HP / May 20, 2009 02:26AM

Where is the "Modality" in §18?

It is interesting to find that there is NO "modality" (literally written) in Section 18 with the fact that it is titled as "What the Modality of a Judgment of Taste Is." I mean: I cannot find the keyword "Modality" in the section. Interesing...but not surprising since we already know we are reading Kant.

I attach some quote form gustav in his private email though it's still hard for me to understand modality. I hope it is ok to him for this quote. See the follows:

第四個moment是關於審美判斷於modality這個環節的分析，
Quality這個環節是關於判斷如何確定其質上的特徵，
Quantity這個環節是關於判斷如何確定其量上的特徵，
Relation這個環節是關於判斷如何確定其關係上的特徵，
Modality也是關於一種關係，但是不是判斷的對象的關係，而是判斷自身的關係，是這個判斷如何讓判斷者接受的關係。

在認知判斷中，任何判斷中判斷者只能用如下三種模式思及這個判斷自身：那可能與否（有多少可能性？）、存在與否（確定是或確定不是）、必要與否（必要或不必要）。

而康德分析審美判斷當中，判斷者只能用一種「必然」的模式思及這個判斷及其結果，
但是這種「必然」又有別於認知判斷當中的必要性，因為一個必然的認知判斷的必要性來源是來自於確定的概念。
於§18他的分析要展現的是：審美判斷的必然性是什麼樣的一種必然性。

Edited 2 time(s). Last edit at 05/25/2009 02:35AM by HP.

---

gustav / May 20, 2009 11:26AM

Re: Where is the "Modality" in §18?

Responding to HP, it is interesting indeed there's no the word "modality" literally written in §18. Kant simply talks about "necesity" in stead of its superordinate "modality," and directly distinguish the necessity in judgment of taste from the apodeictic necessity (which is derived from determined concepts) and empirical necesity (which means something goes as such so far so well and is agreed with by all people, and which however for Kant only occurs in common use of language because experience alone can hardly support the evidence of necessity).

I contribute another interesting observation here: do you notice that the distinction Kant made here seems parallel to that in the first moment: liking for the beautiful is distinguised from liking for the good and liking for the agreeable; and that in the second moment: The beautiful is presented as the object of a universal liking which is distinguished from the good and the agreeable. At both of the latter cases, the good is always determined with concepts, while the agreeable is always connected with concepts too but moreover insufficient for some necessary condition in each moment.

I think the message raised by HP is just an observation, right? There's actually no problem with the message.

Edited 2 time(s). Last edit at 05/20/2009 11:41AM by gustav.
