

- Q. 1) What is meant by categories of understanding?
- 2) How does Kant deduce the u. of u? Discuss.

⇒ 1) According to Kant categories of understanding is a non-sensuous faculty of knowledge and so different from sensibility. When we look at an object, we get some separate sensations. These are not knowledge, but these are the matters of knowledge. While these are not synthesized they cannot give us knowledge. Then we apply something by our reason to synthesize them. These are substance-quality, unity, plurality etc. These all are a priori. These give the form of to the knowledge. These a priori things those are remain present in our mind from beginning, are called categories of understanding.

2) According to Kant categories of understanding is a faculty of judgement. The use the understanding can make of concept is to judge by means of them. Kant accepts with some modification from the formal logic of his time, the division of judgements according to quantity, quality, relation and modality.

Kant believes that the synthesizing function of the categories of understanding which makes objects for us by combining and relating the ultimate data of sense, is one with the function of judgement. So the different kinds of judgements represent the different functions and thus the table of categories is derived from the table of judgements found in ordinary logic. The following table gives the different kinds of judgements and 12 kinds of categories of understanding corresponding to them.

## Table of judgements & categories of understanding

| Judgements of Formal logic       | categories of understanding    |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| A) According to quantity         | According to quantity          |
| i) Universal (All s are p)       | i) Unity                       |
| ii) Particular (some s are p)    | ii) Plurality                  |
| iii) Singular (The s is p)       | iii) Totality                  |
| B) According to quality          | According to quality           |
| i) Affirmative (All s are p)     | i) Reality                     |
| ii) Negative (No s is p)         | ii) Unreality                  |
| iii) Infinite (All s are non-p)  | iii) Limitation                |
| C) According to Relation         | According to Relation          |
| i) Categorical (some s are p)    | i) Substance & accident        |
| ii) Hypothetical (If A then B)   | ii) Cause and effect           |
| iii) Disjunctive (Either A or B) | iii) Reciprocity               |
| D) According to modality         | According to modality          |
| i) Problematical                 | i) Possibility & impossibility |
| ii) Assertoric                   | ii) Existence & non-existence  |
| iii) Apodictic                   | iii) Necessity & contingency   |

Kant has divided judgements under quantity into universal, particular and singular and named the corresponding categories as unity, plurality and totality. In most histories of philosophy the judgements and the corresponding categories are mentioned in the order given by Kant. This seems to suggest that the categories- unity, plurality and totality are derived from the judgements- universal, particular and singular respectively. Thus he derives the other categories from the judgements.

It is remarkable that in every <sup>case</sup> first two categories are opposed to each other and the third is the

combination of first two; e.g. unity and plurality are opposed each other, but totality is the combination of unity and plurality. Same cases are found in other group of categories.

Kant says that the categories classified under four heads may be divided into two groups called mathematical and dynamical. The mathematical categories i.e. the categories of quantity and quality are concerned with the objects of intuition. On the other hand, the dynamical categories i.e. the categories of relation and modality are concerned with the existence of these objects in their relation to each other or to the understanding.

---

- Q:- i) What is space?  
ii) How does Kant prove that space is an a priori intuition?

Ans:- i) According to Kant, every material object has something <sup>land</sup> extension. There is no object which does not belong to land. Though we can imagine the ~~space~~ land without the object. According to Kant this land is called space.

ii) Immanuel Kant discussed about space and time in 'Transcendental Aesthetic of Critique of Pure Reason'. His conclusion of discussion is space and time are a priori intuition. Here <sup>space is</sup> our under discussion matter is ~~space~~. This discussion divided into two ways — a) Metaphysical exposition and b) Transcendental exposition. In the metaphysical exposition directly and in the transcendental exposition indirectly <sup>Kant</sup> proved that, space is an a priori intuition.

a) Metaphysical exposition of space: Here Kant given four arguments to prove space is an a priori intuition. Among them first and third arguments are negative and second and fourth arguments are affirmative. In <sup>the</sup> first and second arguments Kant proves that space is a priori and <sup>in the</sup> third and fourth arguments he proves that space is an intuition.

First argument: In the first argument Kant says that space is not an empirical concept which has been derived from outer experience. Our outer experiences are experiences of things in space. We cannot suppose that we get the idea of space only when we have had such experiences, because such experiences presuppose the idea of space. So ~~idea of~~ that the idea of space must already

be there if we are to have any outer experiences. Instead of these experiences making the idea of space possible, it is the idea of space which makes these experiences possible. So the idea of space is not derived from experience.

Second argument: In this argument Kant proves that the idea of space is a priori. According to him, the various objects remain in space. Space is shelter (adhar) and objects are sheltered. Although we can imagine the absence of all objects in space, but we cannot imagine the absence of space itself. Thus it is proved that space must be necessary <sup>prior</sup> condition of objects. So space is a priori.

Third argument: - The third argument proves that space is not a general concept, but a pure intuition. We cannot represent several spaces but only one space. When we speak of many spaces, we simply mean parts of one and the same place. Moreover the so-called parts of space are not given first, out of which one may suppose the one single whole space to be constructed. Space is ~~not~~ never constructed in that way. It is the parts that arise as limitation of one space which is presupposed by them and is given first. If space were a concept, the parts would have preceded the whole. It is only in an intuition that the whole can precede the parts. So space is an intuition, not a concept.

Fourth argument: - In this argument Kant proves that space is not a general concept, but an intuition. Space is represented as an infinite

given magnitude. If space were a general concept, then nothing could have been determined as regards its magnitude, far less could we say that it was infinite. Because being a generalized concept, it would have to be equally present in all instances. But we know that the different spaces are ~~belong~~ included in an infinite space, so the knowledge of space is pure intuition.

Moreover, a generalized concept has an infinite number of instances under it, but they are not contained within it. The particular spaces are mere parts of the one space. So space is not a concept, but an intuition.

b) Transcendental exposition of space In this argument Kant shows that space is a priori synthetic knowledge. Because ~~it~~ it ~~does not accept~~ becomes geometry intelligible.

Geometrical propositions, such as - 'the sumtotal of the three angles of a triangle is equal of two right-angles' are universal and necessary. whatever is universal and necessary must be a priori.

Again, geometrical propositions are synthetic, since the predicate represents a new idea and not contained in the ideal of the subject. Thus we see that a priori synthetic character of geometrical knowledge is explicable only on the supposition that space is an a priori intuition.