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ABSTRACT:
This article aims to reconstruct the key ideas of Kant’s philosophy of education. It took centuries for the foundations of the current education system to take root in European culture. Despite the differences in the views of tinkers of different eras on the problems of education, the education system per se has always rested on text analysis. Without a hypothetical dialogue with thinkers of the past and their texts, a classical education system is impossible. The 'dialogue through centuries' is based on a system of interrogation and the ability to question texts and their authors. The practices of interrogation and the ensuing theory show that the seemingly simple task of formulating a question requires strenuous work, which was described, for instance, in Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason. For Kant, an orderly interrogation procedure is proof of a person's mental faculties, whereas an ill-structured interrogation procedure yields useless or ridiculous answers. Building on Kant’s attitude to the text and the dialogue, this article uses the integration methodology, on the one hand, and the methodology of expert text analysis, on the other. This article argues that a dialogue with a text transforms into an analytical study. The authors address

RESUMEN:
Este artículo pretende reconstruir las ideas clave de la filosofía de la educación de Kant. Tomó siglos para que los cimientos del sistema educativo actual arraigaran en la cultura europea. A pesar de las diferencias en los puntos de vista de los caldereros de diferentes épocas sobre los problemas de la educación, el sistema educativo per se siempre ha reposado en el análisis de textos. Sin un diálogo hipotético con los pensadores del pasado y sus textos, es imposible un sistema educativo clásico. El "diálogo a través de los siglos" se basa en un sistema de interrogación y la capacidad de cuestionar los textos y sus autores. Las prácticas de interrogatorio y la teoría subsiguiente muestran que la tarea aparentemente simple de formular una pregunta requiere un trabajo extenuante, que se describió, por ejemplo, en la crítica de Kant de la razón pura. Para Kant, un procedimiento de interrogatorio ordenado es una prueba de las facultades mentales de una persona, mientras que un procedimiento de interrogación mal estructurado rinde respuestas inútiles o ridículas. Basándose en la actitud de Kant respecto al texto y al diálogo, este artículo utiliza la metodología de integración, por un lado, y la metodología de análisis de
1. Introduction

This article reconstructs the key ideas of Kant’s philosophy of education. It analyses the problem of communication ‘through centuries’ accomplished by a dialogue with a text – a dialogue structured in the form of text analytics. The authors analyse the notion of the ‘class of thinkers’, the characteristics of Kant’s dialogue method, and the place of logic in his system of education. An analysis of Kant’s model of philosophy of education stresses the importance of returning different types of questions and the equal author/reader dialogue to the educational structures of all levels. The article stresses that the dialogue method of education is crucial to creating the ‘class of thinkers’.

2. Methodology

The education system is in constant search for its foundations. From classical Antiquity, thinkers have argued that these foundations cannot be constructed without taking into philosophical prerequisites and without addressing the ideas of philosophy of education. The greatest thinkers had a predisposition to reflect on the philosophy of their principle areas of interest. This article addresses the philosophy of education devised by Kant – who was not only the greatest philosopher of the 18th century (and is a great philosopher to this day), but also an educator and lecturer. Kant worked for seven years as a tutor and for forty-one years as a university professor. The number of courses and subjects taught by Kant will impress any educator. During his tenure at the university, Kant taught 268 lecture courses, including logic (54 times), metaphysics (49 times), physical geography (46 times), ethics (28 times), anthropology (24), theoretical physics (20), mathematics (16), law (12), encyclopaedia of philosophical sciences (11), pedagogy (4), mechanics (2), mineralogy (1), and theology (1) (Gulyga, 1977).

This explains why ‘a considerable part of Kant’s legacy of the 1780-1790s and the early 1800s was dedicated to the philosophical problems that are currently referred to as philosophy of education’ (Bryushinkin, 2005). One must agree with Bryushinkin and his belief that ‘scrutinising the concepts of enlightenment and education in the light of an in-depth philosophical theory provides a valuable lesson for today’s theory and practice’ (ibid). At the same time, the article shows that studying Kant’s philosophy of education should be based on not only such works as ‘Lectures on Pedagogy’, The Conflict of the Faculties, ‘Answering the Question: What is Enlightenment?’, Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View, but also other works, for instance, the Critique of Pure Reason and Metaphysics of Morals. This study is structured in a manner that helps to reconstruct Kant’s philosophy of education in view of his ideas on the role of dialogue and question/answer procedures in learning. It will be shown below that, for Kant, the goal of any form of instruction is to teach students how to learn and how to develop the courage to use their own understanding (Kant 1996a). This idea has not lost its relevance.

A necessary element to achieve this is the ability to work with scientific texts regardless of their external form. Texts addressing the same problem can represent different eras, positions, and perspectives. The primary goal of researchers – even student researchers – is to analyse different positions and hold an equal dialogue with them. Students must not only learn and
They must be able to consider a variety of opinions to define their own position. Any form of instruction requires working with texts. Lectures, seminars, and the use of current information and communications technology (ICT) enrich student experiences. However, working with texts remains students’ principal activity.

3. Results

The proposed philosophical and methodological approach to the problems of Kant’s philosophy of education is based on the authors’ idea of informal text analytics. At the same time, ITA rests on Kant’s ideas about the methods for working with texts. Kant first introduced his methodological approach to informal text analytics in 1765 in ‘M. Immanuel Kant’s Announcement of the Programme of his Lectures for the Winter Semester 1765-6’. In particular, Kant analysed different methods of teaching philosophy. ‘The philosophical writer, for example, upon whom one bases one’s instruction, is not to be regarded as the paradigm of judgment. He ought rather to be taken as the occasion for forming one’s own judgment about him, and even, indeed, for passing judgment against him’ (Kant 1992b). The authors believe that this idea is crucial to Kant’s philosophy of education. The objective of this article is to present Kant’s philosophy of education as a philosophy based on a dialogue, particularly, a dialogue ‘through centuries’. Note that Kant wrote about Socrates’s influence on his philosophy, specifically philosophy of education.

3.1. Interrogation procedure for creating a ‘class of thinkers’

How does one enter into a dialogue with concrete researchers? How does one begin a conversation?

Regardless of the form of instruction, the interrogation procedure requires an immediate contact with the text. Here, Kant’s ideas about the use of questions in teaching acquire a special significance.

Teaching ‘through centuries’ accomplished by a dialogue with the text requires a possibility to use a written text. In this sense, Kant, Is a teacher for many generations of thinkers. For him, the problem of mentoring a creative person is closely linked to that of creating a ‘class of thinkers’. Kant spoke of a class but not in the sense that developed by Marxists in the 19th. Kant’s ‘class of thinkers’ is comprised of people that are capable of independent reasoning and ‘applying this acquired knowledge and skill for the world’s use’ (Kant 2006). The formation of a ‘class of thinkers’ is inseparable from the education system. Kant’s philosophy of education raises the problem of helping people to fulfil ‘the position that has been assigned’ to them and to become part of the class of thinkers. Among all the sciences, he praised that ‘from which [one] can learn what one must be in order to be a human being’ (Kant 2011)

Therefore, the three main questions Kant posed to define the realm of philosophy were as follows:

- What can I know?
- What must I do?
- What may I hope?

Kant believed it possible to reduce them to anthropology, or the question ‘What is a human being?’ Understanding cognitive faculties and solving the problems of education required answering this question.

According to Kant, changes in a person’s inner world must lead to a condition when he or she has the courage to use his or her own understanding (Kant 1996a). To this end, a person must learn how to answer three other questions, which test human cognitive faculties:

‘What do I want? (Understanding asks)
‘What does it concern? (Judgment asks)
Probably, the answers to each of these three questions characterise different faculties of a cognising person.

The ability to answer the three questions and follow the three maxims:

1) Think for oneself,
2) Think into the place of the other (in communication with human beings),
3) Always think consistently with oneself – is crucial to the ‘class of thinkers’.

According to Kant, creating the ‘class of thinkers’ is the ultimate goal of the education system. Thinkers do not content themselves with ready answers, nor do they follow the principle ‘If I have a book to have understanding in place of me, a spiritual adviser to have a conscience for me, a doctor to judge my diet for me, and so on, I need not make any efforts at all’ (Kant 1996a). Thinkers need freedom and have to think independently.

Kant distinguished between the aspiration for independent thinking and the need to perform public duties. To obey the law and perform their duties, people should use ready answers, since disseminating such answers is part of their duty. Working people ‘cannot be free’ since they are ‘acting on a commission imposed from outside’. However, if they become scholars, they enjoy ‘unlimited freedom to use [their] own reason and to speak in [their] own person’ (Kant 1996a).

Kant expressed this thought not only in the essay ‘An answer to the question: What is enlightenment?’ but also in the Conflict of the Faculties, in Anthropology from the Pragmatic Point of View, in the treatise Lectures on Pedagogy, and in other works. Kant believed that the education system had to develop people’s natural abilities and help them find their place in the world.

Among the methods for developing human abilities, Kant distinguished the art to ask questions and find correct answers. ‘It is already a great and necessary proof of cleverness or insight to know what one should reasonably ask. For if the question is absurd in itself and demands unnecessary answers, then, besides the embarrassment of the one who proposes it, it also has the disadvantage of misleading the incautious listener into absurd answers, and presenting the ridiculous sight (as the ancients said) of one person milking a billy-goat while the other holds a sieve underneath’ (Kant 1998).

### 3.2. Kant’s classification of questions and problems of education

Kant’s ideas on the place of questions in the structure of education are of interest not only as ideas formulated by a great thinker but also as conclusions drawn from his experience as an educator. It is difficult to separate Kant the thinker from Kant the teacher. Therefore, it is important to consider Kant’s classification of questions. Since he did not dedicate a separate work to this problem, it would be more accurate to speak not of Kant’s ideas but, as Fichte put it, of ‘what people heave read into him’ (Fichte 1982).

Kant’s works contain two types of questions – global or metaphysical and educational or pedagogical ones. This distinction is crucial since Kant approaches the two types of questions differently. The former should be strictly limited and regulated. The latter – derivatives of the metaphysical questions – do not have limitations and they are defined only by the proficiency and goals of teachers and the abilities of students.

What does each group of questions represent?

Kant analysed metaphysical questions through solving the problem of scientific knowledge and identifying the sources of different types of knowledge (mathematics, theoretical science, and metaphysics). This problem could not be solved without imposing limitations on possible questions. Otherwise, formulating metaphysical questions would turn into an endless process. According to Kant, obtaining true objective knowledge is possible only through imposing limitations on reason or a conscious restriction of cognition. This thought is expressed in Kant’s
famous phrase, 'I had to deny (aufheben) knowledge to make room for faith' (Kant 1998). Kant deemed it necessary to begin with imposing limitations on admissible questions. The very first phrase of his preface to the first edition of the *Critique of Pure Reason* revealed his attitude to the problem. Kant wrote, ‘Human reason has the peculiar fate in one species of its cognitions that it is burdened with questions which it cannot dismiss, since they are given to it as problems by the nature of reason itself, but which it also cannot answer, since they transcend every capacity of human reason’ (Kant 1998).

These questions never end. Nor does the process of cognition. Therefore, the principles have a function of limiting possible questions of the reason. Metaphysics – a product of the *Critique of Pure Reason* – should rule out questions that have no bearing on the selected field of knowledge. It should create conditions for the culture of reason. According to Kant, such basis is sufficient for Socratic nurturing of the mind. ‘For Socrates, who called himself the midwife of his listeners’ knowledge, gives in his dialogues, which Plato has preserved for us faithfully, examples of how even in the case of old people, one can bring forth a good deal from their own reason’ (Kant 2007). Limitations on metaphysical questions will help to plot the trajectory of science. They will prevent a return to dogmatic metaphysics and the losses of the speculative mind. Such limitations will break the uncontrolled monopoly of the schools of the past.

Kant was not evading questions of human reason. However, the principles that he introduced had to deliver reason from traditionally expected answers and limit ‘dogmatically enthusiastic lust for knowledge’, which could only be satisfied ‘through magical powers’. Kant defined possible questions based on the principles he had introduced.

Kant believed that his efforts would lead to creating an ‘inventory of all we possess through pure reason, ordered systematically’, which could be used to obtain knowledge in ‘a didactic manner’, i.e. with the help of schools and the education system. This way Kant described a possible transition from metaphysical to educational problems.

According to Kant, the didactic manner of obtaining knowledge is determined by the fact that ‘reason has insight only into what it itself produces according to its own design, making nature answer their questions’. The one who asks acts ‘Not like a pupil, who has recited to him whatever the teacher wants to say, but like an appointed judge who compels witnesses to answer the questions he puts to them’ (Kant 1998).

Kant analysed metaphysical questions in the context of the problems of pure reason and educational, methodological questions in the context of practical reason. In the *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant only outlined his approach to this type of questions. He wrote about the need to create a ‘moral catechism’ (Kant 2015) in the form of questions followed by answers. Kant focused on the issue in a work that developed the ideas of the *Critique of Pure Reason* – the *Metaphysics of Morals*. He did not consider a person’s moral condition and virtue as innate. Kant believed that virtue could and had to be learned. He identified the problems of education, which were analysed in the second part of the ‘Doctrine of the methods of ethics’. Kant discussed methods in other works, particularly, in ‘Logic. A Manual for Lectures’ and in ‘Lectures on Pedagogy’.

What methods of teaching did Kant, identify? He distinguished between two principal methods of teaching. The first one is based on a monologue. This is the acroamatic method aimed at listening. The acroamatic method is a necessary method but it is used in combination with other ones. It prepares the ground for the erotematic method – the question/answer procedure, further divided into catechistic and dialogical or Socratic methods (Sorina 2017).

The catechistic method is meant for inexperienced pupils and aimed at their memory. This method is suitable for mastering the principles of moral and duty. The notion of ‘catechesis’ is associated primarily with teaching religion. However, Kant believed that the moral catechism should precede the religious one. ‘A transition from the doctrine of virtue to religion can be made, since otherwise the professions of religion would be impure’ (Kant 1996b). Moral categories should be defined according to the didactic rules.
The catechistic method is necessary at the stage when a partnership is impossible since ‘the pupil has no idea what questions to ask; and so the teacher alone does the questioning’ (Kant 1996b). Pupils should be taught to ask questions relating to a specific field of knowledge. Until they learn it, the teacher must ask questions to draw answers ‘from the pupil’s reason’. Even the wording of these answers cannot be changed, thus they must be ‘committed to the pupil’s memory’. Kant called this ‘mechanical catechism’.

Kant distinguished between the catechistic and the dogmatic method, where the teacher expounds alone. The advantage of this method over the acroamatic one is especially pronounced when it is approaching the dialogical method. A dialogue does not only train one’s memory but also nurtures the mind. The answers are not predetermined, although the teacher still holds the initiative. In such a case, the pupil has a certain freedom of choice. Thus, the mechanical catechistic method is approaching a dialogue and partnership. This is very important for Kant who believed that ‘the Socratic method should be the rule for the catechetical method’ (Kant 2007).

The Socratic method can be used to prove the ignorance of one’s opponents and dismiss their objections against morals and religion. Kant emphasized that he had used this method to construct his *Critique of Pure Reason* (Kant 1998). However, this does not reveal the key characteristics of the Socratic method in the process of instruction. This method is aimed at the pupil’s reason. It creates conditions for a cooperative search for answers. In this case, the relations between the teacher and the pupil become a partnership, since any dialogue requires addressing each other. 'For, if the teacher wants to question his pupil’s reason he must do this in a dialogue in which teacher and pupil question and answer each other in turn. (Kant 1996b) Not only the dialogical method requires the teacher to ask questions to take the pupil to the correct answer but also the inverse process takes place. Pupils become aware of their ability to think. Teachers perfect their art of asking questions. According to Kant, the dialogical method helps to develop the creative abilities of both participants in the dialogue. This method of instruction does not only give the correct answer – it consists of several stages and requires preliminary judgements leading to the correct chain of reasoning. According to Kant, these are the major advantages of the dialogical method. Unfortunately, these considerations were not always taken into account in the times of Kant, nor are they taken today, when multiple-choice thinking is becoming a common thing across the globe.

Although Kant distinguished between metaphysical and pedagogical problems, he sometimes had to consider them jointly. However, when he did, he was not understood properly. This happened with the *Critique of Pure Reason*. The aspiration to be understood properly made Kant expound his ideas for a general audience in the *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*. Certain changes were made to the manner of presentation. In the *Prolegomena*, Kant emphasised that he was writing that book not for pupils but for teachers. It had to become the foundation of science. Nevertheless, the introduction of questions into the text predetermined the train of thought of the reader/pupil/teacher.

Both Kant’s epistemology and his system of teaching paid significant attention to the tools of cognition. When analysing Kant’s deliberations on the methods of teaching, one comes to the conclusion that classical dialogue-based instruction is just as effective in the 21st century as it was in the 18th. The acroamatic, dogmatic system, which suggests mechanical catechistic instruction, has produced today’s system of drilling for exams.

### 3.3. Kant’s philosophy of education and logic

Kant’s model of the philosophy of education suggests the need to return different types of questions and the equal dialogue to all levels of education. This will contribute to the development of people who could constitute Kant’s ‘class of thinkers’ because, according to Kant, the dialogue method of instruction is one of the conditions for raising the ‘class of thinkers’.
Understanding Kant’s ideas of philosophy of education requires understanding Kant’s theoretical philosophy, as well as an insight into the effect of his pedagogical practice – particularly, that in teaching logic – on the development and the language of Kant’s philosophy.

In Kant’s philosophy of education, the interpretation of questions as instruments of the education and cognition systems is determined by his approach to logic.

As a tool for analysis and a model for reasoning suitable for any intellectual sphere, including the education system, logic is omnipresent in Kant’s deliberations. Sometimes he speaks of logic explicitly and sometimes one has to ‘read into him’. ‘Reading into Kant’ can be accomplished by a comparison of Kant’s major texts on logic with the other texts of the philosopher. Kant’s lectures on logic can be used to identify his logical ideas.

Publishing lecture courses has become a rule in the academic community. This can be easily explained. Everyone, who plans lectures in detail without writing them down, knows that communicating with the audience can lead to most unexpected turns. In most cases, these turns will fit in the general concept of the course and the topic of the lecture. However, such a lecture will be a text that is generated in the process of articulation.

Modern technology makes it possible to record all the possible turns of a lecture. The next stage is editing the lecture transcript. An oral text is transformed into the written one, which will be presented to the audience. Despite the precision of recording technology and editing performed by authors themselves, the final written result will differ from the initial oral text. This circumstance could not but affect the analytical approach to texts.

Kant needs analysis to describe the system of education in its anthropological aspect, which is crucial for understanding his philosophy of education and the role of logic in instruction.

For Kant, it is obvious that the systems of instruction and education are logic-oriented. Without such a system of instruction, the pupil will only be able to use the thoughts of others. Kant believed that the lack of logic in instruction could explain why ‘one not infrequently comes across men of learning (strictly speaking, people who have pursued courses of study) who display little understanding. It is for this reason, too, that the academies send more people out into the world with their heads full of inanities than any other public institution’ (Kant 1992a).

Kant emphasised the necessity for training in logic. For Kant, such training can expedite the development of one’s understanding by ‘exercising it in empirical judgements’. From Kant’s point of view, this is important ‘for both school and life’ since the pupil ‘will have grown more experienced and become more clever’ (Kant 1992a).

In the above-mentioned ‘Announcement’ dedicated to the problems of studying logic, Kant, Informs his future students of his understanding of the essence of logic and the particularities of teaching this subject. It seems important that Kant had published that work sixteen years before the first edition of the Critique of Pure Reason saw the light of day. In the Critique, Kant, Introduced hid ideas on creating a new type of logic, which he called transcendental. However, it seems that the distinction between the two types of logic was first outlined by Kant, In the ‘Announcement’, although he did not distinguish between them explicitly in that work.

The first type of logic is ‘a critique and canon of sound understanding’ (Kant’s italics), whereas sound understanding ‘on the one hand, borders on crude concepts and ignorance, and, on the other, it borders on science and learning’. According to Kant, this kind of logic should precede acquaintance with any other science. In this context, logic is ‘so to speak, a quarantine (if the expression be permitted) which must be observed by the apprentice who wishes to migrate from the land of prejudice and error, and enter the realm of a more enlightened reason and the science’ ((Kant 1996b), our italics).

The second kind of logic is also a critique. However, it is not a mere critique of sound understanding but ‘the critique of real learning’ (Kant’s italics). It is an instrument of concrete sciences, which helps to master and improve them. According to Kant, this logic should be studied after concrete sciences. However, ‘the teacher must, of course, be in possession of the organon (our italics) before he presents his account of the science in question’(Kant 1992a).
This type of logic is a field of knowledge that is first transmitted empirically from the teacher to the student and is later embraced by each pupil. According to Kant, logic is a science that has both theoretical and practical applications. The ‘Announcement’ – which, due to some mysterious reasons, has been studied by few Kant scholars – provides an interesting definition of the science of logic, which is called ‘complete logic’. This ‘complete logic’ is ‘the critique and the canon of the whole of philosophy in its entirety’ ((Kant 1992a), our italics). According to Kant, only such a logic ‘enables us to draw up a precise ground plan, on the basis of which an edifice of reason, which is permanent in duration and regular in structure, can be erected’ (Kant 1992a). It is difficult to overestimate the significance of critique for Kant’s philosophy. It underlies his Critiques, which largely predetermined the development of the philosophical thought and the philosophical language of the following centuries. Kant’s ‘complete logic’ was the touchstone of the Critique of Pure Reason. He postulated the development of logic as an example to be followed by all other sciences.

For instance, in the preface to the second edition of the Critique of Pure Reason, he stressed the need to evaluate the development of knowledge in any field by the results obtained, which is a pragmatic and quite contemporary approach. A sustainable path of development requires an opportunity ‘to give up as futile much of what was included in the end previously formed without deliberation’. Kant believed that logic had ‘travelled this secure course’ from the antiquity (Kant 1998). In one of his major works, Kant postulates logic as the touchstone of all other sciences and a solution to the problems of instruction. In both cases, logic should serve as the canon.

Methods of teaching are a central problem for Kant. He addresses it in many of his works. In particular, Kant explains the need for publishing the ‘Announcement’ as follows, ‘I thought it necessary to say something in this connection in order to explain my method, where I have now found it opportune to make some alterations ((Kant 1992a), our italics). In the ‘False Subtlety of the Four Syllogistic Figures’, Kant stressed that it had been inspired by methodological problems, ‘My intention is simply to explain why, in my course on logic – where I am not permitted to arrange everything in accordance with my own understanding of these things but am often obliged to defer to the prevailing taste – I treat these matters (syllogisms – GS and IG) only briefly, so as to devote the time thus saved to the genuine enlargement of useful knowledge’ ((Kant 1992a), our italics).

3.4. The ‘theoretical charge’ of deliberations on education

The ‘theoretical charge’ of Kant’s methodological deliberations is not random, nor is the extent of conclusions drawn from this ‘charge’. A combination of ‘pure science’ and pedagogical deliberations has often led to significant discoveries. It suffices to remember that made by Dmitry Mendeleev, which was largely a result of his search for an effective way to present the material to students.

Such examples are numerous. One can begin with Aristotle, since ‘Aristotle’s works constitute a corpus of lectures that he delivered to his students at different times. The final editions of these works were often produced by his students, who collated Aristotle’s texts dating back to different periods’ (Popov and Styazhkin 1974). However, any new example will be just another demonstration of the connection between methodological and theoretical problems and between the discussion on the methods of teaching in a concrete discipline and the philosophy of education.

A comparison between Kant’s texts on logic and his texts on critical philosophy shows that his deliberations on the course in logic are ‘scattered’ throughout Kant’s works. The language of Kant’s logic has a significant effect on the language of his theoretical philosophy. Kant provided a theoretical framework for his methodological ideas, which made it possible to obtain new theoretical results.

Kant’s lectures on logic, which he viewed as a ‘germ of his own critical philosophy’, have been
examined by the Kant scholar Norbert Hinske (1998). The lectures on logic created the foundation for Kant’s philosophy of education.

A comparative analysis of Kant’s methodological and theoretical texts shows that a consistent and thorough discussion of methodological problems was necessary to formulate the major problems of cognitive faculties. In his early methodological works, Kant, Identifies structural elements necessary for describing and understanding the process of cognition. Kant emphasises the need to distinguish between

- representations relating to differentiating things and recognising the difference between them;
- the ability to ‘differentiate logically’ and ‘differentiate physically’ (Kant 1992b).

4. Discussion

All the above suggests that, in the framework of a lecture course, the methodological and theoretical discussion of the problems of knowledge became a tool for obtaining theoretical results and developing the language of theory. Such a language was also meant for discussing the problems of human cognition and the characteristics of the field ‘currently referred to as philosophy of education’ (Bryushinkin 2005).

5. Conclusions

Our gratitude to the person, who introduced us to and encouraged to develop the ideas known under the term ‘logical Kant studies’, can be expressed only as an In Memoriam tribute to our dear friend and colleague Prof Vladimir Bryushinkin. He conceived the idea of a workshop on logical Kant studies, which was a permanent event from 1997 to 2007. For us, that workshop was an opportunity to meet and converse with such outstanding Kant scholars as A. Wood, P. J. Rossi, G. Geismann, and others. We are deeply grateful to them for the opportunity to hold a dialogue ‘here and now’ rather than ‘through centuries’.
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