

WHAT ARE THE MODERN CLASSICS? THE BARUCH POLL OF GREAT PHILOSOPHY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

DOUGLAS P. LACKEY

The millennial frenzy that generated several highly publicized “Best of the Century” lists early in 1999 planted in my mind the idea of conducting a poll asking my fellow philosophers to name the best works of philosophy in the twentieth century.

I approached the project with some trepidation. The polls that had bounced around in the media in early 1999 had something crazed about them. “Hiroshima Voted Top News Event Of The Twentieth Century,” for example: what could one possibly do with such information? Furthermore, even polls that might have some use—the book and movie and musical recording lists that might guide one’s choice of casual entertainment—had in some cases gotten silly results with silly methods. Thus, we have a “top 100 American movies” list without a single film by Buster Keaton, a “top 100 novels” list produced by Random House in which Random House books were listed first when the experts tied, and so forth.

All “best of” polls are afflicted with nearly insuperable problems of method and commensurability. The possibility of producing something silly in designing a philosophy poll loomed large. Perhaps asking philosophers to name their favorite books would be like asking mathematicians to name their favorite integers. Nevertheless, there is nothing *prima facie* absurd in asking philosophers to discriminate between important books and unimportant books. Every teacher does this in designing a syllabus for a course. And even if there is no sense in claiming that a poll of great books tells us what the great books are, at least it will tell us what they are believed to be. This is something I thought it would be fun to know.

The goal decided, the question was how to do it. The polls so far had appealed to panels of experts; I was determined not to go that route. There is of course the regress problem: you need an expert to pick the experts. But there is the more

significant fact that if you poll a few philosophy experts you learn only about the experts. If you poll a larger and more representative group you learn something about the state of the philosophy profession, which is sociologically more interesting.

Using the Philosophers' Email Directory, we mailed our questionnaire to 5,000 teachers of philosophy. About 1,000 emails bounced back for mis-typed or obsolete addresses, 4,000 reached their targets. We received 414 survey replies, a healthy response rate of better than 10%. Since there are about 10,000 teachers of philosophy in North America, we had replies from 4% of the entire profession. At a confidence level of 80%, the survey has an error rate of plus or minus 3%, assuming that we reached a demographically representative group. We have no reason to believe that we did not. The email addresses in the Directory are haphazardly assigned, usually by schools to professors' offices, and we can detect no significant demographic differences between randomly selected groups of philosophy professors on the list and off the list. The email directory contains a nice mix of large and small, secular and religious, United States and Canadian schools. Assignment of emails across the continent does not break along gender lines or according to specialties. The 4,000 emails were scattered; the 414 replies were scattered.

We asked respondents to name the five most important books in philosophy in the twentieth century, and also the five most important articles. Giving five choices permits discretion, but five is a small enough number to force voters to choose their selections carefully. Since we were interested in judgments of quality, we instructed respondents to make their choices on the basis of intrinsic merit, not on the basis of causal influence. (By the causal influence standard, *Mein Kampf* might be the most important book of the twentieth century.) We received a small number of return letters that found the distinction between "important" and "influential" confusing. In our follow-up letter we explained, "if you think that a book that has influenced many is trash, don't list it."

There were some replies indicative of strategic voting. Some respondents, for example, listed only books in continental philosophy, perhaps because they felt that only continental philosophy books were important, but more likely because they wanted to see continental philosophy well represented in the results. The rate of strategic voting, however, was too low to affect the basic results. The commonest strategic ballots were those listing books in ethics, in feminist philosophy, in environmental ethics, and in Asian philosophy. Apparently these fields a contain an unusual number of persons who feel that the profession at large has underrated the importance of their specialty.

We asked respondents to list their choices in order of preference. On this score we had little compliance: some persons listed only one book; some wrote "in no particular order" or "in alphabetical order." We decided not to use any

point system for weighting the results according to preference. We did keep track, however, of which book was listed first on each ballot, and use that indication to break ties.

Only 25 books were cited on 11 or more ballots. The number to the left of the title indicates total citations. The number to the right indicates the number of ballots listing the book first.

Here are the top 25, by frequency of citation:

- 1) 179 Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* [68]
- 2) 134 Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time* [51]
- 3) 131 John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* [21]
- 4) 77 Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* [24]
- 5) 64 Bertrand Russell and A. N. Whitehead, *Principia Mathematica* [27]
- 6) 63 W. V. O. Quine, *Word and Object* [7]
- 7) 56 Saul Kripke, *Naming and Necessity* [5]
- 8) 51 Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* [3]
- 9) 38 Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness* [4]
- 10) 34 A. N. Whitehead, *Process and Reality* [16]
- 11) 30 A. J. Ayer, *Language, Truth, and Logic* [4]
- 12) 25 John Dewey, *Experience and Nature* [5]
- 13) 23 Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception* [0]
- 14) 19 G. E. Moore, *Principia Ethica* [0]
- 15) 18 William James, *Pragmatism* [1]
- 18 Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* [1]
- 17) 17 Edmund Husserl, *Logical Investigations* [9]
- 18) 17 Edmund Husserl, *Ideas* [5]
- 19) 17 Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* [2]
- 20) 14 H. L. A. Hart, *The Concept of Law* [2]
- 21) 14 Gilbert Ryle, *The Concept of Mind* [0]
- 22) 13 Nelson Goodman, *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast* [1]
- 23) 12 Hans Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* [3]
- 24) 12 Derek Parfit, *Reasons and Persons* [2]
- 25) 11 Bertrand Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy* [5]
- 11 W. V. O. Quine, *From a Logical Point of View* [2]
- 11 Karl Popper, *Logic of Scientific Discovery* [2]

The immediate, indisputable, and unexpected result is that there is a runaway winner in first place. Wittgenstein's *Investigations* was cited far more frequently than any other book and was listed first on more ballots than any other book. The *Investigations* was cited by persons whose other selections were all logic

books, by persons whose other selections were all phenomenology books, by persons whose other selections were all Asian books. It is the one crossover masterpiece in twentieth-century philosophy, appealing across diverse specializations and philosophical orientations. At the same time, it was only cited on 43% of all ballots. There is, apparently, no book that a majority of American and Canadian philosophers will put on a short list of five.

Heidegger's *Being and Time* edged out Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* for second place. But 51 persons cited *Being and Time* as the outstanding philosophy book of the twentieth century, while only 21 cited *A Theory of Justice* first. Rawls is admired; Heidegger is adored. Almost every ballot that listed any work of continental philosophy listed Heidegger. At the same time, a certain number of analytically oriented ballots also cited Heidegger in the top 5. One had the impression, reviewing the ballots, that some people were voting for Heidegger, not because they shared his interests, theses, or methods, but because they recognized in *Being and Time* the workings of an original and subtle philosophical mind.

The appearance of Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* as a close third is perhaps the single most surprising result of the survey. It is the only work of political philosophy in the top 25 and the only work of ethics in the top 10. According to our respondents, Rawls's book is the preeminent work in ethics from the last half of the twentieth century; Moore's *Principia Ethica* (#14) is the preeminent book from the first half. The strength of support for *A Theory of Justice* is remarkable. The gap between Rawls and the next book down is large; there is no close fourth. We are now nearly 30 years past the publication of *A Theory of Justice*, and its popularity can no longer be attributed to some 1960s (or 1950s) zeitgeist. If American and Canadian teachers of philosophy could send only three books from the twentieth century into the twenty-first, Rawls's *Theory of Justice* would be one of them. One wonders whether there would be a corresponding result from a poll of philosophy teachers in Europe.

Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* is a solid fourth; indeed, 24 voters considered the *Tractatus* the outstanding philosophical work of the twentieth century. Wittgenstein has two books in the top 5; only two other philosophers, Husserl and Quine, have two books in the top 25. Russell and Whitehead have a book each, plus the work they coauthored.

Russell and Whitehead's *Principia Mathematica* is fifth in total citations but a surprising third in first-place votes. No other work of formal philosophy shows up in the top 30 books; neither does any other book devoted to the foundations of mathematics. *Principia* is the earliest work in the top 10, and its monumental scale is more reminiscent of nineteenth-century scientific treatises, like Maxwell's, than of twentieth-century scientific publications. After *Principia*, research in logic and foundations of mathematics shifted overwhelmingly from

books to articles, and no consolidation on this scale, with perhaps the exception of Quine's *Mathematical Logic*, has been attempted. But the ballots that list *Principia* did not cite Quine's *ML*.

The work of Quine that was mentioned most often is *Word and Object*, which statistically tied with *Principia Mathematica* but was listed first 7 times compared with *Principia*'s 27. Of all the philosophers on the list, Quine is perhaps the one least likely to object to being beaten out by *Principia Mathematica*! One virtue of the poll is to indicate, for philosophers who have authored several prominent books, whether one work is considered particularly more important than the rest. Of all Dewey's books, respondents converged on *Experience and Nature*; of all Russell's books, they liked *The Problems of Philosophy*; for Quine, it was *Word and Object*.

Word and Object abjures modality; Kripke's *Naming and Necessity* revels in it. If we consider that Rawls's basic idea for his theory of justice goes back to 1958, the ideas of *Naming and Necessity*, presented orally in 1970, are the greenest among the top 10 books. Even so, they are three decades old.

In the top 10, there are no books from the 1980s or the 1990s; in the top 25, there are two from the 1980s and none from the 1990s. Does this show that voters are reluctant to identify recent books as classics, or that there have been no classics like *Naming and Necessity* written in the last 30 years? Kripke is now in his late fifties, yet he is the youngest author on the top 10 list; indeed, there is only one baby boomer in the top 25. According to our respondents, there has not been another Kripke—since Kripke.

Kuhn's *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* is a surprising eighth on the list, since many might classify *Structure* more as a work of history than of philosophy. *Structure* is one of only three books in the philosophy of science to break into the top 25, and only one of two (the other is *After Virtue*) to identify a subject with its history.

Kuhn has repeatedly stated that he is not a Kuhnian, and the more relativistic offshoots in the Kuhnian mode—books by Feyerabend and Hanson, for example—did not draw anything like the votes pulled in by *Structure*. Likewise, there was little support among respondents for relativism of the type found in Goodman's *Ways of Worldmaking*. Some of the support for *Structure* seemed to come from persons who have a pessimistic view of reason and science. There are many ballots that link up Heidegger, Sartre, Kuhn, and the Wittgenstein of the *Investigations* as a kind of irrationalist group. Conversely there are many ballots that link Russell, Quine, Kripke, and the Wittgenstein of the *Tractatus* as a kind of rationalist group.

Sartre's *Being and Nothingness* is ninth on the list. Considering the decline of Sartre's reputation among the French intelligentsia, various revelations of Sartre's unpleasant personal behavior, and the interest among feminists in

assigning some fraction of his work to Simone de Beauvoir, the position of *Being and Nothingness* in the first ten is a mild surprise.

Being and Nothingness is the only book in the top 10 written in French. Of the top 25, seven were written in German, three in French, and one—*Principia*—in no human language. The other fourteen are in English. A poll of German philosophers or French philosophers would certainly alter these proportions, but it does appear that the vast majority of teachers of philosophy in the United States and Europe consider philosophy a game played in three languages, English, French, and German, perhaps with some symbolic logic thrown in. Substantial twentieth-century works of philosophy written in languages such as Italian, Spanish, Polish, Russian, or Japanese simply do not register on the scales, at least until they get translated into the three primary tongues.

Whitehead's *Process and Reality* is tenth according to total citations but sixth highest in first-place votes. Nearly half the people who listed *Process* at all listed it as the greatest philosophy book of the twentieth century: the book is to some degree a cult object. Yet for all its esoteric status, it is the one book on the top 10 that harks back to the comprehensive works of Plato and Aristotle and Kant and Hegel: the grand metaphysical maps of former ages.

Process in its remarkable closing pages is also the only book on the top 25 that presents innovative work in theology. (The other metaphysical map in the top 25, Dewey's *Experience and Nature*, professes a determined naturalism that contributes little to the philosophy of religion.) The absence of direct comment on the divine in the top 25 indicates something about the philosophical orientation of the century and exhibits a striking change from previous periods, in which the relation between the temporal and the eternal, reason and faith, nature and God, finite and infinite, provided a major theme of philosophical work. Of the top 10 works, four are focused on the relation between language and the world (*Philosophical Investigations*, *Tractatus*, *Word and Object*, and *Naming and Necessity*), three are focused on human life and human arrangements (*Being and Time*, *A Theory of Justice*, and *Being and Nothingness*), and two are focused on the analysis of human achievements in mathematics and science (*Principia Mathematica*, *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*). Only Whitehead gives us an old-style direct assault on the absolute.

Those who think that positivism is long, long dead may be surprised to see *Language, Truth, and Logic* in firm eleventh place. Most Ayer ballots were hard-core analytic sets of five, though a few broad-minded souls listed both Ayer and Heidegger. None of the other positivists did nearly so well, but Carnap's *Logische Aufbau der Welt* pulled in nine votes, including one first-place ballot, and Hempel's *Aspects of Scientific Explanation* pulled in four. Other positivist works did relatively well in the poll of articles.

The fact that Dewey's *Experience and Nature* placed twelfth shows that Dewey's immense contributions to philosophy are happily not forgotten; indeed, more books by Dewey were cited by respondents than any other single philosopher save Russell. Dewey scored slightly higher on the poll than William James, whose *Pragmatism* placed fifteenth. James's performance on the poll may have been affected by the tendency of some respondents to consider James a nineteenth-century philosopher, even though some of James's most important books were published well into the twentieth century.

James's *World of Pure Experience*, for example, was published seven years later than G. E. Moore's *Principia Ethica*, which is fourteenth on the overall list. Moore's *Principia Ethica* is the oldest classic in the top 25 and, after Rawls, the highest ranked book in ethics. Moore's book has gone from being the surrogate Bible of the Bloomsbury set to the canonical rebuttal of ethical naturalism to an interesting forerunner of supervenience theory. One wonders how the next century will construe it.

The thirteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth books are classics of the phenomenological school, Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception*, Husserl's *Logical Investigations*, and Husserl's *Ideas*. The *Phenomenology of Perception* was strongly supported, but votes for other books by the French phenomenologist were scarce, though *Signs* and *The Visible and the Invisible* picked up a few. Husserl's two masterpieces were jointly listed on many ballots, but in most cases the *Logical Investigations* was listed ahead of *Ideas*. One could see from the ballots that Husserl's books are still terra incognita to most analytical philosophers, despite Findlay's superb translation of the *Logical Investigations* and despite the relevance of Husserl's early work on intentionality to current work in the philosophy of mind. Other works of Husserl also received some votes, particularly *The Crisis of the European Sciences*.

Alasdair MacIntyre's *After Virtue* (#16) was one of four books on ethics to make the top 25. Three other MacIntyre books pulled in votes: *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?*, *Against the Self Image of the Age*, and *Three Rival Forms of Moral Inquiry*. The MacIntyre orthodox juggernaut promises to be a powerful force in ethics well into the next century, and it was not surprising to find ballots that listed MacIntyre along with Gilson, Lonergan, Maritain, and other Catholic lights. We found no ballots that linked MacIntyre with works in the Theology of Liberation.

At #19 we find the first book by a female philosopher and the first book devoted to the experience of women, de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*. Though there is no doubt that *The Second Sex* is an enduring classic, the ballots listing this book proved to be a bit of a puzzle. Some ballots listed *The Second Sex* along with other standard classics, particularly *Being and Nothingness*. But many ballots that listed *The Second Sex* contained only books by female authors,

often titles mentioned on no other ballots. What seems to emerge from this is that some think *The Second Sex* is a philosophic classic, many think it is the most important twentieth-century book devoted to feminist issues, and some believe it is the obvious first choice for a new philosophical canon that overthrows the existing, male-dominated list.

Two books by dominant postwar British philosophers, H. L. A. Hart's *Concept of Law* and Gilbert Ryle's *Concept of Mind*, are side by side at #20 and #21. (Remember when philosophy consisted of "the analysis of concepts"?) No other book in the philosophy of law garnered much support, though one voter put down five books by L. Ron Fuller. No other book in the philosophy of mind did anywhere near as well as Ryle's, though the field was strongly represented in the poll of articles.

Two stellar works in the philosophy of science, Goodman's *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast* and Popper's *Logic of Scientific Discovery*, placed at #23 and #25. If we had done a citation search for mentions of books in philosophy journal articles, I suspect that these two books would be near the top in influence on twentieth-century philosophical work. Their ideas are coin of the realm: witness one voter who put down "The Grue Book" as the title of Goodman's work. Other Popper titles drawing votes included *The Open Society and Conjectures and Refutations*; other Goodman titles drawing votes included *Ways of World-making* and *Languages of Art*, the sole book in aesthetics to make a showing in our poll.

Popper's *Logic of Scientific Discovery* shares twenty-fifth place with Quine's *From a Logical Point of View* and Russell's *The Problems of Philosophy*. Quine's book reprints his two most influential essays, "On What There Is" and "Two Dogmas of Empiricism." The voters for Russell's *Problems* included five persons who listed it as *the* outstanding book in philosophy of the twentieth century. They do not agree (nor do I) with Santayana's deflationary retitling of Russell's book: "Some Problems Recently Agitated by Russell and Moore."

Hans Georg Gadamer's *Truth and Method* (#23) made the top 25 despite its unfamiliarity among American analytical philosophers. There are 23 different authors in the top 25, and 5 of these, Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Husserl, and Gadamer, use phenomenological and hermeneutic methods associated with "continental philosophy." The percentage of continental practitioners among the top authors seems to be higher than the percentage of continentalists in American and Canadian philosophy departments.

Finally at #24 we have Derek Parfit's *Reasons and Persons*, published in 1984 and the newest book in the top 25. Parfit has a unique genius for the invention of counterexamples, and who could dislike an author who admits that the Buddha had his ideas first? *Reasons and Persons* is perhaps the deepest probe into normative ethics since Sidgwick. Given the steady advance of ethics in the curricula

of American universities, it is fitting that the most recent book in the top 25 should be in this field.

We turn now to the balloting for articles. Many voters were hard pressed to list five, and so the total number of citations per title is down, so much so that many of the differences in ranking are statistically insignificant. Nevertheless, at the top there are statistically significant differences between ranks, and certainly one can distinguish statistically between articles at the top end from articles at the bottom. Here are the top 23 articles:

- 1) 131 Quine, "Two Dogmas of Empiricism"
 - 2) 85 Russell, "On Denoting"
 - 3) 40 Godel, "On Formally Undecidable Propositions of Principia Mathematica and Other Systems"
 - 4) 39 Tarski, "The Concept of Truth"
 - 5) 37 Sellars, "Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind"
 - 6) 26 Gettier, "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?"
 - 7) 22 Putnam, "The Meaning of Meaning"
 - 22 Thomson, "A Defense of Abortion"
 - 9) 20 Kripke, "Naming and Necessity"
 - 10) 18 Moore, "A Defense of Common Sense"
 - 11) 17 Anscombe, "Modern Moral Philosophy"
 - 17 Rawls, "Justice as Fairness"
 - 13) 16 Nagel, "What Is It Like to Be a Bat?"
 - 16 Sartre, "Existentialism Is a Humanism"
 - 15) 14 Austin, "A Plea for Excuses"
 - 14 Quine, "On What There Is"
 - 17) 10 Rawls, "Two Concepts of Rules"
 - 10 Davidson, "The Very Idea of a Conceptual Scheme"
 - 19) 11 Moore, "A Refutation of Idealism"
 - 20) 9 Davidson, "Truth and Meaning"
 - 9 Grice, "Logic and Conversation"
 - 9 Strawson, "Freedom and Resentment"
 - 23) 8 Kripke, "Semantical Considerations on Modal Logic"
- (There are five articles with seven citations each.)

Once again, the most statistically solid result of the poll is that there is a runaway first-place winner, Quine's "Two Dogmas of Empiricism." When Quine read this paper before the American Philosophical Association in Toronto in December 1950, Arnold Isenberg, Quine's classmate and my first philosophy teacher, rose to his feet, gasped "But Van . . . , " keeled over, and was rushed to hospital. (He was later diagnosed with a bleeding ulcer.) In one stroke, or rather

two strokes, Quine liberated American philosophy from the Vienna Circle and from British Empiricism, reconnecting professional American philosophy with its pragmatist roots. This was a declaration of independence for which we are all grateful. But we have been left for fifty years with Rorty's question, "How can we do analytical philosophy without a concept of analytic truth?" For some the answer has been "you can't." Perhaps that is why so many of us are doing ethics.

Russell's 1905 *Mind* article, "On Denoting," is an solid but surprising second. (The surprise is that it was not first.) The effects of Russell's article are legion; it showed how philosophy at the highest level might be conducted in technical articles in professional journals, rather than through books circulated to the educated public. For an entire century, students have been instructed via Russell in the proper analysis of "The present King of France is bald," and should the monarchy be restored in France, the philosophers of the world will be duty-bound to overthrow it. When one considers certain other physics articles published in the same year as "On Denoting," 1905 emerges as the banner year for the human race.

If any article has had the influence of "On Denoting," it is surely Frege's "On Sense and Reference," published in 1891 and therefore excluded by an arbitrary calendar from inclusion in our best-of-the-century poll. Some ballots included it anyway, and more alert respondents tried to get Frege aboard by listing "The Thought," volume 2 of the *Grundgesetze*, and other early twentieth-century Frege productions, to no avail. We regret that we did not conduct a poll of "100 years of philosophy" back in 1990. "On Sense and Reference" is not in our century, but our century is in its shadow.

Godel's masterpiece (#3) was described a dozen different ways by respondents, most simply as "Godel's Theorem." Published in 1931, it is the only purely formal piece on the list, and it transformed philosophy and mathematics. Oddly, Russell, whose project in *Principia* was thought to have been destroyed by this article, was not particularly unsettled by Godel's incompleteness result. The project, in Russell's view, was already in ruins because of the supplemental axioms required in *Principia*, and Russell was relieved that Godel did not do to him what he had done to Frege, proving a lifetime of work to be inconsistent.

The placement of Tarski in fourth position is a slightly artificial construction. Many respondents simply said "Tarski on truth," which does not distinguish between "The Concept of Truth in Formalized Languages" (1936) and "The Semantic Conception of Truth" (1944). In our view the later article is an informal English presentation of the earlier results published in German, and so we felt justified in combining the tallies together. Those who appreciate Tarski's immense contributions to formal semantics and the theory of truth will not object to this minor sleight of hand.

The strong fifth place for Sellars's "Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind" is perhaps the biggest surprise of the survey of articles. The number of philosophy studies devoted to problems of perception has steadily declined since the days when everyone talked about sense data, and since so much of Sellars's work is devoted to perception and related issues, one might think that the philosophical community had lost interest in it. Apparently the unique verve of Sellarsian analysis continues to be appreciated, and the recent publication of works such as McDowell's *Mind and World* will perhaps swing philosophy back to Sellars's agenda and problems. One good result of the poll might be that some readers conclude: it's time to read Sellars once again.

Gettier's "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?" (#6) is the shortest article on the list but the progenitor of an entire subfield of epistemology. Never have so many owed so much to so few words. To improve the quality of journals, perhaps everyone in philosophy should be restricted to publishing one article in a professional lifetime, and it had better be good. If so, Gettier would be the model.

Putnam's "The Meaning of Meaning" (#7) is the first of six Putnam articles cited by respondents. Each of us has a personal Putnam favorite (mine is "It Ain't Necessarily So"), but the respondents converged to put this article at the top of the Putnam canon. Given the number of citations of this piece in the journal literature, it deserves to be there.

Judith Thomson's "Defense of Abortion" (#8) stands in the articles list as *A Theory of Justice* does in the book list: it is the only ethics entry in the top 10. "A Defense" is the most reprinted article in ethics and perhaps the most reprinted article in twentieth-century philosophy. It demands no more from its readers than simple logical constancy in moral judgments, but that demand in Thomson's hands goes a very long way. The methods of this piece have had many imitators, but how many have shared Thomson's root intuitions about the lack of obligation to give aid is not clear. The article must have had some political effect, as traveling missionaries in the right to life movement are given kits that equip them with answers to Thomson's arguments or arguments in her style.

Kripke's "Naming and Necessity" (#9) appears also on the book list, and we debated how to tabulate this divided vote. We decided not to transfer votes from the articles poll to the book poll, as persons might consider "Naming and Necessity" less competitive against other books as against other articles. If we transferred all the book votes to the article list, we would fail to indicate how well Kripke's opus fared against the heavy competition of classic books. In the end, we chose to leave things as they are. The result is that Kripke joins Quine and Russell as the only authors to appear in the top 10 on both lists, a group of three in which Kripke should feel comfortable.

Moore's "A Defense of Common Sense" at #10 is a bit of a surprise: there are as many people who just don't "get it," both inside philosophy and outside it. As a callow youth I once denigrated this article before J. N. Findlay, an other-worldly metaphysician of the first rank who I thought would be a sympathetic listener. I was rightly blasted for my remarks. The more you read Moore, Findlay growled, the more you discover how extraordinary the ordinary can be.

Anscombe's "Modern Moral Philosophy" (tied at #11) is perhaps the most passionate piece of writing on either list; it was strongly supported by respondents from Catholic schools. Anscombe convinced her readers that philosophers, or at least utilitarian philosophers, corrupt the youth they teach, and many ethics teachers have since wondered whether they have the power. Persons who teach ethics courses by carefully balancing competing arguments on all sides on the issues, and then discover that students conclude "you can prove anything in ethics," may feel that Anscombe was right as long ago as 1958.

The same year that Anscombe published her article repudiating utilitarianism as a guide to personal action, Rawls published his "Justice as Fairness," repudiating utilitarianism as a guide to the design of social institutions, even the rule-utilitarianism sponsored in his earlier classic article, "Two Concepts of Rules" (#17). Anscombe had argued that there were no moral laws without a lawgiver; Rawls argued that the lawgiver was nothing more than right reason, a conclusion not likely to please the religious. Rawls's piece, which left us with maximizing individuals and an optimizing demand directed toward the least advantaged, caught the attention of American social scientists, who found in Rawls someone who spoke their language. The secondary literature on this theory now approaches five thousand articles.

Nagel's "What Is It Like to Be a Bat?" (#13) has assumed legendary status in the philosophy of mind. It sticks in the craw, so to speak, of the new sciences of neurophilosophy and artificial intelligence. Nagel's elegant plea for the irreducibility of subjectivity outdrew Searle's related classic article, "Minds, Brains, and Programs," and the antithetical article by Alan Turing, "Computing Machinery and Intelligence" (6 votes each).

Sartre's "Existentialism Is a Humanism" (tied at #13) has served as the introduction to existentialism for (let us guess) ten million American undergraduates, who remain disturbed that Sartre died without telling them whether Pierre should care for his mother or join the Resistance. Continental philosophy proceeds more via books than articles, and Sartre's piece was the only existentialist article on our list, though eight essays by Heidegger did draw some votes.

Austin's "A Plea for Excuses" (#14) and Grice's "Logic and Conversation" (#20) both exhibit enormous subtlety deployed toward the resolution of difficult philosophical problems. Austin's method of ordinary language analysis, especially its application to the philosophy of mind, has pretty nearly died off, but

one wonders whether the Cognitive Science replacement is doing a better job. Grice's article and its descendants represent a still active program in the philosophy of language.

Quine's "On What There Is" is tied with Austin at #14. The article has been around for over fifty years, and the idea that to be is *to be* the value of a variable is now a working tool that philosophers use without hesitation. When it was published, things were different, especially among systematic metaphysicians. "It's not a theory," said Paul Weiss, "it's a tragedy."

Davidson's "The Very Idea of a Conceptual Scheme" (tied at #17) is the first in a parade of eleven Davidson articles that showed up in our poll, a larger number of articles than from any other philosopher in the twentieth century. "Truth and Meaning," perhaps an even more influential article, weighed in at #20. The old positivist idea of meaning as truth conditions has been elevated by Davidson into a powerful tool of analysis that has attracted a devoted band of adherents sure to keep his ideas alive in the next century.

Moore's "Refutation of Idealism" (#19), published in 1903, is the earliest article on our list. Today its force seems not so much to derive from its "refutation" of absolute idealism, which has been nicely revived in Rescher's hands. What "A Refutation of Idealism" provides is a vivid sense of the strength and complexity of ordinary beliefs, against which a theory will always be (just a) theory. Moore's sense of the foundations has outlived the assault of numerous anti-foundationalisms and the various skepticisms stemming from Unger and others. Perhaps the day will come when it is no longer needed, but that day, according to the respondents, is not yet.

Strawson's "Freedom and Resentment," the fifth and most recent ethics article, is a surprising but elegant choice, though it is a little puzzling that Strawson should end up higher on the article list for an essay on ethics than for any of his work on referring, persons, or descriptive metaphysics. Strawson's effort to bring the emotions into ethical theory has not borne the fruit it should, though he did convince the ethics community that reference to the emotions need not signify a collapse into subjectivism.

Last but not least we have Kripke's seminal paper (or papers—the ballots are vague) on modal logic, which made it possible in philosophy to talk without shame about "possible worlds." If Kripke had not written these pieces, would the course of analysis have been the same, using Hintikka's complete narratives or Montague's sets to do the jobs that Kripke pulled off with possible worlds? Perhaps yes, but probably not, and Quine's ban on modal notions might have remained in place through the 1970s and the 1980s. The effect of this article cannot be overestimated: it gave us, not just theses and arguments, but a language in which to conduct discussions in the decades that followed.

This completes the survey of the survey. Readers may make of it what they will. It was fun, and perhaps it tells us something about the state of philosophy. The results for different titles are often very close, but winners are still winners, at least for a day. On the other hand, if one treats the process as a survey of the profession, close results blur together statistically, and only the larger gaps are meaningful.

No book and no article received a majority of the votes, and many listed titles received a small number of votes. I am not disheartened by this: given the spread of interests among the voters and the number of available choices, that there are pockets of agreement and convergence (on Dewey's *Experience and Nature*, for example) shows something. And beyond any doubt, the survey shows that *Philosophical Investigations*, *Being and Time*, and *A Theory of Justice* are our favorite books, and that "Two Dogmas of Empiricism" and "On Denoting" are our favorite articles.

This survey has involved many hours of work, starting with typing 5,000 email addresses. The labor has been shared with Mr. Steven Pantusco, who stayed late for days without complaint, and who wisely spared me from reading derisive emails until the job was done. I thank him for his help, and now we're off to read Sellars (article #5).

Baruch College, CUNY, U.S.A.

APPENDIX I. BOOKS RECEIVING THREE TO TEN MENTIONS

<i>Ten</i>	Foucault, <i>Discipline and Punish</i> Levinas, <i>Totality and Infinity</i>
<i>Nine</i>	Derrida, <i>Of Grammatology</i> Carnap, <i>The Logical Structure of the World</i> [1]
<i>Eight</i>	Austin, <i>How to Do Things with Words</i> [1] Rorty, <i>Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature</i> Strawson, <i>Individuals</i> [1]
<i>Seven</i>	Husserl, <i>Crisis of the European Sciences</i> [2] Carnap, <i>Logical Syntax of Language</i> [1] D. Lewis, <i>On the Plurality of Worlds</i> [1] Habermas, <i>Theory of Communicative Action</i>
<i>Six</i>	Lonergan, <i>Insight</i> [3] Dewey, <i>The Quest for Certainty</i> Sellars, <i>Science, Perception and Reality</i> Wittgenstein, <i>On Certainty</i>
<i>Five</i>	C. I. Lewis, <i>Mind and the World Order</i> [1] Lovejoy, <i>The Great Chain of Being</i> [1]

CLASSICS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

- Adorno, *Negative Dialectic*
 Buber, *I and Thou*
 Foucault, *The Order of Things*
 MacIntyre, *Three Rival Forms of Moral Inquiry*
 T. Nagel, *The Possibility of Altruism*
 C. Taylor, *Sources of the Self*
 Ross, *The Right and the Good*
- Four
- Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations* [1]
 Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society* [1]
 Plantinga, *The Nature of Necessity* [1]
 T. Nagel, *The View from Nowhere*
 Leopold, *Sand Country Almanac*
 Arendt, *The Human Condition*
 Hempel, *Aspects of Scientific Explanation*
 Singer, *Animal Liberation*
 Gewirth, *Reason and Morality*
 Dummett, *Frege*
- Three
- Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*
 Russell, *Logic and Knowledge* [2]
 Russell, *Lectures on Logical Atomism* [1]
 Russell, *Principles of Mathematics* [1]
 Nussbaum, *The Fragility of Goodness* [1]
 Rorty, *Contingency, Irony, Solidarity* [1]
 de Beauvoir, *The Ethics of Ambiguity*
 Goodman, *Languages of Art*
 Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests*
 Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations*
 Quine, *Ontological Relativity*
 Russell, *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*
 Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*
 Cassirer, *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*
 Strauss, *Natural Right and History*
 Randall, *Making of the Modern Mind*
 Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*
 Davidson, *Essays on Truth and Interpretation*
 Polnyi, *Personal Knowledge*
 Evans, *The Varieties of Reference*
 Putnam, *Reason, Truth, and History*

APPENDIX II: AUTHORS WITH MORE THAN
THREE BOOKS MENTIONED
(and number of titles mentioned)

11	Russell
8	Dewey
6	Wittgenstein
6	Sartre
5	Foucault
5	L. Ron Fuller
4	Husserl
4	James
4	Goodman
4	MacIntyre
4	Popper
4	Whitehead

APPENDIX III: ARTICLES WITH THREE TO SEVEN MENTIONS

<i>Seven</i>	Carnap, "Empiricism, Semantics, and Ontology" Frankfurt, "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person" Austin, "Other Minds" Berlin, "Two Concepts of Liberty" James, "The Will to Believe"
<i>Six</i>	Davidson, "Actions, Reasons, and Causes" Moore, "Proof of an External World" Prichard, "Does Moral Philosophy Rest on a Mistake?" Turing, "Computing Machinery and Intelligence" Searle, "Minds, Brains, and Programs"
<i>Five</i>	Davidson, "Mental Events" Heidegger, "The Essence of Truth" Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology" Scanlon, "Contractualism and Utilitarianism" Stevenson, "The Emotive Significance of Ethical Terms"
<i>Four</i>	Carnap, "Testability and Meaning" Chomsky, "Review of B. F. Skinner's <i>Verbal Behavior</i> " Derrida, "Difference" Heidegger, "The Ontology of the Work of Art" Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism" Hempel, "Studies in the Logic of Scientific Explanation" Levinas, "Philosophy and the Idea of Infinity"

- Murdoch, "The Sovereignty of Good"
 Parfit, "Personal Identity"
 Putnam, "Why There Isn't a Ready-Made World"
 Putnam, "The Mental Life of Some Machines"
 Smart, "Sensations and Brain Processes"
 Taylor, "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man"
Three Cavell, "Must We Mean What We Say?"
 Bouwsma, "Descartes' Evil Genius"
 Chisholm, "The Problem of the Criterion"
 Dewey, "Postulates of Immediate Empiricism"
 Dennett, "Where Am I?"
 Foot, "Moral Beliefs"
 Goldman, "What Is Justified True Belief?"
 Goodman, "The Problem of the Counterfactual Conditional"
 Grice, "Meaning"
 Horkheimer, "Tradition and Critical Theory"
 Husserl, "Philosophy as Strict Science"
 Husserl, "Phenomenology"
 James, "Does Consciousness Exist?"
 Kaplan, "On the Logic of Demonstratives"
 Kripke, "Identity and Necessity"
 Quine, "Ontological Relativity"
 Quine, "Epistemology Naturalized"
 Ramsey, "Truth and Probability"

APPENDIX IV: AUTHORS WITH MORE THAN
 THREE ARTICLES MENTIONED
 (and number of articles mentioned)

- 11 Davidson
 9 Dewey
 9 Quine
 8 Heidegger
 7 Austin
 7 Kripke
 7 D. Lewis
 6 James
 6 Putnam
 6 Russell
 5 Carnap
 5 Foucault

5	Nagel
5	Plantinga
5	Sartre
4	Anscombe
4	Derrida
4	Dummett
4	Moore
4	Rawls
4	Rorty

Modern Classics of Philosophy based on a poll of professional philosophers. Copyright: © All Rights Reserved. The baruch poll of great philosophy in the twentieth century. Douglas p. lackey. Substantial twentieth-century works of philosophy written in languages such as Italian, Spanish, Polish, Russian, or Japanese simply do not register on the scales, at least until they get translated into the three primary tongues. Whitehead's Process and Reality is tenth according to total citations but sixth highest in first-place votes. Nearly half the people who listed Process at all listed it as the greatest philosophy book of the twentieth century: the book is to some degree a cult object.