

## **Contents of the Doctoral Thesis**

### *Introduction*

#### *Imagination in the Critique of Pure Reason*

*Imagination as common root of sensitivity and understanding (Heideggers's interpretation) – Imagination and deduction – Imagination and schematism – Objectivity and alterity*

#### *Imagination in the Critique of Practical Reason*

*Principles of pure practical reason – Imagination and symbolic representations – Typic of pure practical judgment*

#### *Imagination in the Critique of the Power of Judgment*

*Imagination and taste – Imagination and objectivity*

## **Keywords**

*Analogy, a priori, a posteriori, transcendental deduction, beauty, taste, imagination, understanding, thing in itself, noumen, transcendental object, presentation, reason, sensible pure reason, schematism, sensitivity, sublime, typic, topics, tropics*

## **Summary**

The fundamental problem that led to the development of this research was that of establishing the importance of the faculty of imagination within Kantian philosophy. It started from the ambiguous status of this faculty, especially in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Kant states that in order to make a critique of reason it is necessary to see what and how much it can know. In order for an experience to be possible, two heterogenous sources of knowledge must compile: sensitivity and understanding. Nevertheless, a third faculty is needed to ensure a certain homogeneity between the two; this is imagination.

Transcendental aesthetics has the role of isolating sensitivity and decomposing it in its basic elements and then fulfils the role of establishing its contribution to knowledge. Transcendental logic isolates and decomposes understanding in its basic elements which are the categories. Yet, the transcendental theory of elements does not assign a certain

topic to the transcendental imagination. The question from which we started was the following: does the fact that imagination is short of a topic mean that its role in knowledge is desconsidered? Or, rather, being in the act of experience forming is the very proper character of this faculty. The homogeneity of the two transcendental sources of knowledge can be ensured only by a transcendental faculty.

Our working hypothesis was that beyond the architectonic aspect of the apparatus of criticism imagination is the one that renders best the diverse positioning and re-positioning of the Kantian analyses regarding the theoretical, practical and aesthetic experience. What we have been trying to point out is that the analysis of imagination may very well shed light on the coherence and unity of the Kantian approach in the three Critiques.

We attempted to build our interpretation on imagination around the analysis belonging to Martin Heidegger as it is found in *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*. Following the Hegelian interpretation, Heidegger identifies imagination with reason. His interpretation is somehow justified by Kant himself who, in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, asserts the existence of a common root of sensitivity and understanding; Heidegger says that imagination is this common root, leading to the conclusion that this faculty is the root of transcendence. Previous to any determinative synthesis which, as such, produces experience, there is an *ante*-predicative synthesis in which the world is already given; this synthesis is the work of transcendental imagination. The benefit of Heideggerian interpretation is that it orientates the hermeneutic attention towards the connection between imagination and the ideas of reason. As a faculty of presentation (*Darstellung*) imagination must have the ability of a simplification of the ideas of reason. What Heidegger fails to notice is the fact that the theory of faculty prototypes – intellectual intuition and intuitive understanding - raises the question of creative imagination – the unfulfilled problem of a prototype for imagination within the Kantian corpus.

The proof that such a problem was not unknown to Kant is the fuse of the theme of creative imagination in *The Critique of Faculty of Judgment*. This is an ability that belongs to the genius, but it is not reduced only to the genius personality. Imagination is defined as a faculty of representing the object even in its absence. The transcendental faculty of imagination consists in its capacity of representing what is missing. Such a fact may be understood in two ways: 1) imagination represents what was actual perception, meaning that it helps us in representing an appearance of the object (this being the moderate version of this capacity of imagination) and 2) imagination makes 'present' what is missing,

fundamentally speaking, from experience, the transcendental object, which is the transcendental soil preceding any presentation of an empirical object (the hard version of the thesis). The second version of the thesis is the one that reveals best the transcendental character of imagination.

Our interpretation of imagination in *The Critique of Pure Reason* has been decisive for our overall interpretation. For that matter, this is the most consistent part of our dissertation. In the first chapter, *Imagination in The Critique of Pure Reason*, the first part, *Imagination as common root of sensitivity and intellect*, displays Heidegger's thesis of imagination. In the second part of the first chapter, *Imagination and deduction*, we attempted to interpret the obvious asymmetry between the two versions of deduction in regard to the role and importance of imagination. The first deduction, known as subjective deduction places imagination in the centre of faculties analysis. In contrast, the second deduction seems to operate a resorption of imagination in the intellect. Firstly, we tried to clarify the difficulties of transcendental deduction in itself. Then we analysed the first transcendental deduction of the categories from the perspective shaped by the three syntheses: apprehension synthesis in intuition, reproduction synthesis in imagination and recognition synthesis in concept; we specified the difference between the reproductive imagination and productive imagination, then we clarified the link between imagination and apperception. The analysis of imagination in the second deduction of the categories unfolded around the concept of figurative synthesis. This synthesis is fulfilled by the intellect, but not in its proper name, as pure intellect, but under the name of imagination.

The third part of the first chapter, *Imagination and schematism*, shows the specific act of imagination within the framework of knowledge. Schematism is the mechanism through which an objective reality is procured to a concept with the help of the corresponding intuition. Transcendental schematism works as a mediator (the third term) between pure thinking and sensitivity, offering meaning to the categories and ensuring a category structure to intuition. Schematism procedure best highlights the function of imagination of homogenizing the two heterogenous sources of knowledge. The difference between the image and the scheme has led us to the idea of an imagination without an image and the idea of a quasi-schematism without a concept. At the same time, we analysed the problem of the schematism of the ideas of reason. The substantial problem regarding this type of schematism is that the ideas of reason can never be presented directly, but only indirectly. This part of the analysis has fused the theme of symbolic

representations from *The Critique of Practical Reason* and *The Critique of Faculty of Judgment*.

The last part of the first chapter, *Objectivity and alterity*, emphasizes the role of imagination in the construction of the object and of objectivity. We developed an analysis of the three instances of indetermination at the level of the three faculties: the thing in itself at the level of sensitivity, the noumenon at the level of the intellect and the transcendental object at the level of imagination. We presented some fundamental theses regarding the problem of indetermination: Henry Allison's thesis, Philonenko's thesis, Rousset's thesis and Garelli's thesis. Important attention has been paid to the problem of the transcendental object, as hypostasis of indetermination at the level of imagination. This is the native soil of any objectivity.

The second chapter is entitled *Imagination in The Critique of Practical Reason*. The main interpretive difficulty was due to the more than discrete presence, even concealed we may say, of imagination in the second Critique. Practical philosophy is confronted, as well as theoretic philosophy, with the exigence of presentation: the possible application of a freedom law to a human action taking place in the sensitive world. The heterogeneity that imagination is meant to solve here is that between the moral law and the sensitive world. However, Kant seems to exclude imagination from the process of sensitive presentation of the law. The analysis of the chapter about the transcendental typicality highlighted two specific movements for the typicality process. In a first movement, typicality organizes / encourages / stimulates the exercise of imagination, so that in a second movement it suspends this exercise because the only shape the intellect conserves is the presentation form. At the end of the chapter we presented Jeffrey Liss's interpretation which shows the way in which the problem of the positive and negative meaning of the noumenon from the first *Critique* fuses the problem of the law specific to the second *Critique*.

In the third chapter, entitled *Imagination in the Critique of Faculty of Judgment*, we analysed the connection between imagination and the faculty of taste. Here too the concept of presentation is central in the analysis of imagination. In the second part of the chapter, *Imagination and objectivity*, we showed the manner in which the problem of objectivity is built at the level of the third Critique from the perspective of imagination.

The conclusion of the dissertation is that imagination can respond for the coherence of the critical project on the whole and that the function of imagination is every time that of a mediator. If there is no order of words as regarding imagination, this fact is owed to its

metaphorical character, of the faculty of permanent formation, of the perpetual placing and re-placing.

## **Selected bibliography**

### **Romanian translations of Immanuel Kant's Works**

KANT, Immanuel: *Critica rațiunii practice și Întemeierea metafizicii moravurilor*, traducere, studiu introductiv, note și indice de nume proprii de Nicolae Bagdasar, Editura IRI, București, 1999.

KANT, Immanuel: *Critica rațiunii pure*, traducere de Nicolae Bagdasar și Elena Moisuc, ediția a III-a îngrijită de Ilie Pârvu, Editura IRI, București, 1998.

KANT, Immanuel: *Logica generală*, traducere, studiu introductiv, note și index de Alexandru Surdu, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1985.

KANT, Immanuel: *Prolegomene la orice metafizică viitoare care se va putea înfățișa drept știință*, traducere de Mircea Flonta și Thomas Kleininger, studiu introductiv și note de Mircea Flonta, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1987.

KANT, Immanuel: *Religia doar în limitele rațiunii*, traducere, studiu introductiv, studiu asupra traducerii, note, bibliografie selectivă, index de concepte germano-român, index de concepte de Rodica Croitoru, Editura BIC ALL, București, 2007.

KANT, Immanuel: *Critica facultății de judecare*, traducere, studiu introductiv, studiu asupra traducerii, note, bibliografie selectivă, index de concepte germano-român, index concepte de Rodica Croitoru, Editura ALL, București, 2008.

### **French translations of Immanuel Kant's Works**

KANT, Emmanuel: *Œuvres philosophiques*, 3 volumes, édition publiée sous la direction de Ferdinand Alquié, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris;

- Vol. 1: « Des premières écrits à la *Critique de la raison pure* », Editions Gallimard, 1980;
- Vol. 2: « Des *Prolegomènes* aux écrits de 1791 », Editions Gallimard, 1985;
- Vol. 3: « Les dernières écrits », Editions Gallimard, 1986.

KANT, Emmanuel: *Leçons de métaphysique*, Le Livre de poche, Paris, 1993.

### **English translations of Immanuel Kant's Works**

*The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*, general editors Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood, Cambridge University Press, New York;

- Vol. 1: "Theoretical Philosophy, 1775-1770", Cambridge University Press, 1992;

- Vol. 2: "Critique of Pure Reason", Cambridge University Press, 1998;
- Vol. 3: "Theoretical Philosophy after 1781", Cambridge University Press, 2002;
- Vol. 4: "Practical Philosophy", Cambridge University Press, 1996;
- Vol. 5: "Critique of the Power of Judgment", Cambridge University Press, 2000;
- Vol. 7: "Anthropology, History, and Education", Cambridge University Press, 2007;
- Vol. 14: "Correspondence", Cambridge University Press, 1999.

### **Main studies and articles on imagination**

- BIELEFELDT, Heiner: *Symbolic Representations in Kant's Practical Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- CIOMOȘ, Virgil: *Conștiință și schimbare în Critica rațiunii pure, o perspectivă arhitectonică asupra kantianismului*, Editura Humanitas, Colecția Academica, București, 2006.
- DICKERSON, A.B.: *Kant on Representation and Objectivity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 2004.
- FREYDBERG, Bernard: *Imagination in Kant's Critique of Practical Reason*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 2005.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin: *Kant et le problème de la métaphysique*, introduction et traduction par Alphonse de Waelhens et Walter Biemel, Editions Gallimard, Paris, 1953.
- KNELLER, Jane: *Kant and the Power of Imagination*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- MAKKREEL, Rudolf: *Imagination and Interpretation in Kant. The Hermeneutical Import of the Critique of Judgment*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1990.
- MAKOWIAK, Alexandra: *Kant, l'imagination et la question de l'homme*, Editions Jérôme Millon, Collection Krisis, Grenoble, 2009.

### **Articles**

- BASCH, Victor: Du rôle de l'imagination dans la théorie kantienne de la connaissance. In: *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, T. 12, No. 3 (Mai 1904), pp. 425-440.
- BAYNE, Steven: Objects of Representations and Kant's Second Analogy. In: *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 32:3 (1994:July), pp. 381-410.
- BENOIST, Jocelyn: L'impensé de la représentation: De Leibniz à Kant. In: *Kant-Studien*, 89:3 (1998) pp. 300-317.
- DUYCKAERTS, François: L'imagination productrice dans la Logique transcendantale de Fichte. In: *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*. Troisième série, Tome 50, N°26, 1952, pp. 230-250.
- ESCOUBAS, Eliane: Kant ou la simplicité du sublime. In *Du sublime*, Edition Belin, 1998.
- FRAISSE, Jean-Claude: Imagination schématisante et esthétique musicale. In: *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 93e Année, No. 3 (Juillet-Septembre 1988), pp.365-379.
- HANDY, William: Imagination and the Understanding: Contemporary Versions. In: *Texas Studies in English*, 36 (1957), pp. 20-27.

- LISS, Jeffrey: Kant's transcendental object and the two senses of the noumenon: a problem in imagination. In: *Man and World 13*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, The Hague/Boston/London, 1980, pp. 133-153.
- MAKKREEL, Rudolf: Imagination and Temporality. In Kant's Theory of the Sublime. In: *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 1984, pp. 303-315.
- MINEUR, Didier, Représentation et régime représentatif chez Kant. In: *Revue Française d'Histoire des Idées Politiques*, 2005/1 N°21, pp. 73-87.
- SALLIS, John: La mortalité et l'imagination: Heidegger et le nom propre de l'homme. In: *Le Cahier (Collège international de philosophie)*, No. 8 (octobre 1989), pp. 51-77.
- SCHLANGER, Judith: Kant aux images. In: *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 81e Année, No. 3 (Juillet-Septembre 1976), pp. 328-349.
- THOMPSON, Michael: Roots and role of imagination in Kant: Imagination at the core. In: *Graduate School Theses and Dissertations*, University of South Florida, 2009, Paper 50.
- YOUNG, Michael: Construction, Schematism, and Imagination. In: *Topoi* 3 (1984), pp. 123-131.
- YOUNG, Michael: Kant's View of Imagination. In: *Kant-Studien*, Lawrence Kansas, 79:2 (1988), pp. 140-164.
- ZOELLER, Guenter: Makkreel on Imagination and Interpretation in Kant: Questions and Criticisms. In: *Philosophy Today*, 36:3 (1992:Fall), pp. 266-275