Conclusion

Our conceptual scheme, in its fundamental features, concerns substance and causality, which are the two most prime concepts both in Locke’s Essay and in Kant’s Critique. In the preceding chapters, this study has critically expounded these two concepts. Here attempt has been made to interrelate the various issues centered round these concepts and in this process to draw conclusion from them.

The first chapter has depicted the influence of the predecessors viz., Aristotle and Descartes, and contemporary viz., Newton on Locke’s thought. Locke has incorporated many aspects of their philosophies in his theory of substance and causality. While interpreting Newton’s relation to Locke, it has been observed that it was the common interest of scientific objective knowledge that brought them closer together.

Similarly, in case of Kant, Leibniz and Hume have acted as an immediate impetus to mould his new line of thinking. Leibniz’s rationalism and Hume’s empiricism that are opposed to each other have left an indelible mark on Kant’s thought. And this led him to form his critical method. So what both Locke and Kant have developed in their philosophies, are not something piecemeal out of isolated and fragmentary thoughts, on the contrary, they are the reflections of the then existing
ideas, prevalent in that period, i.e. seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The principles of their time are not separate forces acting upon them, on the contrary, they are the foods, out of which both the philosophers selected and assimilated such as are fitted to nourish their conception of substance and causality.

The second chapter has examined Locke’s concept of substance and causality. In dealing with these issues, it has been shown that epistemology is not altogether independent of ontology. And it is through the general epistemological framework; the concepts of substance and causality have emerged. It has been also brought out that these two concepts viz., substance and causality, which are complex ideas in Locke’s philosophy, are so vital that without them, the talk about permanence and causality fails.

In this chapter we have dealt with the intricate issues too, relating to these concepts viz, the issue of primary and secondary qualities, nominal and real essences, the polemic whether Locke is a realist or nominalist etc. In dealing with these issues, the following observations are made.

It has been noticed that the distinction between primary and secondary qualities is very important in Locke’s theory of substance. Locke has inherited the distinction immediately from Boyle, his scientist friend and ultimately from Epicurus, the ancient Greek philosopher. We have shown there, that though Locke recognizes the independent existence
of substance, yet substance cannot be known directly. Substance can be
known only through the intervention of primary qualities. So the
knowledge that we gather regarding material object is not direct.

Regarding nominal and real essences, we have discussed in the
second chapter that according to Locke, substance is constituted of the
above mentioned essences. And one can know the nominal essence of a
substance only. Real essences though it constitutes the core of substance
cannot be known. According to Locke, our nature is so made that one
cannot know the real essences of a substance, though real essences are
there.

The polemic whether Locke is a realist or nominalist has settled
neither in realist nor in nominalist camp. It has been shown that there are
both realist and nominalist aspects in Locke's philosophy. And this creates
contradictions in his thought.

Similarly, in case of causality, it has been explored that though
Locke recognizes necessary causal connections, yet like real essences, one
failsto observe it. What one observes is nothing but constant conjunction
between different events.

It has been observed in the second chapter, while discussing
Locke's theory of knowledge that he recognizes both knowledge of God's
existence and the knowledge of mathematics, which are outside the
purview of experience. And to accommodate the knowledge of these
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concepts, Locke admits both intuitive and demonstrative besides sensitive knowledge. Therefore, in recognizing knowledge of necessary truths, he crosses the boundaries of experience.

Regarding the above point, Kant, later remarks in the Critique:

...Locke, who after having derived all concepts and principles from experience, goes so far in the use of them as to assert that we can prove the existence of God and the immortality of the soul with the same conclusiveness as any mathematical proposition—though both lie entirely outside the limits of possible experience.¹

This position of Locke results, as he recognises entities, that go beyond the arena of experience. Locke wants to adjust them within the world of experience, that is why, this contradiction results.

Accepting Locke’s premises that knowledge begins with experience, Kant wants to overcome the above problem by separating the world of phenomena and the world of noumena, which we have discussed in the third chapter. In that chapter we have discussed that to accommodate both knowledge and faith, Kant creates two worlds viz, phenomenal and noumenaland ascribes the origin of substance and causality to reason.

The categories of substance and causality are applicable within the world of phenomena. There, it has been also shown, that to prove the permanence of substance, Kant has ascribed a special role to time.

Starting from the above mentioned Locke's premise and agreeing with Hume that it is not possible to derive necessary causal connections from experience, he reiterates that though all knowledge begins from experience, it does not follow that all arises out of experience. Besides materials, contributed by the sense, there are certain apriori forms. This apriori forms of our knowledge has its origin to reason, which makes knowledge universal and necessary.

In the third chapter, we have pointed out Newton's influence on Kant. Corresponding to Newton's three laws of motion, viz, matter, force and reaction, Kant has shown that there are three categories viz, substance, causality and reciprocity.

After discussing the criticisms of different commentators on substance, we have arrived at the following conclusion.

Whatever changes there may be, there is something that preserves its own identity i.e., the thing itself. Substance is there and it endures through all such transformations, whether that is earth, air, fire and water.

There, we have also dealt with the pre-critical writings on causality. While discussing, it has been observed that the thoughts of these pre-critical writings on causality, Kant later, incorporates in the Critique. There, we have brought out, Hume's connection with Kant, who induced him to arise from his 'dogmatic slumber' to formulate the notion of causality as an apriori category of understanding.
In chapter four, we have compared the concepts, substance and causality in the philosophies of Locke and Kant. Here, we have shown that there are many similarities as well as differences between these two philosophers, regarding their formation of these concepts.

After the study, we have observed, that Locke's material substance though it is real has some unknown part. Similarly Kant's concept of substance and causality are workable only within the world of actual and possible experience, that is phenomena.

The world of noumena is something unknown and unknowable, with no access to reach there.

In conclusion, we may say that, substance and causality, which are indispensable for our knowledge of objective reality, both Locke and Kant, in their own way, have developed them and thus enriched the philosophical heritage.