, Brent Crouch, and Robert W. Burch.⁶⁶ And I would especially be remiss if I did not mention that C.I. Lewis published a piece in 1916 which discusses

Royce's System Σ .⁶⁷ Royce also wrote on Philosophy of Mathematics and I encourage those scholars who are already pursuing this area.

Plans of Action for the Future

Before turning to public issues, I briefly suggest areas of fruitful contribution to pressing issues or areas in contemporary philosophy that can be gleaned from Royce's work and thought. The first is in the area of philosophy of mind. Royce addressed the issue of mind, body brain throughout his career in a manner that is holistic in contrast to today's reductionistic approaches and also relates to issues in contemporary neuroscience.⁶⁸ I addressed this specifically in a paper for a 2008 Royce Conference in Poland, where I argue that Josiah Royce developed theories of mind and self that are viable alternatives to contemporary theories, theories that resonate with contemporary evolutionary theory, neuroscience, and experimental psychology, while allowing us to escape the assumed Cartesian materialism of much contemporary discussions of mind, in which the older dualism of soul and body has been replaced by that of brain and the rest of the body." Royce is clearly anti-Cartesian both in its traditional and materialistic manifestations. Royce also takes us beyond the blatant scientism of much of contemporary philosophy because he viewed science as a fallible, yet genuinely progressive epistemic endeavor. In *Josiah Royce in Focus*, I also related Royce's work on mind and self to work in contemporary neuroscience, particularly the work of Michael Gazzaniga.⁶⁹ Closely related, is the whole area of Psychology and particularly of Social Psychology, a discipline area that is engaged in addressing many crucial philosophically-related questions such as psychopathology and acts of evil. Royce's writings on the development of the self and his *Introduction to Psychology* are full of fruitful ideas for exploring contemporary psycho-philosophical issues and his work on pathological personality disorders and his reflections on evil

are certainly relevant for contemporary issues in social psychology- philosophy, neuroscience and philosophy of religion. I have briefly ventured into Royce's psychological work as has Frank Oppenheim, and we encourage others to do so also.⁷⁰

Royce also wrote extensively on ethics and, a number of us agree that "Ethics," for Royce, is first philosophy. Frank Oppenheim began the exploration in depth of Royce's ethics⁷¹ and others have explored various aspects in relation to contemporary problems. Thus, I have used Royce's views on self, community, and ethics to address certain issues in moral psychology such as altruism, psychopathology and autism.⁷² In this connection someone ought to probe the work of Royce with the Committee on Apparitions and Haunted Houses of the American Society for Psychical Research as well as his published work on several topics in parapsychology.⁷³

Another rich field for interpretation of Royce is Royce's views on science and scientific method. He, like Peirce and Husserl, argued that science is a human activity in the service of humanity, its role is to describe our human place in the natural world, but it is not the only viable and valuable description of nature. Along with Husserl, Royce perceived our present day "crisis" in that fact-minded science, conceived as a report about nature which produces "lifeless data" has led to the mathematizing of nature and the naturalization of consciousness. This also produces fact-minded people who make the primary mode of interacting with people and the world the attitude of dealing with "objects."⁷⁴ This attitude, as well as the false dichotomy between mind and body has infected medicine in unsatisfactory ways—explored by both Griffin Trotter and myself.⁷⁵ Again, this whole area of science, medicine, and related fields deserves further exploration.

Turning to the relevance of Royce for the many issues confronting our present society and impacting on the lives of so many persons, I will be brief in my suggestions. The discussion of the Royce and race question needs to continue and expand with an eye on his theory of community and his life-long desire to build inclusive communities. In this regard is his seeing how individual and community are mutually needed aspects of human life; genuine individuals make genuine

communities and genuine, supportive communities make genuine, rich individuals, capable of transcending self and communal interest. The self interprets itself in terms of the communal past and future. Self needs community and community needs the self. Thus, Royce provides a new definition of community, namely, “the community is a being that attempts to accomplish something in time and through the deeds of its members...It involves the idea of deeds done and ends sought or attained...In so far as these personalities [members] possess a life that is for each of them his own, while it is, in some of its events, common to them all, they form a community.”⁷⁶ Thus, community is a temporal being; it has a past and will have a future. As temporal, a community is the bringing forth of an embodied ideal. A community is a plan of action, it, in Royce’s view is a “person,” a being who acts in the world. As a temporal being, a community is also intimately involved with the notion of an irrevocable past and thus of the possibility, as for any self, of the stain of sin and guilt and a demand for forgiveness and reconciliation. Once a deed is done it cannot be recalled; only some form of reconciliation can bring about changes in the stained and injured human relations that a hurtful and traitorous individual and/or communal act has caused.

This insight about community and group responsibility is, in my judgment, a very fecund one that should become one of our operating ideas as we tackle issues in contemporary society—thus, for example, judgments about the immoral behavior of corporations or, in the area of race relations about institutional racism exemplified in actions of various social institutions such as courts, school systems, religious institutions, and legislative bodies. It is my judgment that too much of our social, political and ethical analysis focuses on individual behavior and very little on communal behavior. The platform of colorblindness is a good example of the very wrong approach to race questions;

it implies that all there is to racism is individual prejudice. This is only one form of prejudice; a more insidious, often invisible form of racism is institutional racism. Royce's insight on community as a moral, responsible being, may prove very fruitful for analyzing all the complexities of race relations in the United States and in the world. Indeed, it may assist in a broader insight about "racism," manifested in other than the black-white dichotomy. Indeed, overcoming our individualistic focus would, in my judgment, be an advance in many areas. Thus, those who work in democratic theory need to deal with the blatant individualism of liberalism, and those concerned about religions and religious behavior need to critique the individualistic bases of so much contemporary religious behavior.

Royce's work offers many riches for dealing with contemporary problems of community and of relationships—including building a peaceful and cosmopolitan world, tackling the difficult issues of welcoming immigrants and living with them in harmony and fruitful interaction, while respecting differences and their unique individuality and contributions. It also offers material, as I have said, for seeking to reframe Democracy and Democratic theory in a manner more relevant to our contemporary scene. There has been ongoing interpretation of Royce's philosophy for issues of immigration and building a cosmopolitan world,⁷⁷ but obviously more can be done.

Finally, religion is playing a significant role in many critical issues facing our contemporary society and Josiah Royce has left us a substantial and fecund body of work on religion. John E. Smith played a key role in introducing Royce on this topic to the contemporary philosophical community as well as advocating for the importance of religion as a topic for deep philosophical reflection.⁷⁸ A number of other scholars have pursued the topic of religion in Royce, especially Frank Oppenheim but also younger scholars such as Dwayne Tunstall.⁷⁹ In my judgment Royce's

work on the problem of evil, the overcoming of treason and guilt, and the notion of “immorality,” is very compelling, as a number of my students have attested. His work on religious community is unparalleled and his phenomenological investigation of the human experience of the religious in *The Sources of Religious Insight* is a superb piece of work relevant in many ways today to not only contemporary issues but also theoretical issues in philosophy of religion.⁸⁰ And Royce was familiar with Hindu, Buddhist and other Asian religious traditions and, as Oppenheim has suggested, provides resources for the currently needed inter-cultural, inter-religious, and inter-faith dialogues.⁸¹ One can only be excited and hopeful for future discussion of these crucial issues as the work continues toward realization of a Critical Edition of the “Works of Josiah Royce,” commencing with *The Sources* and the moving to *The Problem of Christianity*.

So this is my hopeful agenda as we move forward to our interpretive project of the works of Josiah Royce guided by the following words in notes prepared for an ethics course offered near the end of his life:

Loyalty, if it is anything, is or ought to be in all of us a growing doctrine about life, and a growing method of trying to solve the problems of life. The doctrine of Loyalty does not consist of a collection of formulas you can memorize verbatim, and apply mechanically to all cases as they come up. . .[W]hat one means by loyal conduct can be defined only through a continual effort to readjust the problems of life to an ideal, which, just because it is always living and growing, involves a willingness to reinterpret the situations which arise, to reconsider the solutions which have thus far been attempted.”⁸²

Dear friends—let us be loyal and grow in loyalty.

¹ As a affirmation of this strong sense of temporality for Royce, Randall Auxier argues, in his new book, that Royce’s philosophy is a form of “temporalism.” Randall Auxier, *Time, Will and Purpose: Living Ideas from the Philosophy of Josiah Royce*, La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2011. See especially chapter 6.

² Josiah Royce, 1913, *The Problem of Christianity*, New York, Macmillan; Chicago, Henry Regnery Company, 1968, 2:42.

³ Charles S. Perice, *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Perice*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960, 6:615.

⁴ Joseph Margolis, *Texts Without Reference*, London and New York, Basil Blackwell, 1989, 289.

-
- ⁵ Josiah Royce, 1892, *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy: An Essay in the Form of Lectures*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 116.
- ⁶ Josiah Royce, 1889, "Is There a Philosophy of Evolution?" *Unitarian Review* 22, No. (July, 1889, 1-12, 97-113.
- ⁷ Richard C. Cabot, 1916, "Josiah Royce as a Teacher," *Philosophical Review* 25, No. 1 (May 1916); 466-72, 468.
- ⁸ Josiah Royce, 1911, "James as a Philosopher," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 29 June 1911, 13; reprinted in *Science* m.s. (1911) 33-35, 24; and under the title "William James and the Philosophy of Life," In Josiah Royce, *William James and Other Essays on the Philosophy of Life*, New York, Macmillan, 1912, 3-45, 6.
- ⁹ Josiah Royce, *The World and the Individual (Gifford Lectures)* 2 vols., New York, Macmillan, 1899 and 1901; reprint New York, Dover, 1959, 2:171-2. Italics are Royce's..
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 165-166, Italics are Royce's.
- ¹¹ Josiah Royce, 1874, "Literary Education, *The Berkeyan*, 1 (May 1874) 4-5.
- ¹² 1916, "Tribute to Josiah Royce," *Science* n.s. 44 (1 December 1916) 773.
- ¹³ Josiah Royce, 1910, "Loyalty and Insight," *Simmons Quarterly* 1 (1910) 4-21, Reprinted in *William James and the Philosophy of Life*, 49-95, 60. In this commencement address Royce is urging the graduates to develop a philosophy of life.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵ Royce, *The Problem of Christianity*, 2:249.
- ¹⁶ Josiah Royce, 1910, "The Reality of the Temporal." *The International Journal of Ethics*. XX. 3, 257-71, 259.
- ¹⁷ Josiah Royce, *The World and the Individual*. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1899, 1901; reprinted. New York: Dover, 1959). II, 132.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.* 133.
- ¹⁹ "The Reality of the Temporal," 262.
- ²⁰ *The World and the Individual*, 133.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*
- ²² *Ibid.* 270.
- ²³ *Ibid.* 271.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁵ Auxier, *Time, Will and Purpose: Living Ideas from the Philosophy of Josiah Royce*, 2011.
- ²⁶ Josiah Royce, 1910, "The Reality of the Temporal." *The International Journal of Ethics*. XX. 3, 257-71.
- ²⁷ *The Personalist Forum*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Spring 1999).
- ²⁸ Here one needs also to explore other volumes of *The Personalist Forum*, especially *Volume 13, 1 spring 1997* and *Volume 13, 2 (fall 1997)*. In addition, I suggest a re-reading of the posthumous volume, *Lectures on Modern Idealism*, edited By Jacob Lowenberg, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1919. I believe this is one of the finest expositions of Hegel and idealism to be found anywhere.
- ²⁹ Thomas W. Price, "The Appreciation of Natural Beings and the Finitude of Consciousness," *The Personalist Forum*, Vol. 15, No. 1, (spring 1999), 153-166; and Jason M. Bell, "The World and Its Selves: Royce and the Philosophy of Nature," *The Personalist Forum*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (spring 1999), 167-184.
- ³⁰ Marc M. Anderson, 2011, *Hyperthematics: An Extension of Josiah Royce's Philosophy of Interpretation*, submitted to the Institute of Philosophy, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium and successfully defended on June 12, 2011. Chapter 4 deals entirely with a comparison of Royce and Whitehead. Having had the privilege of participating in the defense of this work, I strongly urge Marc to seek publication either or the whole project, but certainly of the excellent chapter 4.
- ³¹ Among Royce's writings on evolutionary theory are: Josiah Royce, "Natural Law, Ethics and Evolution," *International Journal of Ethics*, 5 (1894-5) 489-500; [This paper discusses Thomas H. Huxley's work on ethics and evolution]; Josiah Royce, "Is There a Philosophy of Evolution?" *Unitarian Review*, 32 (1889) 1-29, 97-113; Josiah Royce, "Herbert Spencer and His Contributions to the Concept of Evolution," *International Quarterly Review*, 9 (1904), 335-65. This was reprinted in *Hrebert Spencer: An Estimate and Review*, New York, Duffield & Co., 1904.
- ³² John E. Smith, 1992, *America's Philosophical Vision*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- ³³ Smith, John E., 1992, *Jonathan Edwards: Puritan, Preacher, Philosopher*, London: Geoffrey Chapman and Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- ³⁴ George P. Lucas, 1997, "Philosophy's Recovery of its History: A Tribute to John E. Smith," in *The recovery of Philosophy in America*, edited by Robert P. Kasulis & Robert Cummings Neville, Albany. New York: SUNY Press, 11-37, 12.

³⁵ Ibid., Smith, 1992.

³⁶ Josiah Royce, 1880, "Natural Rights and Spinoza's Essay on Liberty," *Berkeley Quarterly*, 1 (October, 1880), 312-16. This was reprinted in *Fugitive Essays*, 1920, Edited by Jacob Lowenberg, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 290-99.

³⁷ Josiah Royce, 1881, "Before and Since Kant," *Berkeley Quarterly*, 2 (1881) 134-50; and Josiah Royce, "Kant's Relation to Modern Philosophic Progress," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 15, (1881), 360-81.

³⁸ Josiah Royce, 1891, "Two Philosophers of the Paradoxical," *Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 67, "Hegel," 45-60; and "Schopenhauer," 161-73.

³⁹ Josiah Royce, 1892, *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy: An Essay in the Form of Lectures*, Boston and New York, Houghton and Mifflin and Co.

⁴⁰ Josiah Royce, 1917, "Nietzsche," *Atlantic Monthly*, 119, 321-31,

⁴¹ Josiah Royce, "The Squatter's Riot of '50 in Sacramento: Its Causes and Its Significance," *Overland Monthly*, n.s. 6 (1885); 225-45. This was reprinted in Josiah Royce, 1898, *Studies of Good and Evil: A Series of Essays upon the Problems of Philosophy and of Life*, New York, D. Appleton and Co., as "An Episode in Early California Life: The Squatter Riot of 1850 in Sacramento." See also: Josiah Royce, 1890, "Frémont," *Century*, n.s. 18, 548-57; "Light on the Seizure of California," *Century*, n.s. *1890), 792-94; and "Montgomery and Frémont: New Documents on the Bear Flag Affair," *Century*, n.s. (1891), 780-83; and especially, Josiah Royce, 1886, *California from the Conquest in 1846 to the Second Vigilance Committee in San Francisco [1856]: A Study of American Character*, Boston and New York, Houghton and Mifflin and Co. There are other minor articles on California to be found in the "Annotated Bibliography of the Published Works of Josiah Royce," by Ignas K. Skrupskelis, in John J. McDermott, editor, 2005, *The Basic Writings of Josiah Royce, Volume 2*, New York, Fordham University Press, 1167-1226.

⁴² See: Robert V. Hine, *Josiah Royce: From Grass valley to Harvard* (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1992. , 193. Hine argues that Royce is a precursor of Fredrick Jackson Turner, author of *The Frontier in American History*, New York, Henry Holt, 1920.

⁴³ Kevin Starr, 1973, *Americans and the California Dream*, New York, Oxford University Press; and especially *California: A History*, 2005, New York, Random House.

⁴⁴ John Clendenning, 1970, *The Letters of Josiah Royce*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press and 1999, *The Life and Thought of Josiah Royce*, Nashville, Tennessee, Vanderbilt University Press. See also: Robert Hine, 1992, *Josiah Royce: From Grass Valley to Harvard*. Series editor Richard Etulain, Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

⁴⁵ The original essay entitled "Race Questions and Prejudices," appears in Josiah Royce, Race Questions, Provincialism, and Other American Problems, originally published in 1908 by Macmillan and recently reissued in an expanded edition edited by Scott Pratt and Shannon Sullivan, New York, Fordham University Press, 2009. My interpretations of this article appeared in "Is a Coherent Racial Identity Essential to Genuine Individuals and Communities? Josiah Royce on Race," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 2005, 216-228.; and "Josiah Royce on Race: Issues in Context," *The Pluralist*, Vol. 4, Number 3, Fall 2009: 1-9. For the controversy see: "Symposium on Josiah Royce and the Question of Race," published in *The Pluralist* Vol. 4, Number 3, Fall 2009, which includes the following papers: my "Josiah Royce on Race: Issues in Context," 1-9; Tommy J. Curry, "Royce, Racism and the Colonial Ideal: White Supremacy and the Illusion of Civilization in Josiah Royce's Account of the White Man's Burden," 10-38; and Dwayne Tunstall, "Josiah Royce's Anti-Black Racism?," 39-45. This controversy has been continued in an essay by Marilyn Fischer, "Locating Royce's Reasoning on Race," forthcoming in a future issues of *The Pluralist*.

⁴⁶ The original lecture by Donna Gabaccia, Historian from the University of Minnesota, was entitled "Nations of Immigrants: Do Words Matter," is printed in *The Pluralist*, Vol. 5, No. 3, Fall, 2010, 5-31. There were responses by Marilyn Fischer, "What's An Advocate to Do with the Words She's Given?" (32-40); Jose Jorge Mendoza, "A 'Nation' of Immigrants," (41-48); Ceila Bardwell-Jones, "The Space Between: The Politics of Immigration in Asian/Pacific Islander America," (49-55) and a response by Dr. Gabaccia (56-62).

⁴⁷ Fischer, 32.

⁴⁸ Mitchell Abuolafia, *The Cosmopolitan Mind: George Herbert Mead and Continental Philosophy*, Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois Press, 2001.

⁴⁹ Marilyn Fischer, *The Pluralist*, 2010, 33. See also: Marilyn Fischer, "Mead and the International Mind," *Transactions of the Charles Sanders Peirce Society*, 44-3 (2008), 508-31.

⁵⁰ Fischer, *The Pluralist*, 2010, 33-4.

⁵¹ Frank M. Oppenheim, 2005, *Reverence for the Relations of Life: Reimagining Pragmatism via Josiah Royce's Interaction with Peirce, James, and Dewey*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 2005.

⁵² Jason Bell, 2011, "The German Translation of Royce's Epistemology by Husserl's student Winthrop Bell: A Neglected Bridge of Pragmatic-Phenomenological Interpretation?," *The Pluralist*, Vol. 6, No. 1. See: Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, 1978, "Royce and Husserl: Some Parallels and Food for Thought," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 14:3 (1978) 184-99.

⁵³ Robert W. Burch, Royce and Wittgenstein on the Context of Privacy," *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 3, July 1988. pp. 287-304.

⁵⁴ I have a forthcoming essay entitled "The Self as Naturally and Socially Embedded but Also as So Much More," read at an International Conference on the Philosophy of George Herbert Meade in Opole, Poland, June, 2011.

⁵⁵ Gary Herstein, 2011, "The Roycean Roots of the Beloved Community," *The Pluralist*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 91-107; and Dwayne A. Tunstall, 2009, *Yes, But Not Quite: Encountering Josiah Royce's Ethico-Religious Insight*, New York, Fordham University Press.

⁵⁶ Kara Barnette, 2007, "Communities, Traitors, and the Feminist Cause: Looking Toward Josiah Royce for Feminist Scholarship," *The Pluralist* 2.2 (2007), 81-90; and Celia T. Bardwell-Jones, 2008, "Border Communities and Royce: The Problem of Translation and Reinterpreting Feminist Empiricism," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 22.1 (2008), 12-23.

⁵⁷ Josiah Royce, 2009, *Race Questions, Provincialism and Other American Problems*, Expanded Edition, edited by Scott L. Pratt and Shannon Sullivan, New York, Fordham University Press. See also: *Josiah Royce's Late Writings: A Collection of Unpublished and Scattered Works*, edited by Frank M. Oppenheim, Bristol, England, Thoemmes Press, 2001; Randall Auxier, *Papers in Honor of Josiah Royce on His Sixtieth Birthday*, Thoemmes Library of American Philosophy, Chippenham, England, Thoemmes Press, 2003.

⁵⁸ Shannon Sullivan, "Whiteness as Wise provincialism: Royce and the Rehabilitation of a Racial Category," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (Spring, 2008), 236-62.

⁵⁹ This is

⁶⁰ Josiah Royce, "The Vassar Miscellany and 'Middlemarch,'" 3 *Berkeleyan* (March, 1875) [This is a defense of George Eliot against the charge that her work, while good literature, weakens her readers morally. Another piece on this author is "George Eliot as a Religious Teacher," *The Californian*, 3 (1881), 229-37]; "The Modern Novel as a Mode of Conveying Instruction and Accomplishing Reform," *Berkeleyan* 1 (April, 1874), 10-11; "The Prince of Denmark, the Moor of Venice, and Their Creator," *Berkeleyan* 1 (November, 1874) 3-5; "The Literary Artist and the Work of Literary Art," *Berkeleyan* 2 (January, 1875, 3-5); "T. Hardy's 'Far from the Maddin Crow,'" *Berkeleyan* 2 (April, 1875), 9-10; "The Foundation Idea in Poe's Poetry," *Berkeleyan* 2 (April, 1875) 11, "The Intention of the Prometheus Bound of Aescyhlus, Being an Investigation in the Department of Greek Theology," *Bulletin of the University of California* no. 16 (June, 1875), 113-37; "The Aim of Poetry," *Overland Monthly*, 14, (1875); 542-49; "Shelley and the Revolution," *The Californian*, 1 (1880), 543-53;

⁶¹ *The Feud of Oakfield Creek, A Novel of California Life*, Boston and New York, Houghton and Mifflin and Co., 1887.

⁶² Richard Hall, "Royce on Tragedy," presented at an International Conference on Royce held in Opole, Poland, June, 2008.

⁶³ See the Annotated Bibliography by Skrupskelis, 1192.

⁶⁴ Ari Sutinen, Research Fellow, Faculty of Education, The University of Oulu, Finland, and Ari Kivela, Senior Research Assistant are working on the topic of Royce and Education and gave a paper in Poland in June: "Royce and Meade: From Absolute Idealism to Social Pragmatism," paper given at International Conference on the Philosophy of G.H. Meade, Opole, Poland, June, 2011.

⁶⁵ Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, 1997, *Genuine Individuals and Genuine Communities: A Roycean Public Philosophy*, Nashville and London, Vanderbilt University Press, chapter 6.

⁶⁶ Robert W. Burch, "An Unpublished Logic paper of Josiah Royce," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Spring, 1987), 173-204; J. Brent Crouch, "Reflections on Josiah Royce's Logic:: Royce on Russell's Paradox," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Fall 2004) 607-626; Scott Pratt, "The Logical system of Josiah Royce," *History and Philosophy of Logic*, Vol. 28, No. 2, May 2007, 133-150; Robert W. Burch, "Royce, Boolean Rings, and the T-Relation," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 46, No. 2, (Spring 2011), 221-241; J. Brent Crouch, "Between Frege and Peirce: Josiah Royce's Structural Logicism," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, (Spring 2011) Vol. 46, No. 2, 155-177; Scott Pratt, "The Politics of

Disjunction,” *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, (Spring 2011) Vol. 46, No. 2, 202-220; and Michael Scanlon, “Sheffler’s Criticism of Royce’s Theory of Order,” *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, (Spring 2011), Vol. 46, No. 2, 178-201. Burch is working on a book on Royce’s logic.

⁶⁷ C.I. Lewis, “Types of Order and System Σ ,” *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (May 1916) 407-419.

⁶⁸ Thus, I refer one to the recent scathing review of Patricia Churchland’s book, *Ruler Breaker* in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 12, 2011 and August 7, 2011.

⁶⁹ Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, “Mind as Personal and Social Narrative of an Embodied Self,” presented at an International Conference on Royce in Opole Poland, 2008, to appear in the Conference book to be published by Lexington Press.

⁷⁰ As indicated earlier, I have an essay, *Self as Naturally and Socially Embedded but Also as So Much More*,” read at an International Conference on the Philosophy of George Herbert Meade in Opole, Poland, June, 2011. See my *Josiah Royce in Focus*, Chapter 2. See: Frank M. Oppenheim, “Royce’s Community: A Dimension Missing in Freud and James,” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 13 (1977), 173-90.

⁷¹ Frank M. Oppenheim, 1993, *Royce’s Mature Ethics*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

⁷² Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, 2011, “The Ethical Subject/Agent” as ‘Rational Individual’ But Also as So Much More!” *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, New Series, Volume 25, Number 1, 2011, 116-129. See also: *Royce in Focus*, Chapter 3.

⁷³ See: Josiah Royce, “Recent Psychical Research,” *Nation*, 45 (1887), 116-118; “Hallucination of Memory and Telepathy,” *Mind*, 13 (1888), 244-48. In Skrupkalis, “Annotated Bibliography,” there are a series of reports on the work of the Committee on Phantasms and Presentiments noted, 1182-1185.

⁷⁴ See: Bell, “The German Translation of Royce’s Epistemology by Husserl’s Student Winthrop Bell: A Neglected Bridge of Pragmatic-Phenomenological Interpretation?,” *The Pluralist*, Vol. 6, 446-62, primarily 49-50; and Kegley, “Royce and Husserl,” 186-188, as well as Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, “Peirce and Royce and the Betrayal of Science: Scientific Fraud and Misconduct,” *The Pluralist*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Summer 2010, 105-140.

⁷⁵ Griffin Trotter, *The Loyal Physician: Roycean Ethics and the Practice of Medicine*, Nashville and Boston: Vanderbilt University Press, 1977; and in Chapter 7 of Kegley, *Genuine Individuals and Genuine Communities*, 1997.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 64-65.

⁷⁷ Jose-Antonio Orosco, “Cosmopolitan Loyalty and the Great Global Community,” *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 19:3 (2003), 204-215. “Defending the Great Community: Royce’s Concept of Humanitarian Intervention,” *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 46, No. 2, Spring 2010, 266-81; Griffin Trotter, “Royce, Community, and Ethnicity,” *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 30: 3, 1994, 231-69, 254; Stuart Gerry Brown, “From Provincialism to the Great Community: The Social Philosophy of Josiah Royce,” *Ethics*, Vol. 59, No. 1, October, 1948, pp. 14-34. 19-20.

⁷⁸ John E. Smith was responsible for the reissuing of *The Problem of Christianity* in 1968 and for writing an introduction of this work.- Josiah Royce, 1913, *The Problem of Christianity*, The Macmillan Company, and 1968, Henry Regnery Company. He also wrote on religion. See: ⁷⁸ John E. Smith, 1949, “Religion and Morality,” *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 29, No. 2, April, 85-94. 91; John E. Smith, “The Experiential Foundations of Religion,” *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 55, No. 13 (June, 19, 1958), 538-46; John E. Smith, 1967, *Religion and Empiricism*, Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 86; John E. Smith, 1986, “The Fact of Religion: Diagnosis and Deliverance,” *The Scottish Journal of Religious Studies*, Vol. 6, Number 4, 61-77, 61; John E. Smith, 1995, *Experience and God*, Fordham University Press.

⁷⁹ See: Frank M. Oppenheim, 1987, *Royce’s Mature Philosophy of Religion*, Notre Dame, Indiana, Notre Dame University Press and Dwayne Tunstall, 2006, “Concerning the God that is Only a Concept: A Marcellian Critique of Royce’s God,” *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 42, Number 3, Summer 2006, 394-416. See also: Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, *Josiah Royce in Focus*, Chapter 4.

⁸⁰ Josiah Royce, 1912, *The Sources of Religious Insight*, New York, C. Scribner’s Sons.

⁸¹ Frank M. Oppenheim, “Royce’s Windows to the East,” *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 43, No. 2, Spring 2007, 288-318.

⁸² Royce, *Josiah Royce’s Late Writings: A Collection of Unpublished and Scattered Works*, vol. 2, ed. Frank M. Oppenheim, S.J., Bristol, England, Thoemmes Press, 2001, 138.