



00:00

[Today we will look specifically at the B Deduction §§17-20.]

	<p>We aim to get through the whole Deduction in one week [but as we'll see, it will take next week to finish it off].</p> <p>We want to try to feel the structure of it and see it as a continuous argument.</p>
1:00	<p>We'll begin with §17, having looked a lot at §16 in the past—and in any event, §17 summarizes §16 anyways.</p>
2:30	<p style="text-align: center;">§17</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Principle of the Synthetic Unity is the Supreme Principle of all Employment of the Understanding</i></p> <p>The supreme principle of the possibility of all intuition in its relation to sensibility is, according to the Transcendental Aesthetic, that all the manifold of intuition should be subject to the formal conditions of space and time. [1one] The supreme principle of the same possibility, in its relation to understanding, is that all the manifold of intuition should be subject to conditions of the original synthetic unity of apperception.^a [Kant's footnote] [2two] In so far as the manifold representations of intuition are <i>given</i> to us, they are subject to the former of these two principles [3]; in so far as they must allow of being <i>combined</i> in one consciousness, they are subject to the latter [4threefour]. For [5five] without such combination nothing can be thought or known, since the given representations would not have in common the act of the apperception 'I think', and so could not be apprehended together in one self-consciousness. [6six]</p>
2:30	<p>[1] So that is just simply a statement of the Transcendental Aesthetic—namely, whatever affects sensibility must be subject to space and time.</p> <p>But why should he state that here? Why drag us back to the Transcendental Aesthetic? He had just done the 'I think' in monotonous, repetitive tone—so why go back?</p>
4:00	<p>The crucial thought is to be clear on what are the conditions under which we have any manifold whatsoever? Namely, he brings the Transcendental Aesthetic in here to underscore the 'two sources of knowledge' thesis.</p> <p>Discursive cognition is always going to be about both what is given to us and what we do with it—that is both passivity and activity. Again, for Kant the unity of passivity and activity is simply what he means by discursive cognition.</p> <p>And as we will see the B Deduction is nothing more than a regressive analysis of discursive cognition.</p> <p>So it is absolutely appropriate that he would begin here by reminding us that in talking about eventually the TUA he is going to be talking about it as in relationship to the given—because that is what an intuition does—it has its origins in sensibility.</p>

6:30	<p>So far all we should have said should be analytic truths. Of course they are not obvious analytic truths—nothing in Kant, even the analytic truths, are obvious. But we are working at a series of an analytic analysis of discursive cognition.</p> <p>For Kant, because of the Transcendental Aesthetic and because of what he says in §15—whatever unity we have must be a product of combination; no unity without unification.</p> <p>So between the Transcendental Aesthetic and §15 you have the materials for the analytic claim that discursive cognition is going to be the combination of those two things. seventeen</p>
8:00	<p>[2] That is to say that for Kant, all combination not only must involve a spontaneous synthesis—this is arguably the minimal argument of §15—because combination cannot be given but must be produced. Therefore combination rests on the spontaneity.</p> <p>So the next thought is that what that spontaneity does, what is involved in spontaneity is my awareness of the manifold of intuition hanging together. My awareness of the manifold of intuition together—my awareness of something as an object with certain charactersitics—is just what he means, so we are claiming, by the TUA.</p> <p>Otherwise there would be an awareness of something for which I would not be aware, which is a contradiction in terms.</p>
12:00	<p>So the thought up to here is that unless the manifold of intuition can be thought or grasped together in one self-consciousness—unless that were to occur, nothing could be cognized at all.</p> <p>And that is true simply in virtue of the notion of representation.</p> <p>After all, what is representation? Representation is my taking some internal state and treating it <i>as</i> a representation of an objective state of affairs. That is what it is to have a representation.</p> <p>We said last week that because there can be unconscious representations, then in order for me to have a cognition through a representation, then I must add self-consciousness to them—that is taking them up, but taking them up is no more than treating my inner states as representing an objective state of affairs.</p>
14:30	<p>Again, we want to see that the second sentence like the first is just analytic.</p> <p>If the manifold of intuition were not subject to the conditions of the original synthetic unity of apperception—that is, if the manifold of intuition were not grasped as representing an object, then I have no cognition at all.</p> <p>It really is an analytic statement—although not one we might have realized as a teenager. seventeen</p>

15:30	[3] space and time
	[4] Transcendental unity of apperception. seventeen
	[5] The claim now is that this following sentence states the analytic thesis we have just laid out. seventeen
	<p>[6] Just a series of equivalences.</p> <p>So to summarize: if the manifold of intuition cannot be combined in one consciousness, then the manifold of intuition cannot be grasped in a self-consciousness. If it could not be grasped in a self-consciousness, nothing could be cognized through the manifold.</p> <p>So we are doing this as a <i>reductio</i>—since something is cognized through the manifold—so if the manifold of intuition cannot be combined in one consciousness then nothing can be cognized through the manifold, and that is a contradiction [see below why is this a contradiction?] , therefore something must be able to be cognized through the manifold of intuition [Jay is stating this as a conclusion here, a “therefore”, but I think he misspeaks and later acknowledges that it is <i>not</i> a conclusion that we have knowledge but the whole premise of the Copernican Turn].</p> <p>That is the premise of the entire argument. [see, I was right]. On Jay's reading that something must be able to be cognized through the manifold of an intuition is the premise since the negation of this position is impossible—all those other things make this negation impossible—therefore the manifold of intuition must be able to be combined in one consciousness—that is an analytic truth.</p>
18:00	Now we should start to get uncomfortable because we have gone really far down a Kantian path with a series of analytic truths.
	<p>So that is the summary of §16—which Dickerson calls the “Master Argument”—is really an elaboration of that thought that the “I think must be able to accompany all my representations” <u>or</u> there would be nothing to me.</p> <p>And a variety of thought to show why the opposite of that entails simply that unless we grant there would be no cognition at all.</p>

19:00	So on our reading the point of §16 is to reveal the “I think” as an analytic truth.
	.
	<p>The progressive majority are going to interpret these early moves of the Deduction more robustly. They are going to do a lot more sweating.</p> <p>We will come back later to why we are going the regressive route—we will say more where it comes out more sharply later.</p>
20:00	<p>But in short Jay does not think that this is an anti-skeptical argument. A regressive analysis begins with the claim that we have knowledge, and more precisely that we cognize and object, the world, through a manifold of intuition.</p> <p>But this claim is not that radical since he is agreeing with any representationality (Locke, Newton) and he is taking a representationalist premise—he assumes that Locke in particular but other representationalists as well would agree that if I am in a representational state, e.g. I am aware of a cup, then I have an awareness of an object in the world.</p> <p>[]</p> <p>The regressive/representationalist strategy asks if it is the case that I have an awareness of an object in the world, how then is that possible?</p>
21:00	<p>The anti-skeptical/progressive strategy begins with a different premise.</p> <p>It begins by saying that I have experience, I am self-aware, and then builds out to the possibility of that.</p> <p>Here you work out from the very thin premise of something like Cartesian self-consciousness and then you try to show that that necessitates awareness of the world independently of you.</p>
21:30	<p>Now Kant has an argument close to this anti-skeptical strategy—it is called the “Refutation of Idealism”(see outline above).</p> <p>We’ll see it in a couple weeks. But to anticipate, he does have a critique of skepticism of a certain kind, which he calls a critique of problematic idealism. But the fact that he has that argument is good evidence that he doesn’t mean this (the B Deduction) to be that argument.</p> <p>Rather he has something in particular that he takes to be the Refutation of Idealism, indicating that he doesn’t think that the rest of what he is doing is that.</p>

22:00	<p>But someone like Guyer will try to account for this by arguing that Kant realized the Transcendental Deduction (as an anti-skeptical argument) was a great failure, so then in the Refutation of Idealism he finally gets it right.</p> <p>The assumption here is that the Refutation of Idealism is the only valid argument in the whole book—which is roughly what Guyer thinks. Which just seems odd.</p>
23:00	<p>Moving on then to the next ¶ of §17, which is the core argument of §17.</p> <p>B 137:</p> <p><i>“Understanding is, to use general terms, the faculty of knowledge [i]. This knowledge consists in the determinate relation of given representations to an object; and an object is that in which the concept of which the manifold of a given intuition is united [ii]. Now all unification of representations demands unity of consciousness in the synthesis of them [iii]. Consequently [iv] it is the unity of consciousness that alone constitutes the relation of representation to an object, and therefore their objective validity and the fact that they are modes of knowledge; and upon it therefore rests the very possibility of the understanding[v]”</i></p>
	<p>[i] that is simply a restatement of the representational hypothesis—i.e. what is knowledge? Knowledge consists in the determinate relation of given representations to an object. That is, taking my representational state-e.g. I have this coffee cup here in my hand with a picture of a face on it—I take this state—that judgment—to be an awareness of an object.</p> <p>So I am simply taking my judgment, there is a cup here in my hand with a face on it, as a way of treating my representations, namely as saying of the object that it has a face on it.</p>
25:00	<p>[ii] So what then do we mean by “object”. Here we can see that he repeats the argument of A 104. It is going to come back more than once in the B Deduction, it is the “Transcendental reinterpretation of the way of ideas”.</p> <p>(for A 104, see 6. A Deduction.doc#transcendentalobjectX, class 6, 41:30)</p> <p>Because what he says is, what is an object? An object is that <i>in the concept of which...</i> We keep waiting for the object to be something out there.</p> <p><u><i>This is the Copernican Turn.</i></u> This very sentence.</p>

26:00	<p>So I will call something an object if and only if my manifold of intuitions hold together in a certain way, namely in a way in which allows me to say...</p> <p>So the <i>concept</i> of the cup, unites the various features of it...</p> <p>So it is an object because of the way I treat my representations. It is the way in which representations are handled that gives them representational force, significance, meaning.</p>
27:30	<p>So the notion of an object is had through the way in which we have certain representations—that is we have them in way in which we say 'Ah, this is an awareness of an object'.</p> <p>This is not the only way we have representations. Consider a drunken experience. You can have representations of not-an-object—these are hallucinations or whatever.</p> <p>But some of our representations, and it is the character of or the quality of the kind of unity which they have which form a relationship to an object.</p>
	.
28:30	<p>So the form is constitutive of the power of those representations to represent.</p> <p>[go back to B137]</p>
29:00	<p>[iii] That is the easy thought—that is, as it were, the “my side” thought.</p> <p>That sentence is simply to say that the unity of representations requires unity of consciousness, that almost comes from the combination thesis.</p> <p>But now he is going to infer from that, let's call it 'the flip'—that is going to raise the stakes.</p>
30:00	<p>[iv] And it is that word “Consequently” that drives all of his critics crazy. So this is a bone of contention.</p>

[v] Here is where Kant's critiques and friends even have lots of trouble.

Because here Kant seems here—especially on the anti-skeptical argument—to have a fallacious argument working.

()

On the anti-skeptical reading, this looks like a fallacious argument because he seems to be moving from the anodyne thought that the unity of representations requires unity of consciousness—which looks alright—to the unity of consciousness constitutes objectivity.

In other words he seems to be looking from the subjective condition for the possibility of knowledge and saying that that very subjective condition is the condition for objectivity.

That is the way he seems to be arguing. And Guyer, for example, thinks that here Kant is simply concocting a wildly fallacious argument. In Guyer's terms, here Kant makes a necessary condition of knowledge—the unity of representations—into a sufficient condition of knowledge.

That is one way of seeing why some see this move as fallacious. Another way of putting it is that he is simply being stipulative, defining an object as...

It is stipulative because he seems to be defining objectivity in terms of unity rather than an object as independent of us—which is as Guyer points out another notion of an object.

So he seems to be doing away with that independent object. That is Guyer's worry here.

33:00	<p>Allison is a bit messier on this point, and we will return to this point later.</p> <p>But Allison notices that there are two words in German for “object”—<i>Objekt</i> and <i>Gegenstand</i>.</p> <p>And in the German those words are floating around in §17 and throughout. Allison decides that they mean different things. Roughly Allison thinks that <i>Objekt</i> means ‘logical object of judgment’—meaning simply we will call anything an <i>Objekt</i> anything that fits a certain form: unified through the TUA.</p> <p>While <i>Gegenstand</i>, a standing-against, is treated as the “heavy” notion of an object and that is what is achieved only in §26.</p> <p>[]</p> <p>So that for Allison Kant is not here making a mistake of moving fallaciously from necessary to sufficient conditions—rather he is just defining the logical notion of an object.</p>
35:00	<p>It is here that Jay really thinks that using a regressive reading makes life much easier.</p> <p>The regressive argument wants to begin <i>not</i> from representations in general but only from those very representations which are by definition those through which subjects cognize particular objects. Jay thinks that is what Kant is talking about here.</p> <p>When we read A 104 (6. A Deduction.doc#transcendentalobjectX), we stipulated this as a Lockean premise—let’s just assume that we have ideas that we think of as representing a world of things—now how is this possible.</p> <p>So on the regressive argument he is not attempting to prove that some set of representations are objective—rather he is just asking after the necessary conditions of objectivity.</p> <p>[.]</p>
37:30	<p>And in this case, he seems to be saying that the object of my cognition is precisely that which all the component representations hang together as representations of and of which I grasp as being presented to me by or in those representations.</p> <p>[]</p> <p>So we want to read that sentence “an <i>object</i> is that in which the concept of which the manifold of a given intuition is <i>united</i>” [ii] [B137] for Kant this is a <i>necessary</i> presupposition of representationalism.</p>

	<p>And that is what we saw at A 104 (6. A Deduction.doc#transcendentalobjectX)—the argument about “the transcendental = x” and we saw that there was no X, because the X as the independent things to which they all related and in which they all are united would have to be another <i>intuition</i>.</p> <p>[]</p> <p>Which is exactly what we lack. So he says that is just going to repeat the representational circle, so we did the turn. Now instead of making the source of unity the object, the source of unity is in the subject.</p>
39:00	<p>So the thought is that an object is presented to my awareness in virtue of my having a unified apperceptive awareness of a complex intuition. That is what it is for an object to be presented to my awareness.</p> <p>The unified apperception of the manifold is possible only if it is <i>grasped</i> as a unified complex whole through an act of spontaneous synthesis—I grasp it as a complex whole through the synthesis.</p> <p>That is how the presentation occurs.</p>
40:30	<p>Now comes the kicker.</p> <p>If spontaneity is doing what we are claiming that it is doing, then the intuition on its own is blind.</p> <p>An intuition that is grasped through spontaneity has no representational force—it doesn't count as presenting an object to me.</p>
41:30	<p>So without the synthesis the intuition has no determinate representational content.</p> <p>Remember the experience of coming up from the subway—there you are having representations all right, you are just not cognizing anything through them.</p> <p>()</p>
42:00	<p>So the unified grasp, the synthesis of an intuition constitutes it as a representation of an object.</p> <p>[]</p> <p>Where we are going with all of this is that the form through which I synthesize an intuition determines that something is a representational content <i>uberhaupt</i>. So it is only through form.</p>

43:30	<p>So to use a linguistic analogy to try to flesh this out.</p> <p>To use a Chomskian thought experiment—you can use words, “dreams” “the” “girl” “the” ...</p> <p>The point is that we can get a series of words, but they will not count as giving meaning—not because the words individually lack sense, but they can only have meaning in a grammatical sentence.</p> <p>Hence the analogy the idea of a grammatical sentence, or the “form”, is what allows the words to suddenly truly latch onto the world. Without that form, that words would just be so many little things that just pop up in dictionaries. They would be a hallucination.</p>
45:00	<p>Now we are trying to think the thought, but with the idea of representational contents. It is exactly the same thought.</p> <p>Michael Dummett's big book on Frege shows how Frege can sound a lot like Kant.</p> <p>David Bells and Eli Frielander's works on Frege are explicit Kantian readings of Frege.</p> <p>Frege thinks, the crux of the Fregean turn, is that the sentence is the minimal unit of comprehension—not words but sentences. That was the beginning of that turn, which we are going to call later on the movement from atomism to wholism.</p> <p>And it works just as truly in the world of words as it does in the world of ideas [].</p>
46:00	<p>So somehow, what we are beginning trying to get at, is how forms actually can have a determining role for contents to become contents of a certain kind—namely, have representational force, representational authority, or representational meaning.</p>
47:00	<p>So to regroup--the Unity of Apperception is the unified grasp of the component representations making up a complex intuition.</p> <p>The unity of apperception is the unified grasp of them hanging together.</p> <p>So the unity of apperception is the grasp of the component of representations as hanging together as making up a representation of a particular object.</p>
48:30	<p>So while Allison thinks that there is a reciprocal unity of apperception and the representation of objects as the goal of part 1.</p> <p>But we are arguing that this is not the <i>goal</i>, but it is the <i>premise</i>. On this reading, Kant is just trying to let that premise breathe a little bit, he is not trying to set it up.</p>

	<p>So apperception on this reading is by definition the subject's capacity to grasp internal states as a presentation of objects. And by definition an intuition is a representation through which a subject cognizes a particular object.</p> <p>[]</p>
49:30	<p>This shows that analytic truths are not tautologies—or at least that tautologies can be really hard.</p>
	<p>So if all this is right, we still have not gone very far beyond a kind of Lockean view because we are only saying that cognition is a unified awareness of a manifold of an intuition.</p> <p>And that just sounds like a Lockean idea.</p> <p>So the necessary condition for that is that our cognition must involve a spontaneous synthesis and—this is what we are going to get to today—to make it obvious our claim is that form is doing to work of giving the materials that are formed representational force.</p> <p>[]</p> <p>So we are saying that there must be something about the mind—our modes of thinking that are essential to it.</p> <p>And to say that there is something essential to it is to say that our spontaneous activities achieve what they achieve because they are governed—spontaneity is governed—by something structural: we'll call it "the categories".</p>
52:00	<p>So cognition must involve spontaneous synthesis, and spontaneous synthesis must be governed by categories.</p> <p>And that gets us exactly to what we are going to worry about in §18.</p>

*** BREAK ***

00:00	<p>Looking now at §18.</p> <p>We are going to read it as if it was intended, not as a definition—which is roughly how Allison and Guyer read it—but simply as a further elaboration of the thesis by means of a comparison.</p> <p>On our reading, to anticipate, what is going to happen in §18 is a discussion of the difference between the Transcendental UA—the unified grasp and all that stuff—and the subjective or empirical unity of consciousness.</p>
-------	---

1:30	<p>So §18 is going to draw a contrast between the way Kant is reading our account of our being in a representational state and contrast it with the way Locke and Berkeley, for example, treat our being in a representational state.</p> <p>]</p> <p>So on Kant's account, objective unity—that is the kind of unity in which there is a representation of an object—is the result of a priori syntheses.</p>
2:30	<p>Subjective unity, on the other hand, is the result of contingent habits of association.</p> <p>So, for example, Locke says—and this is Locke trying to figure out how an idea represents an object—how these ideas that I have like 'red' 'round' 'sweet' etc. come to represent an 'apple'. So he says:</p> <p><i>"The mind takes notice that a certain number of simple ideas go constantly together [a], which being presumed to belong to one thing [b] are called, so united in one subject, by one name--apple"</i></p>
	<p>[a] That is, regularity. I am pretty used to seeing redness, and roundness, and sweetness going together. Indeed in my past they constantly go together.</p> <p>[b] I presume because they always come in these little groups—I presume that they belong to one thing.</p>
4:30	<p>So what would make an apple an apple is the regularity of the presentation of simple ideas constantly associated together.</p>
	<p>And we can find the same thought in Berkeley where, for example, he says:</p> <p><i>"A certain color, taste, smell, figure, and consistence having been observed to go together are accounted one distinct thing, signified by the name 'apple'."</i></p>
	<p>Philosophers love that apple, but why always the apple? Why do we always go back to the back to the Bible, why always back to Eve?</p> <p>[.]</p>
5:30	<p>For the empiricists and for the idealists roughly it is going to be some version of regularity and association under certain conditions.</p> <p>It is usually given as a series of conditionals—which are normally taken as defeasible [capable of being annulled or terminated] conditions, namely, <i>if</i> I am awake and in a well lighted room and I am having these impressions of red and round and in the past I called that an apple, then <i>ceritus paribus</i> [???], I am seeing an apple.</p>

6:30	<p>From Kant's view, that is a simply contingent fact, and it is the contingent going together with other contingencies under a <i>ceritus paribus</i> clause that is supposed to miraculously constitute knowledge.</p> <p>For Kant, what the empiricists accomplish regularity, habit, association, he replaces that with "Form".</p> <p>And on Jay's reading §18 simply says this and shows that if we take on board what is going on here, then we are bound to think that really what the empiricists are talking about is a contingent state of my empirical consciousness, and <i>not</i> an awareness of an object.</p>
8:30	<p>So can we make §18 say just that?</p> <p>And to what it takes to be a professional philosopher is to be able to read a passage like this 50 times and still find it thrilling. This § is thrilling for Jay—because it takes the most obvious thing in the world—that I am in a state of awareness of an object, and unearths it in all its richness and complexity.</p> <p>Philosophy has the habit of making the simplest thing infinitely complex and rich.</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">“§18</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Objective Unity of Self-Consciousness</i></p> <p>The transcendental unity of apperception is that unity through which all the manifold given in an intuition is united in a concept of the object[z]. It is therefore entitled <i>objective</i>, and must be distinguished from the <i>subjective</i> unity of consciousness, which is a <i>determination</i> of <i>inner sense</i> [y] —through which the manifold of intuition for such [objective] combination is empirically given [x]. Whether I can become <i>empirically</i> conscious of the manifold as simultaneous or as successive depends on circumstance or empirical conditions [w]. Therefore the empirical unity of consciousness, through association of representations, itself concerns an appearance, and is wholly contingent [u]. But the pure form of intuition in time, merely as intuition in general, which contains a given manifold, is subject to the original unity of consciousness, simply through the necessary relation of the manifold of the intuition to the one '<i>I think</i>', and so through the pure synthesis of understanding which is the <i>a priori</i> underlying ground of the empirical synthesis [t]. Only the original unity is objectively valid; the empirical unity of apperception [s], upon which we are not here dwelling, and which besides is merely derived from the former under given conditions <i>in concreto</i>, has only subjective validity [r]. To one man, for instance, a certain word suggests one thing, to another some other thing; the unity of consciousness in that which is empirical is not, as regards what is given, necessarily and universally valid." [q]</p>

10:00	<p>[z] This is just a restatement of the transcendental turn. The TUA is the grasping of [?] in the concept of an object.</p> <p>We will eventually get to where we get this idea of the concept of an object—it turns out it will come from the categories. The categories are going to be our concept of an object in general—that's what the categories are—therefore synthesizing something through them with a particular concept is going to allow for a relation to an object.</p>
11:00	<p>[y] A loose definition of “inner sense” is an awareness of my own inner states. gobacksec18</p>
11:30	<p>[x] That is corresponding of course to any objective awareness, I am aware of an object as having these features—there must correspond to this a state of my consciousness.</p> <p>So if I turn my attention not away from the object and back toward the state of my consciousness, I will find there that relationship of things, of representations. gobacksec18</p>
	<p>[w] That is, how I am aware of a particular manifold as an object or as an event—that is not up to me. That is up to contingent circumstances.</p> <p>What is <i>not</i> up to contingent circumstances is the “Therefore” and what follows. gobacksec18</p>
13:00	<p>[u] So my awareness of my empirical consciousness as either changing [an event] or as a thing is itself contingent. Because any state of inner sense is either going to be of something there [static] or of something changing. It has got to be one of the two. gobacksec18</p>
	<p>[t] Skip this chunk for now since it will only confuse us here.</p>
14:00	<p>[s] My empirical unity of apperception is simply my awareness of my inner states.</p>
	<p>[r] What is all this about?</p> <p>One thing that Kant is interested in here is that people conflate inner sense and apperception—and here we want to distinguish them. That is what is really going on here.</p> <p>And that move repeats an argument he takes up later where he makes the conflation clear at B 153-155 (§24, which we'll see next week). We won't follow-up on this now.</p> <p>At the moment he is just interested in this conflation. gobacksec18</p>

16:00	<p>Let's look harder at that sentence, because he says something really unobvious, yet it is one of the keys to the argument.</p> <p>"Only the original unity is objectively valid [+]; the empirical unity of apperception [=], upon which we are not here dwelling, and which besides <u>is merely derived from the former under given conditions <i>in concreto</i></u> [!], has only subjective validity."</p> <p>[+] We should be used to this thought by now—but what follows it the funny part...</p> <p>[=] The empirical unity of my inner awareness</p> <p>[!] My inner awareness is <i>derived</i> from my outer awareness. [.]</p>
17:00	<p>So the argument that he is making here is that my capacity to be aware of my own inner states is <i>secondary</i> and <i>derivative</i> from my original awareness of <u>particular objects</u> in the world.</p> <p>[]</p> <p>This, by the way, is *the key* for the regressive argument. Because if this is right...</p> <p>What is Kant is saying here?</p> <p>First, he is suggesting that empiricism generates a genetic fallacy.</p> <p>The genetic fallacy comes about in this way: the empiricist, like in is robust Lockean common sense asks himself 'how is it possible for me to be aware of an object?'. And Locke tells an absolutely plausible story—namely, light waves hit the object, hit my eyes, and then my mind puts them together and constructs an object. That is the genetic story.</p> <p>And therefore he begins by atomistically, with the elements, and constructs a whole.</p>
19:00	<p>Kant's procedure is exactly the <i>opposite</i>.</p> <p>Kant says, the minimum form from which we must begin is awareness of an object.</p> <p>So he is saying that the genetic order, the order in which things come to be, is not their <i>true</i> order. Their true order, that is, what comes first, is the <u>whole</u>.</p> <p>And what he means by that it is only on the basis of our awareness of objects that we <i>learn</i> how to think about our inner states.</p>

20:30	<p>The Sellarsian story tells a nice version of that. I can “the cup is green” and you might intervene and say “look man, the cup is not green at all, it is red”.</p> <p>At that point I might look again, and if it still looks the same, I inevitably say “It <i>appears</i> green to me.”</p> <p>So now its ‘appearing green to me’ gets us to what Kant means by ‘awareness of our inner states’ [that we have representations of objects]—we are making a claim in this case not about how it <i>is</i> but about how it is that I am <i>experiencing</i> it.</p> <p>And I learn to do that by learning that not everything that I claim is the case in fact turns out to be the case indeed, therefore I have to learn to go from “is” to “appears”.</p>
21:30	<p>Kant wants to say that learning how things “are” is <i>first</i> and how they “appear” to inner sense is a secondary and derivative thing.</p> <p>Consider the story about cubism—nothing actually looks like a cubist image but you are supposed to learn to see things in a certain way. This is Kant’s kind of story.</p> <p>[I don’t quite get how the example of cubism helps here because I like to see cubism in a Husserlian vein where what the cubist does is bring into view, onto the surface, all those things that would be lost in the epoche—for instance, that the front of that coffee cup suggests the back of a cup out of view.]</p>
	<p>The claim here is that you have got to begin with the whole and the relationship to the object, and on the basis of that, in particular conditions, you can learn to examine or rehearse your own inner state.</p> <p>And their contingent unity is parasitic in general on objective unity.</p>

23:00	<p>But why would one think that?</p> <p>Let's take a standard Wittgensteinian story: namely, you can't have one bit of language, e.g. "red". We can't know what "red" is unless we know it is different than "green" and "blue" and "yellow".</p> <p>And we can't know what "green" and "blue" and "yellow" are unless we know of objects that are green-blue-yellow.</p> <p>So eventually, in order to have a bit of language, to have a concept, you must have a lot of concepts and not just a lot of concepts but you need them to be in Wittgenstein-speak to participate in certain kinds of language games—e.g. the language game of reporting, stating.</p> <p>The Kantian language game in particular is <i>judging</i>—things are such and such or the causal language game, this happens and then that happened and the former caused the later.</p>
24:00	<p>[q] So the thought here in §18 (gobacksec18) is that objective consciousness is logically, or better transcendently prior to subjective consciousness.</p> <p>It is that thought that brings Jay to the regressive argument. If wholism is true, then the idea of beginning from mere experience is unintelligible. It buys too much from the genetic fallacy.</p> <p>So Jay's claim is that if the anti-skeptical reading is in fact Kant's strategy, then the sentence we are examining is unintelligible as part of the Deduction:</p> <p>"Only the original unity is objectively valid; the empirical unity of apperception, upon which we are not here dwelling, and which besides is merely derived from the former under given conditions <i>in concreto</i>, has only subjective validity."</p>
25:00	<p>But on Jay's regressive reading it is perfectly consistent.</p>
	<p>So the <i>starting</i> point for Kant is not private sense data but rather <i>judgments</i> about the objective realm—the opposite of that is not subjective experience but "inchoate" experience.</p> <p>What we are denying here is that we go <i>from</i> subjective <i>to</i> objective. That just seems to be what is impossible to do.</p> <p>Rather we in fact go from inchoate—that is, not having a world at all, and in light of having a world we then learn about our own subjective path through it.</p>

26:00	<p>Question:</p> <p>Yes, this is a formal version of the argument we will see in the “Refutation of Idealism” (see outline above). The Refutation of Idealism is going to state this, but in another way.</p> <p>The Refutation of Idealism (RI) is going to say that inner time consciousness is dependent on outer spatial awareness.</p> <p>But in that case he is going to do as refutation of skepticism. Here we don’t have a refutation but rather a further elaboration of the argument for the TUA.</p> <p>But this is a parallel case to the RI; the RI just hammers that in in a detailed way with respect to time consciousness.</p>
27:00	<p>Question:</p> <p>“Objective” is here object awareness...</p> <p>Question: but where do the objects come from?</p> <p>[]</p> <p>Objects come from the role of intuition in the previous sentence. [gobacksec18]</p>
28:30	<p>The point here is that we are just looking at the difference between TUA and Empirical UA [].</p> <p>[</p> <p>And we are tracking ‘contingent’ vs. ‘necessary’ or ‘objective’ vs. ‘subjective’.</p> <p>And Kant is claiming that the subjective is parasitic on the objective.</p> <p>[</p> <p>Of course he hasn’t got the outer going yet []—rather he is simply saying, whatever we are as awareness of a particular [] which is what he does do in the RI.</p> <p>But we are claiming that the natural way of reading that is to already put the Sellarsian spin on it—otherwise the sentence makes no sense—how is the parasitism [the ‘deriving’] going to work otherwise if it is not going from “I see red” to the “It appears red to me”:</p> <p>“Only the original unity is objectively valid; the empirical unity of apperception, upon which we are not here dwelling, and which besides is merely derived from the former under given conditions <i>in concreto</i>, has only subjective validity.”</p> <p>That move [from “I see red” to the “It appears red to me”] does shift from something that has the form—and we’ll talk about necessity in a moment—to a merely empirical unity of consciousness, which is itself a judgment...</p>

30:00	<p>Onto §19.</p> <p>For us, because Jay is one of the few who loves the Metaphysical Deduction, §19 should come as no surprise since all this stuff about spontaneity as a source of objectivity and synthesis as a source of objectivity is all about unification, §19 is really going to re-cross the whole terrain of the Metaphysical Deduction.</p>
31:00	<p>So he says at the very end of B 141:</p> <p>“...I find that a judgment is nothing but the manner in which given modes of knowledge[f] are brought to the objective unity of apperception [g]. That is what is intended [h] by the copula ‘is’.[j]” [k]</p>
	[f] By this he means just ‘representations’
	[g] A Judgment is nothing but the way in which modes of knowledge are unified to become an object.
	[h] and this is what hammers it in, this is what makes it follow right from our regressive reading.
32:00	<p>[j] So what does he mean by this?</p> <p>For example, what does it mean to say “the pomegranate is red”?</p> <p>Where does the notion of judgment come from here?</p> <p>$S = P$, or S is P.</p> <p>That’s what a copula is, the “is”.</p> <p>So saying something <i>is</i> the case, e.g. the Pomegranate <i>is</i> red, is nothing more than holding the representations together in a unity [l].</p>

	<p>But in so far as I grasp them and unify them, it says that I am aware of the pomegranate as having the property red.</p> <p>So all the business about synthesis is now translated into <i>judgment</i> talk.</p> <p>Judging is synthesizing.</p> <p>So we can dump that technical word “synthesizing” and instead of saying we synthesize our representations we can say rather that we put our representations together in a judgment.</p> <p>And putting them together into a judgment requires judgmental form—and that judgmental form confers upon those representations the power to <i>be</i> cognitions of an object.</p> <p>And not just any old cognition of an object but <i>my cognition</i> of an object. Because I am the one doing the judging.</p>
35:00	Question:
	<p>We'll see [next week] that the A Deduction occurs in §24 and §26.</p> <p>On our reading is that there is no difference in argument between the A and B Deductions, it is just a change of presentation.</p>
36:00	<p>Back to §19—we'll add this time the next two sentences:</p> <p>“...I find that a judgment is noting but the manner in which given modes of knowledge are brought to the objective unity of apperception. That is what is intended by the copula ‘is’. It is employed to distinguish the objective unity of given representations from the subjective [m]. It indicates [n] their relation to original apperception, and its <i>necessary unity</i>. It holds good even if the judgment is itself empirical, and therefore contingent, as, for example, in the judgment, ‘Bodies are heavy’. [o] I do not here assert that these representations <i>necessarily</i> belong to one another in the empirical intuition, but that they belong to one another <i>in virtue of the necessary unity</i> of apperception in the synthesis of intuitions...[p] ”</p>
	<p>[m] this is just what Ed was asking about above (see 27:00).</p> <p>It is giving the things the logical form that literally is what distinguishes objective from subjective awareness.</p>
	<p>So how do I gain objectivity? I make judgments. How do I get out of my subjectivity? I make judgments.</p> <p>As Wittgenstein would say ‘I learn to talk’—I learn to say ‘the pomegranate is red’</p>

37:00	<p>[n] it is never complete clear that Kant knows what he means when he says “it” [might well be a problem of translating long German sentences into intelligible English]—but the rest of the sentence gives us enough of an idea to not get too lost.</p>
	<p>[o] He then goes on to clarify that thought</p> <p>[p] So let's try to make some sense out of that.</p> <p>It is clear that Kant is not committed to saying—and he says that he is not committed to saying—that, e.g., ‘redness’ necessarily belongs to ‘apple’. If he was committed to saying that he would be nuts—because there are after all green apples.</p>
39:00	<p>So where is the necessity?</p> <p>[sorry, I dropped the recorder again]</p> <p>The necessity is in the <i>form</i> through which I bring ‘apple’ and ‘red’ together.</p> <p>That is, the necessity comes from...what is necessary is the structure. That is, I bring my representations necessarily to unity and that necessity confers objectivity on the actual representation.</p>
40:00	<p>Why is this necessary?</p> <p>This is what we have been trying to show all day. If it wasn't the case then my awareness of a complex intuition would not be a cognition at all.</p> <p>[but that to me just simply begs the question—that is, perhaps it is in fact not a cognition at all]</p> <p>It is in virtue in their unification in the judgmental form that that they are awareness of an object—so it is a transcendental necessity that underlies that an empirical unity can be objective, a contingent unity can nonetheless be objective.</p>
41:30	<p>That is what he means by that sentence:</p> <p>“I do not here assert that these representations <i>necessarily</i> belong to one another in the empirical intuition, but that they belong to one another <i>in virtue of the necessary unity</i> of apperception...” because that is what confers on my representation a relation to an object and makes them a cognition.</p>

42:00	<p>So the copula “is” is to distinguish the objective unity of given representations from the subjective.</p> <p>Thus to go to the bottom of the page. And this is to repeat the argument we made about §18:</p> <p>“Thus to say ‘The body is heavy’ is not merely to state that the two representations have always been conjoined [^] in my perception, however often that perception be repeated [&]; what we are asserting is that they are combined <i>in the object</i>, no matter what the state of the subject may be[\$].”</p> <p>[^] Whenever I am aware of a heavy body I am aware of heaviness.</p> <p>[&] Repetition of their constant conjunction doesn’t make it true. What we are asserting is that they are combined <i>in the object</i>.</p> <p>[\$] So now we have an extra-kicker here. When we suggest ‘the apple is red’ and judge it to be so, I am saying that redness belongs to the apple irrespective of my contingent state of awareness or feeling or the like.</p> <p>Another way to put it is that I am not making the judgment as a report on my inner state and then projecting it outward. Rather, again, the outward comes first.</p>
44:00	<p>So the unified apperception of representations, Kant is stating, cannot be grounded in contingent psychological features of the cognizing subject—they must be based on essential features of the cognizing mind.</p> <p>And he is now going to add that up, pull all this together in §20.</p> <p>§20 is meant as a summary of the B Deduction up to here.</p>

45:30	<p style="text-align: center;">§20</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>All Sensible Intuitions are subject to the Categories, as Conditions under which alone their Manifold can come together in one Consciousness.</i></p> <p>“The manifold given in a sensible intuition is necessarily subject to the original synthetic unity of apperception, because in no other way is the <i>unity</i> of intuition possible (§17) [<]. But the act of understanding by which the manifold of given representations (be they intuitions or concepts) is brought under one apperception, is the logical function of judgment (cf. §19) [>]. All the manifold, therefore, so far as it is given in a single empirical intuition, is <i>determined</i> in respect of one of the logical functions of judgment, and is thereby brought into one consciousness [/]. Now [#] the <i>categories</i> are just these functions of judgment [%], in so far as they are employed in determination of the manifold of a given intuition (cf. §13) [@]. Consequently, the manifold in a given intuition is necessarily subject to the categories.”</p>
46:00	<p>[<] That is the spontaneity thesis: no unity without unification. Unification must not only be unification but unified unification, finding the object hanging together.</p> <p>[>] That is, we get the “oneness” through the logical forms of judgment. They give us the kind of unity that representations need in order to represent.</p> <p>“S is P” is the kind of hanging-together of a thing that allows it to be an awareness of an object with a property.</p> <p>This is the repetition of the Metaphysical Deduction. gobacksec20</p>
47:00	<p>[/] That is, anything that I can be aware of has to be subject to some unification—the logical functions of judgment which we looked at in the Metaphysical Deduction give us the possibilities—“if...then”, “s is p”, etc.</p> <p>Therefore anything that we might be aware of in an empirical intuition is brought under some logical function of judgment—because that is a condition of cognitive unity. gobacksec20</p>

48:00	<p>[#] And this could be the conclusion of the whole Deduction.</p> <p>[%] What are categories? They are themselves nothing but these logical functions of judgment.</p> <p>[@] The categories are not "s is p" or "subject is predicate" but 'substance' and 'attributes'.</p> <p>So in so far as I judge through the categories or through the logical functions of judgment, their determination and intuition is nothing but the use of categories. gobacksec20</p>
49:30	<p>Therefore anything that I can have awareness of is a priori subject to the categories, QED.</p>
50:00	<p>So why is there another 5 §§? We'll come back to this next week—and we will go onto the Schematism.</p> <p>For Schematism, see outline above.</p>