

gustav / October 10, 2008 11:15PM

[第三週心得報告](#)

請大家把第三週的心得回應到這篇文章來！

---

gustav / October 10, 2008 11:16PM

[Re: 第三週心得報告rev20081128](#)

Week03: What's real and what's ideal?

That which you are conscious of via apperception is real. That which you are conscious of not via apperception is ideal.

(I) Apperception, metaphorically speaking, is an act to bring the non-conscious given blind intuition to be the object of one's thought. An object which is apperceivable implies to be both intuitively and conceptually cognizable. That is, the real conscious experience is knowable to the subject as synchronically intuitive and conceptual (nevertheless allowing psychologically either intuitive or conceptual).

Ideal consciousness is the mental state which is (II) an intuition that no concepts can be adequately correspondent with at all, or (III) a concept that no intuitions can be adequately correspondent with at all.

My experience and description:

(I) Being caused with the senses, the mind operates following a proper set of rules (of empirical concept, categorially coordinated) so that the subject feels something (the object) and appears. For instance, when you see an object, you actually (a) apply the set of rules of the coordination of categories (so that you anticipate something as a limited unit, which has a start and an end, as a real substance indicating real actuation of senses, as in a relation that you can classify it as a real object, and as in an assertive mode toward the judging subject) to the proper application target (the result of the very operation), so that (b) the mind operates; in such an operation, (c) your self-awareness rises and at the same time (d) is aware of the object as how it has been anticipated by the very awareness. If you see an object as a tree, you (a) apply the set of rules of the concept tree categorially coordinated (so that you anticipate something as a limit unit as tree, as a real substance indicating real actuation of senses as such and such properties, as in a specific location of the classification system your community has collectively structured, and as in an assertive mode toward the judging subject) to the proper application target (the result of the very operation), so that (b), (c), and (d). (a), (b), (c) and (d) take place at the same time, this is the insight of apperception.

(II) The mind operates following its own way (subjective principle of reason), and no sets of rules are well applied, or all possible sets are well applied. The subject feels and appears when sets of rules are followed in turn, or when all possible sets of rules are followed at once. For instance, when you apply A concept to your present conscious target and then you apply B concept, then C concept to the present conscious target, all in the categorical relation (predication), you find that all of them are somehow suitable for the target and yet none of them can adequate, i.e., properly applied as we can in (I). Now, the awareness the self-awareness is aware of is its own self-product in productive imagination, an aesthetic idea, which has no adequate correspondent concepts.

(III) By means of the coordination of the categories, i.e., the objective principle of reason, the concepts are systematized in classification systems. The concepts implying these systematizing principles have no adequate intuitions, are ideal, and they are rational ideas.

Via apperception, we are experiencing in the sensible world, phenomenologically. Via the consciousness of aesthetic ideas and rational ideas, we are conscious of something strange-not as in the phenomenal world, not as in real space and time.

Transcendental idealism should be understood in contrast with the distinction of reality and ideality above, I suggest. But to spell out the suggestion, I need to pay more effort describing how rational ideas and aesthetic ideas communicate with each other.

Edited 3 time(s). Last edit at 11/28/2008 10:31PM by gustav.

---