Aesthetic = science of the rules of sensibility
Logic = science of the rules of the understanding

Table of Judgments

Quantity:
Universal: All dogs are stupid
Particular: Some dogs are stupid
Singular: My dog is stupid

Quality:
e.g. <Kant is not mortal> is negative and finite
OTOH, <Kant is immortal> is infinite: negative in force, positive in form

Relation:
Categorical: relation of predicate to subject (x is F)
Hypothetical: relation of the ground to the consequence (if P, then Q)
Disjunctive: relation “of two or more propositions to another… insofar as the
sphere of the one excludes that of the other…” (Kant’s example: “The world
exists either through blind chance, or through inner necessity, or through an
external cause.”)

Modality:
Problematic: x may be F
Assertoric: x is F
Apodeictic: x is necessarily F

There are exactly as many pure concepts of the understanding as there were logical
functions of all possible judgments.

Table of Categories

Of Quantity: mathematical: objects of intuition
Of Quality
Of Relation: dynamical: relation of objects to each other or the understanding
Of Modality
**Transcendental Deduction:**

A xvi: investigations leading to the transcendental deduction: “…are the investigations that have cost me the most, but I hope not unrewarded, effort.”

fn in *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science* : “without a completely clear and adequate deduction of the categories the system of the *Critique of Pure Reason* would totter on its foundations…” (A IV 475)

Transcendental Deduction is supposed to contain the two most important arguments in the book: the first demonstrating the possibility of systematic knowledge of experience and the second the impossibility of knowledge beyond the limits of experience

**Transcendental Deduction and Transcendental Idealism:**

In the *Metaphysical Foundations* Kant gives the following summary of his argument:

(1) Conceded: The table of categories completely contains all the pure concepts of the understanding as well as all the formal operations of the understanding in judgments, from which such pure concepts are derived and from which they also differ in nothing except that in the concept of the understanding, an object is thought as determined in regard to one or the other function of judgments.

(2) Conceded: The understanding by its nature carries with it a priori synthetic principles, by which it subordinates to the categories all objects that might be given to it. Consequently, there must also be a priori intuitions, which contain the requisite conditions for the application of the pure concepts of the understanding.

(3) Conceded: These pure intuitions can never be anything but mere forms of the appearances of the external senses or of the internal sense (space and time), and consequently can be forms only of objects of possible experiences.

(4) It follows that no employment of pure reason can ever concern anything but objects of possible experience. (A IV 475)

Premise of the whole argument of the transcendental deduction: there occurs awareness of a manifold in time.

From this premise Kant tries to prove that

1. There is a unified self (as opposed to a mere sequence of representations).
2. We know physical objects.
3. By means of 1 and 2, all our knowledge is subject to the categories.

Kant seeks to refute Hume, for whom there is no possibility of giving a philosophical justification of self-identity, the existence of physical objects, and the validity of a priori categories, e.g. causality.
Kant wants to refute Hume and the dogmatic metaphysicians in two ways:

(1) Categories could only be proved with reference to possibility of experience and were therefore only valid within the realm of actual and possible experience.
(2) Unity of the self was inseparable from the unity of objects known and vice versa; so we could no longer assert either a soul-substance retaining an identity apart from its relation to objects or physical objects existing independently of us in the sense of a realist.

B Deduction

B Deduction falls naturally into two parts: §§15-20, which seem to make a clear and coherent argument; and §§21-27, which either argue something else or constitute a second step in the argument.

A sketch of the argument:

(1) The representation of combination [Verbindung] is the one kind of representation that can never be given by sense. It is due to an act of spontaneity – as such it is performed by the understanding. This is called synthesis.
(2) Besides the manifold and its synthesis, there is also the representation of the unity of the manifold. Representation of the synthetical unity of the manifold is necessary to and constitutes knowledge. Representation of unity conditions consciousness of synthesis, and therefore can’t be the product of it.
(3) The consciousness of unity is here apperception or transcendental self-consciousness.
(4) A manifold though given is not for that reason also represented. Only what can be combined in one consciousness can be related to the “I think”. The analytic unity of self-consciousness presupposes the synthetic unity of the manifold.
(5) Through the synthetic unifying of the manifold the self comes to consciousness both of itself and of the manifold.
(6) The transcendental original unity of apperception is an objective, not a merely subjective, unity. Its conditions are also the conditions in and through which we acquire consciousness of objects.
(7) Judgment acquires objective validity through its participation in the necessary unity of apperception. In so doing it is made to embody those principles of the objective determination of all representations through which alone cognition is possible.
(8) Apperception conditions experience, and the unity which both demand for their possibility is that of the categories.