MOORE'S INFLUENCE ON RUSSELL

In studying the influence of G.E. Moore on Russell's philosophy, an examination of Russell's published references to Moore yields information that is not without value. What follows is a (non-exhaustive) bibliography of such references, and some conclusions drawn therefrom. The references in Russell's articles are from an index in the Archives, which, however, covers only published articles and lists only the first reference to any one publication. The references to Moore in Russell's published philosophical books are taken from their prefaces, introductions and indexes.

1900 The Philosophy of Leibniz. There are no references to Moore in the index. On p. xvi of the preface, Russell gives Moore credit for reading the proofs, revising the Latin translation, and "very valuable suggestions".


1901 On p. 316 of "Is Position in Space and Time Absolute or Relative", Russell refers to Moore's "Necessity" (1900).

1903 The Principles of Mathematics. Seven Moore references in the index. They include this statement in the preface: "On fundamental questions of Philosophy, my position, in all its chief features, is derived from Mr. G.E. Moore" (p. viii in 2nd ed., p. viii in 1st ed.).

1904 On p. 218 of "Meaning's Theory of Complexes and Assumptions", Russell refers to Moore's "Experience and Empiricism" (1903).

1910 Principia Mathematica. No index, no references to Moore in preface.


1912 The Problems of Philosophy. No references in index. On p. 6 of the preface, Russell says he has derived "assistance" from unpublished writings of Moore on the relation of sense-data to physical objects.

1914 Our Knowledge of the External World. No references in index or preface.

1918 On p. 492 of his review of Broad's Perceptions, Physics and Reality, Russell refers to Moore's "The Refutation of Idealism" (1903).

1919 Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy. No references in index or preface.

1921 The Analysis of Mind. Ditto.

1922 Russell's article "Analytic and Synthetic Philosophers" is a one-page review of two books, one of which is Moore's Philosophical Studies (1922).
What conclusions of interest to students of Russell's thought can be drawn from this list? Considering only this information, there are four inferences that seem well-founded:

1. Moore was not a significant influence on Russell until after Russell's first philosophical book was published. (The earliest reference on this list occurs in 1900. This is further supported by the references to Moore in Russell's unpublished notebook, "What Shall I Read?" The first entry is dated Nov. 1898, and it and an entry for Feb. 1899 are to unpublished writings of Moore - of which some appear to be in the Archives.)

2. Moore was tremendously influential on Russell around the turn of the century. (See the entries for 1900, 1901, 1903, 1904, and the first item for 1909.)

3. Moore was not a significant factor in Russell's philosophical development after 1912. (Excluding the first item from 1909 - which is historical - there are no significant references to Moore in books after 1912, and relatively few insignificant ones. The mere brevity of the 1922 and 1944 articles is significant.)

4. Nothing published by Moore after 1903 was of significant influence on Russell. (The unpublished writings of Moore referred to in The Problems of Philosophy may be the lectures that were later published as Some Main Problems of Philosophy. If so, this would be the only serious exception.)
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