CHAPTER III

KANT'S APPROACH TO A PRIORI AND A POSTERIORI

Introduction

One could easily find out two most influential epistemological doctrines, namely, rationalism and empiricism that have inadequate solutions to the problems concerning the acquisition of knowledge. The reason being that we are told that rationalists believe that mind is capable of intellectual activity in complete isolation from any sense-experience on the one hand, and on the other hand we are told that the empiricists believe that mind is incapable of any intellectual operations that do not derive from sense experience. Both the characterizations are extremely misleading. The empiricists, despite their talk of the mind being a *tabula rasa*, had to ascribe certain unlearned abilities to the mind. The reason being that mind must be innately equipped to learn from experience. It would be absurd to suggest that we must learn all those very abilities which are necessary conditions of our learning anything. For instance, in order to learn at all one must at least be able to generalize. Further, it is clear that neither Descartes nor Leibnitz believed men are capable of intellectual activities in complete isolation from sense-experience. Leibnitz says of our innate ideas that without the senses it would never have occurred to us to think of them and that sense-experience is necessary for all our actual knowledge. Against Locke’s picture of the mind as a block of marble in which
veins mark out a certain figures, which will not be clearly revealed until superfluous bits are chipped away. Sense-experience serves to reveal our innate ideas in the way that chiseling reveals the figure which belongs “innately” to the marble. During the course of time, it becomes to restrict the application of reason within the realm of experience and this was exactly done by Immanuel Kant. It would be evident that, if we analyze his transcendental method, his philosophy basically evolved out of the critical investigation of the said two schools—rationalism and empiricism. In it he made reconciliation between them.

**Kant’s Critique of Rationalism**

The reason for Kant to reject rationalist approach to knowledge is that of a matter of coherency. If we say that knowledge is exclusively constituted of innate ideas, how can we be sure that these innate ideas themselves refer to or fit into real world? If we are not sure, indeed we are not so, we are revolving around the fantasies. However, he tried to overcome the shortcomings of rationalism and this paved the way for his transcendental philosophy. He believed that the failure of rationalism is mainly due to their improper application of reason. This he referred to as an uncritical approach of reason towards anything.

Knowledge for Kant is certain, and hence he said that skepticism is unwarranted. If anything is certain, then it should satisfy the conditions of necessity and universality. It is impossible to find errors
on this line over rationalism, for the concepts of rationalism satisfied these two conditions very well. The innate ideas residing in the minds of all human beings are the same, for everybody possesses common facility, namely reason. This shows that everybody has a common cognitive disposition, which satisfies the condition of universality. Again, the rational faculty of human beings directs all persons to perceive the truth. So the common cognitive proposition constituted of innate ideas must be necessary as a result of inner compulsion. This satisfies the condition, necessity.

Then where did rationalism fall short of? As stated earlier, innate ideas exist only in the minds of human beings, and these innate ideas are known only when the knower intends to know it. As such, it is clear that it does not stand for any object in the external world. When one wants to know about the idea of an object that exists in the external world, which is certainly considered as a matter of fact, there is no guarantee that the innate idea of a subjective mind has to correspond to this matter of fact. This shows that there exists a gap between the knower and the known. In the history of Western philosophy, it was Descartes who tried to solve this problem by saying that God’s veracity is the ultimate guarantee for the factual truth of clear and distinct ideas. To put it in the words of Descartes:

“Now it is manifest by the natural light there must be at least as much reality in the efficient and the total cause as in its effect. For whence can the effect draw its reality if not from its cause?
How could this cause communicate to it this reality if it did not itself have it? And hence it follows not only that something cannot proceed from nothing; but also that what is more perfect, i.e., contains more reality, cannot proceed from what is less perfect . . . in this way the natural light makes it evident to me that the ideas are in one in the manner of images, which may indeed fall short of the perception of the things from which they have been derived, but can never contain anything greater or more perfect.”³

It is obvious that clear and distinct ideas by themselves do not explain their factual context, then the “God” will not do any miracle, for the very term “God” needs the same sort of explanation.

The other philosopher who follows the line of reasoning that knowledge constitutes innate ideas is Leibnitz. He too has to answer the question of factuality of innate ideas. He maintains the doctrine of pre-established harmony, which was also a failure, as it did not explain the correspondence between one monad and the other. It fails to explain the correspondence because Leibnitz maintains that each monad imperceptibly leads to others, the window-less character of each monad restricts oneself to come out of itself and see its own existence from outside. Therefore, the doctrine of pre-established harmony is an a priori assumption, which ordinarily cannot explain actual state of affairs.
There is yet another short coming arises out of rationalism. Almost all rationalists derived their philosophy on the basis of an axiom. This method is achieved through deductions. They claimed that these axioms served as the ‘given’. It means that reason cannot penetrate beyond this. But they were told that when reason was applied to these axioms, one could get valuable meaning to the reality. For example, Descartes starts his philosophy through the *cogito ergo sum*.4

But the problem of duality arises when the thinking ‘self’ is conceived as body and the self that ‘thinks’ is conceived as the mind. Though Descartes accepted this dualism, he was forced to face the inconsistency when he defined the nature of substance as that which exists on its own, independent of anything else. To quote Descartes here:

“By substance we can understand nothing else but a thing which so exists that it needs nothing else in order to exist. And in fact, as a substance which needs absolutely nothing else, only one can be so understood, namely God. But corporal substance, and created mind or thinking substance, can be understood under this common concept, that they are things which need only the concurrence of God in order to exist . . .”5
In order to meet this difficulty Spinoza brought out the view that there could be one substance, God. Further it is held that:

“Besides God no substance can be nor can be conceived.”

He gave a different name for all sorts of other things (which are usually known as substance) known as modes. He said that the substance, i.e., god alone is real whereas all other things are actual. He continues:

“By mode I understand the modifications of substance or that which is in another thing through which also it is conceived.”

This pantheistic way of approach leads Spinoza into contradictories, for he held sometimes that the modes to be modes are determined not directly by god but by other modes and as such the modes being temporal and finite cannot follow from the infinite substance, whereas he also held sometimes that the modes are said to be in god and as such, therefore, they are eternal and real. The reason for this contradictoriness is due to Spinoza’s belief on the all-powerfulness of reason. Though he started from a self-evident principle-substance, he could not draw his conclusion satisfactorily. This shows that reason, unaided by experience can only build castles in the air, hence it cannot account for any actuality, which we asked for earlier.
Critique of Empiricism
Kant agreed with empiricists that there cannot be “innate ideas” in the sense of anything known prior to any sense experience, but he was not prepared to say that all knowledge must be derived from experience. “Though all our experience begins with experience, it by no means follow, that all arises out of experience.”

He believed that proper knowledge is obtained through ordering and synthesizing of the sense- impressions. However, in order to perform the act of synthesizing, we need the help of the categories of substance, causality etc. that is causality and substance, are for Kant, *a priori* propositions that satisfied the conditions of universality and necessity. This we will discuss in the later part of this chapter.

For Hume, causation is just a psychological phenomenon based on the constant occurrence of certain natural phenomena. The factors that lead us to attribute causation to natural phenomena are: contiguity, co-existence, succession in time, and the idea of necessary connection. Out of these, the first three are given in sense-experience and the fourth is not. Then how can anyone establish this connection? Then the only way is to rely on the association of ideas. If causality is mere fiction, then ordering of sense impressions is possible. Even if we allowed doing so we are confronted with skepticism. In fact, Hume concluded that nothing could be known as *a priori* about the connection of cause and effect. This suggests that Hume is a skeptic.
Hume is forced to follow the line of a skeptic because he noticed the fact that cause and effect are based on matters of fact. Hume maintains that the regularity in the sense experience derives the idea of causation and the impression as such. If it is so then there is no necessary connection between one impression and the other. Further when two events are connected as such and effect, there is no common qualities found in objects by virtue of which a thing may be called as cause? So the concept of universality is eliminated from the notion of causality. Hence the connection between cause and effect cannot be known \textit{a priori}. On the other hand, it is the individuals association of ideas that constitute the notion of causality. This psychological attitude towards causality made empiricism too dogmatic, for it uncritically assumes the constitutive role of experience without reference to \textit{a priori} elements. In the end it sets no limit to ignorance which finally terminates in skepticism.

Apart from causality, the other factor which is very much helpful in ordering and synthesizing our sense impression to attain proper knowledge is the category called “substance”. Classical British empiricist’s viz., Locke, Berkeley, and Hume could not arrive at a stand on this issue. Locke attempted to deduce the existence of material substance from the awareness of the ideas. He said that when we repeatedly find a group of “simple ideas” associated together, then “we accustom ourselves to suppose some substratum wherein they do
subsist and from which they do result, which therefore we call substance.”

He held that the nature of this substance is not known, since our ideas do not inform anything about its nature. They only indicate us that substances exist, which are the ultimate causes of our own ideas. Locke asserted that the idea of corporeal substance in matter is as remote from our conception and apprehensions as that of spiritual substance or spirit. It implies that we must forever remain ignorant of the nature of material and spiritual substances.

We can apprehend either by sense or reflection. That the things I see with my eyes and touch with my Matter, argued Berkeley, does not exist because it can neither be perceived nor apprehended by the mind. He held the view that the idea of a substance has no defining characteristics. It is, therefore, not an idea at all. He said whenever we wish to conceive of any object, we find that we can do so in terms of its qualities which are mind dependent. To quote Berkeley here:

“I do not argue against the existence of anyone thing that hands does exist, really exist, I make not the least question. The only thing whose existence we deny is that which philosophers call matter or corporeal substance. And in doing of this, there is no damage done to mankind, who, I dare say, will never miss it. The atheist indeed will want the colour of an empty name to support his impiety...."
Thus Berkeley maintained that belief in the reality of substance is an unwarranted act of blind faith and holds: “if so, it shall seem good, use the word ‘matter’ in the same sense as other men use ‘nothing.’”

Hume doubts whether the idea of substance comes from the senses. As our senses supply us only with specific qualities we cannot get the idea of substance from impressions of sense experience. Following the hints of skepticism concerning substance made by Locke and Berkeley, he asserts that if at all there is an idea of substance, we cannot get it from anywhere other than impressions of reflection. But Hume says that these impressions of reflection can be resolved into our “passions and emotions”. So what we are getting is nothing but the idea of perception. He states, “The idea of substance . . . is nothing but a collection of simple ideas that are united by the imagination, and have a particular name assigned to them, by which we are able to recall, either to ourselves or others, that collection.”

If substance and causality are considered as mere fictions or imaginations then there is no way to synthesize and order the discrete sense impression. Without the order, according to Kant, there could be no knowledge; we are compelled to face skepticism. On these grounds, Kant rejects empiricism.
Copernican Revolution

The failure of rationalism and empiricism as two important epistemological doctrines can be summed up in the following manner: Both these schools consider that the object of knowledge exists outside the mind. In order to know something, the mind has to approach the objects. In this attempt we can say that such objects are such and such but we cannot say that all the objects must be such and such. It means to say that we cannot arrive at universal and necessary propositions concerning objects. For all these reasons, Kant tried a different method of approach. He gave the suggestion that instead of mind approaching the objects, we have to assume that objects must approach the mind in order to know their identity as objects. He suggested that the apparatus of human sensibility and understanding, which he claimed as the preconditions lie down on objects, itself have a form or structure which in some way contributes to our experience. He compared this new approach to that of Copernicus, as he undertook a task that reverses the existing opinion.

Kant’s Epistemology

Kantian theory of knowledge can be explained only on the basis of Copernican Revolution. If the objects are made to approach the mind then objective knowledge is possible. Usually the term “objective” refers to those that are free from subjective element. But for Kant, objectivity stands for public domains wherein all the subjective elements, which are the constituent of the public domain, posses the
same character. This kind of objective knowledge claims two important aspects of knowledge, namely, universality and necessity. But these two aspects of knowledge, universality and necessity are not the outcome of empirical knowledge, but are the products of pure knowledge. Again, pure knowledge can lead to illusion if it does not get the support of experience. Pure knowledge never proceeds, but follows empirical knowledge and this arises out of experience. Experience which moulds empirical knowledge can yield only discrete and passing impressions, as such, they never give rise to any knowledge at all. Mind has to act upon it in order to yield any knowledge.

Kant believed that scientific knowledge can operate only in the phenomenal realm and hence it cannot go beyond that. This shows that the phenomenal realm as such can be known only through sense and understanding. Yet, man tries to know beyond the level of phenomena, through reasons, which Kant believes that man cannot certainly achieve. This shows that the formal and material elements constitute knowledge. Further formal element does not constitute reason but understanding. To quote Kant:

“All conceptions, therefore, and with them all principles, however high the degree of their *a priori* possibility, relate to empirical intuitions, that is, to data towards a possible experience.
Without this they pose no objective validity, but are mere play of imagination or understanding with images or notions.”\textsuperscript{16}

For this reason, one cannot consider “reason” as one of the constituents of knowledge, but understanding, for “reason” is always applicable only to the understanding with images and not to the understanding with perceptual experience. The role of reason is to “know” things beyond the realm of knowledge. But Kant holds that the operation of reason is regulative in its nature. Hence, according to Kant, knowledge begins with sense experience, proceeds thence to understanding and ends in reason. Corresponding to these three levels, Kant divided his masterpiece, ‘Critique of Pure Reason’ into three parts namely, \textit{transcendental aesthetic}, \textit{transcendental analytic}, and \textit{transcendental dialectic}.

In transcendental analytic, Kant shows that there are \textit{a priori} forms of thinking which help to bind the passing discrete impressions, that are arrived through the senses. So the isolation of \textit{a priori} forms of thinking that deals with the object is known as transcendental analytic. Kant maintains:

“The exercise of this pure cognition, however, depends upon this as its condition, that objects to which it may be applied be given to us in intuition, for without intuition the whole of our cognition is without objects, and is therefore quite void. This part of transcendental logic, then, which treats of the
elements of pure cognition of the understanding, and of the principles without which no object at all can be thought, is transcendental analytic.”\textsuperscript{17}

But in transcendental dialectic, he deals with thinking on things-in-themselves, thereby landing on the transcendental illusions. So among these two, the former alone yields knowledge. In order to show that Kant bridged rationalism and empiricism, thereby forming his transcendental philosophy, we must look into his transcendental aesthetic and transcendental analytic and not his transcendental dialectic, for the last one deals with transcendental illusion and not the scientific knowledge. Prior to that, it is necessary to know the important terms such as judgments, analytic, synthetic, etc., used by Kant in these areas.

Judgment, for Kant, is a synthesis of representations and presentation having objective validity. Objectivity is not possible in terms of experience since experience varies drastically from person to person. As such it differs from propositions and statements. Propositions are attributed with truth and falsity, for they are usually supposed or assumed or denied or asserted of any indicative sentences. On the other hand a statement can mean either the act of stating or what is stated which again leaning towards truth and falsity. As Kantian epistemology arises out of sense and understanding, both
in terms of *a priori*, it has to oblige the conditions of universality and necessity. In such a case it is impossible to arrive at a false judgment.

**Analytic and Synthetic Judgments**

Kantian expression of analytic and synthetic judgments is possible only in terms of definition. Kant defined analytic judgment as the one in which the predicate is contained in the subject.\(^{18}\) similarly a synthetic judgment is the one in which the predicate is not contained in the subject.\(^{19}\) the examples given by Kant is as follows:

“All bodies are extended” is an analytic judgment.

“All bodies are heavy” is a synthetic judgment.

In the examples given above, the concept of body is already defined in terms of extension. So we are not gaining any new knowledge as what is already known is being repeated in analytic judgment. In another words, we can come to know analytic judgments through the principle of identity. As such, the law of contradiction will not apply to analytic judgment. If we attempt to do so, we would be self negating ourselves, in that, and nothing can have and not have properties simultaneously. Finally, there is no need for experience to ascertain analytic judgments.
Judgments based on experience are called synthetic judgments; the predicate is not contained in the subject, so synthetic judgments are argumentative. That is we are gaining some new knowledge. As the subject does not contain the predicate, contradiction of these judgments will not be absurd. Whether a body is heavy or not is known through experience. One cannot derive the knowledge of the predicate heaviness from the subject “body” as one used to do in analytic statements. The significance of the distinction between analytic and synthetic judgments is that we cannot equate this distinction with the distinction of *a priori* and *a posteriori* propositions. The reason being *a priori* necessity is different from analytic necessity. So “*a priori*” cannot replace “analytic”. But all *a posteriori* judgments are synthetic. This does not mean to say that all synthetic judgements are *a posteriori*.

There are *a priori* judgments which give new knowledge. Further, there are *a priori* judgments which are not analytic in a sense that the predicate is not contained in the subject, though they are not synthetic as they are not arrived through experience. Now we conclude that the analytic and synthetic distinction of Kant is based on the content of the proposition where as *a priori* and *a posteriori* distinction always have reference to the source of cognition.
However, Kant claims that in all theoretical sciences of reason, synthetic judgments “a priori” are contained as principles. For example, all propositions of mathematics are synthetic judgments *a priori*. Being universal and necessary such propositions will be called as *a priori*. Further, they are empirical. His stock instance of synthetic judgments was the proposition $7 + 5 = 12$. He stated that $7 + 5$ contains nothing more than the unity of both these two numbers into one, and while doing so no one will think about the product, instead one will concentrate on the process of adding.\(^{22}\) Then it is obvious that the idea of “12” is not contained in “7+5”. In what way is it synthetic? Thus, all pure mathematics, though *a priori*, is synthetic. Apart from mathematics, pure physics also contains synthetic judgments *a priori*.

**Are Synthetic *a priori* Judgments Possible?**
The synthetic *a priori* knowledge raises many problems and one among them is how do we acquire *a priori* knowledge. Russell maintained that one cannot try to solve this problem through induction, for the very purpose of induction cannot be validated through induction.\(^ {23}\) Majority of analytic philosophers do not subscribe to Kant's view. According to them, synthetic *a priori* is a contradiction in terms. What is *a priori* cannot be synthetic and vice-versa. Kant's distinction of these two terms, namely “synthetic” and “*a priori*” may not contradict each other, for there is a possibility of accommodating both in a judgment.
But for analytic philosophers, synthetic \textit{a priori} judgments are absurd like a round square.

Knowledge about the things of which we are not experienced is the cause of synthetic judgments \textit{a priori}. If a judgment is not logically possible in mathematics, then Kantian solution to this problem turns out to be a meaningless job. However, though logic and arithmetic cannot be applied to future event when considering the present, as it is based on synthetic judgment \textit{a priori}, which posses a problem, they are going to work out well when the future turns to present in a future. Kant’s solution to this problem can be seen only through his reconciliation of rationalism and empiricism.

\textbf{Kantian Reconciliation}

Here, it becomes necessary to recall what we stated earlier as regards cognition. Kant subdivided the process of cognition into three, namely, sensing, understanding, and reasoning. As said earlier let us not worry about reasoning as it goes beyond the phenomenal realm of which we cannot know anything but illusion. Let us now take percept and concept in our mission of highlighting Kantian reconciliation.

Kant shows that there are \textit{a priori} forms of sensibility when he deals with transcendental aesthetic. He holds in the opening part of his \textit{Critique of Pure Reason} that in all our experience there are two elements involved which have to be distinguished properly. The one is due to
the physical object and the other is due to our own nature. According to Kant, the crude material given in sensation as impression or presentation such as colour, hardness etc., is due to the object. As such they are merely percepts arrived through experience. Again, experience cannot give universal and necessary objective knowledge. We are gaining knowledge not because these percepts are experienced but because they are presupposed. If percepts are presupposed in all experience, then it is known as pure percepts or *a priori* percepts. Kant argues that space and time are *a priori* percepts on which all empirical percepts are based. We shall now consider ourselves with space, supposing that the same argument can be applied to time as well.

According to Kant space is not a concept but is a percept. The reason being that a concept is arrived at after considering a large number of instances. If space is a concept, then it means that there are instances of space. But space is really one and hence there is no instance of space. But the percept does not refer to empirical percept. On the other hand, it is *a priori* percept. If space is not *a priori* percept then it is *a posteriori*. If it is so then it is derived from experience which leads to the following possibilities:

(a) Space and time are really objective, existing in their own rights. Kant refuses this view. If space were an objective reality, existing in its own right, then it can be known only through experience. If so, the
empirical notion of space cannot have strict universality or true necessity.

If space is derived from experience, then it is just an appearance. Hence no space is real. If there is no space, Kant holds, then there is no object for experience because the existence of an object presupposes that there is a space.

“We may correctly say that space contains all that which can appear to us externally, but not all things considered as things-in-themselves, be they be intuited or not, or by whatsoever subject one will. As to the intuitions of other thinking beings, we cannot judge whether they are or are not same conditions which limit our own intuition, and which for us are universally valid. If we join the limitation of a judgment, it will posses unconditioned validity. For example, the proposition, “All objects are beside each other in space”. It is valid only under the limitation that these things are taken as object, of our sensuous intuition. But if I join the condition to the conception, and say, “all things, as external phenomena, one beside each other in space”, then the rule is valid universally and without any limitation. Our exposition, consequently, teaches the reality (i.e., the objective validity) of space in regard of all which can be presented to “to us externally as object.”26
So, instead of taking the experiences of objects as explaining the notion of space, we have to maintain that the notion of space is presupposed for explaining such experiences themselves. For this reason, experience cannot explain space. The notion of space is prior to any experience and hence it is *a priori*.

Further we can imagine an object to exist without certain qualities. For example, we can imagine a particular object without having this colour or that or even not to have any colour at all. If space is arrived through experience, and if we project our earlier experiment to space, we would be thinking of an object without having any special character at all, which is an absurd thinking. So Kant says:

“With the exception of space, there is no representation, subjective and referring to something external to us, which would be called objective *a priori*. For there are no other subjective representations from which we can deduce synthetically propositions *a priori*, as we can form the intuition of space.”

Thus, we are not in space and time, but space and time are in us. That is, to say they are subjective. But this subjective element is the same for all and hence it is public or objective. Thus it satisfies the conditions necessity and universality and hence space and time are *a priori*. 
In the light of the distinction between phenomena and noumena we can explain the *a priori* perceptual nature of space and time. That is, whenever we perceive an object in experience, which he calls the “phenomenon”? We colour them, modify and transform them by spacing and timing them. Without doing this we cannot perceive them at all. Without perception knowledge is not possible.

So far we have seen only the role of physical object as percept can form only the phenomenon corresponding to the sensation which he termed as matter or material element. To get a proper knowledge the phenomenon has to be arranged under certain relations, whom he calls “forms” or “formal element”. This is achieved through the faculty of understanding.

Knowing, as said already, according to Kant, consists in thinking about the percepts. To think means to combine percepts into judgments with the help of concepts. Again the combination of concepts with the percepts cannot be explained empirically for it lacks universality and necessity. So it is *a priori* form of thinking that combines the concept with the percept in knowing something.

Obviously by concepts Kant meant only the *a priori* forms of concepts. Granted that there are *a priori* concepts without which no objective knowledge is possible, our task now is to determine such
concepts. Kant maintains that such concepts can be established on analyzing formal judgments which were already established in formal logic by Aristotle. Thus, Kant deduced the pure conception of understanding, which he called “categories”, namely, unity, plurality, totality, reality, negation, limitation, substance-accident, cause-effect, reciprocity or action-reaction, possibility-impossibility, existence-non-existence, necessity-contingency. It is evident from the exercise of Kant that he went against Hume’s denial of cause and effect, substance and categories.

Let us now turn to Kantian method of solving synthetic judgment *a priori*. Kant has shown that some contributions of mind are not derived from experience. Yet they are very much helpful in acquiring empirical knowledge. Thus he has shown that knowledge can be arrived through *a priori* means which increase our knowing without being empirical. As it increases our knowledge, they are synthetic. They are also synthetic, for the predicate is not contained in the subject. But they are *a priori* as they are not derived from experience. Also they satisfy those conditions of universality and necessity. He considers that the material given in sensation due to the physical object and our arrangement of physical objects in space and time give rise to various sense data which one can talk in terms of relations. The relations of sense data make sense as we either compare them or consider one as the cause of other or vice-versa. Kant is applying these *a priori* concepts only to space and time, causality,
comparison, substance and not to the physical objects as much. So our 
a priori knowledge can be verified when we pass through the empirical
knowledge. This a priori knowledge is arising out of our own nature
and hence we cannot talk of experience without this a priori
knowledge. We are experiencing something just because we are
possessed of these “a priori”. Thus the synthetic judgments a priori are
no more a problem.

Kant’s solution to the problem of synthetic judgments a priori in
one way antedates his reconciliation between rationalism and
empiricism. We can have objective knowledge only of the
phenomenon. It is nothing, but that which can be known in the object
as we have it in experience. We have knowledge over phenomenon
because we are experiencing it. This experience presupposes our a
priori knowledge over the phenomenon. Thus our a priori knowledge
has been confirmed on the basis of possible experience. So, there is no
use in having a priori knowledge on things of which we do not have
any possible or actual experience. Similarly experience by itself can
only bring discrete sense impression. If they have to assemble together
we need a priori knowledge. Thus Kant gives emphasis on the
assertions of both rationalism and empiricism. But he is not willing to
assert on what they are denying. Thus he harmonizes the contentions
of the rationalists with the arguments of empiricists.
In the next chapter, we would take up for discussion the inadequacy of the “containment theory” in terms of definition, to define the analytic statements. Our concentration is on Fredrich Waismann, who rejects the distinction between analytic and synthetic judgments as he feels that they are strictly bounded by rigid rules.
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