41

JUDGMENT INTRODUCTION

THE word "judgment" has a range of mean-J. ings which includes three principal variants referring to (i) *a quality of the mind,* (2.) *a faculty of the mind,* and (3) *an act of the mind.* Of these three meanings, it is the third which is extensively considered in this chapter; and it is this meaning of "judgment" which many writers use the word "proposition" to express. They sometimes substitute the one word entirely for the other; sometimes they use both words, not as strict synonyms, but to express distinct yet closely related aspects of the same fundamental phenomenon.

The sense in which judgment is *a quality of the mind* is the sense in which we ordinarily speak of a person as having sound judgment or poor judgment. "We credit the same people," Aristotle says, "with possessing judgment and having reached years of reason and with having practical wisdom and understanding." To be "a man of understanding and of good or sympathetic judgment," he continues, is to be "able to judge about the things with which practical wisdom is concerned."

The capacity to judge well concerning what is to be done is often connected with the capacity to deliberate about the advantages and disadvantages or other circumstances relevant to the action in question. It may or may not be accompanied by a capacity to resolve thought into action, to carry into execution the decision which judgment has formed. These three qualities of mind—deliberateness, judgment, and decisiveness—are conceived by Aristotle and Aquinas as belonging together as parts of the intellectual virtue they call "prudence" or "practical wisdom." The qualities may occur separately, but the prudent man will possess all three.

This meaning of "judgment" is reserved for discussion in the chapter on PRUDENCE; and in the chapter on LAW will be found the consideration of the judgment which a court renders—the judgment which is the decision of a judge when he applies the law to the particular case. In the legal sense of a judicial decision, judgment reflects not so much the quality of the judge's mind as his duty and authority to dispose of the case and to have his decision executed by the appropriate officers of the law. The legal significance of judgment is not primarily psychological or logical; and, just as the moral consideration of judgment falls under prudence, the legal consideration is also more appropriately developed in the context of other ideas.

We are left with the meanings which belong to psychology, logic₃ and the theory of knowledge. The sense in which "judgment" designates *a faculty or function of the mind*—a distinct sphere of mental operation—is much more special than the sense in which "judgment" or "proposition" signifies *a particular act of the mind* in the process of knowing or in the verbal expression of that process. Many authors discuss the kinds of judgment which the mind makes, and the kinds of propositions it forms and asserts or denies, but only a few—notably Locke and Kant—use the word "judgment" to name a mental faculty-Locke, for example, says that- "the mind has 'two faculties conversant about truth and falsehood." One is the faculty of knowing; the other of judging. "The faculty which God has given man to supply the want of clear and certain knowledge, in cases where that cannot be had, is *judgment:* whereby the mind takes its ideas to agree and disagree, or, which is the

same, any proposition to be true or false, without perceiving a demonstrative evidence in the proofs." The way in which Locke distinguishes between knowing and judging and the fact that he relates this distinction to the difference between certainty and probability suggest the parallel distinction between knowledge and opinion. The faculty of judgment for Locke is the equivalent of what other writers treat as the forming of opinions.

Kant also makes judgment a faculty. Along with understanding and reason, judgment is one of the three faculties of cognition. It has a distinct function of its own and is coordinate with the other two. As the laws of nature are the work of the understanding in the sphere of speculative reason; as the rules of the moral law are the work of the reason in the practical sphere, wherein it is related to the faculty of desire; so the purposiveness of nature comes under the faculty of judgment which operates in relation to the faculty of pleasure and pain.

Kant divides all the faculties of the soul into "three which cannot be any further derived from one common ground: the *faculty of knowledge,* the *feeling of pleasure and pain* and the *faculty of desire."* He sees each of the three cognitive functions (of understanding, judgment, and reason) as standing in a peculiar relation to these three primary faculties. The faculty of judgment functions with respect to pleasure and pain, which is connected with the faculty of desire. Yet the aesthetic judgment of beauty and the theological judgment of purposiveness in nature are of a speculative rather than a practical character. Because of these two related facts, Kant holds that "the judgement in the order of our cognitive faculties, forms a mediating link between Understanding and Reason."

Kant, perhaps more than any other thinker, makes judgment—both as a faculty and as an act—one of the central terms in his philosophy. It is pivotal in each of the three critiques, but it is *The Critique of Judgement* which serves to connect *The Critique of Pure Reason* and *The Critique of Practical Reason.* "The Understanding legislates *a priori* for nature as an object of sense—for theoretical knowledge of it in a possible experience. Reason legislates *a priori* for freedom and its peculiar causality; as the supersensible in the subject, for an unconditioned practical knowledge. The realm of the natural concept under one legislation, and that of the concept of freedom under the other, are entirely removed from all mutual influence which they might have upon one another (each according to its fundamental laws) by the great gulf that separates the supersensible from phenomena." It is the judgment, according to Kant, which "furnishes the mediating concept between the concept of nature and that of freedom."

KANT'S THEORY of the faculties of understanding, judgment, and reason is so complex a doctrine that it cannot be readily compared with other analyses of the capacities or functions of mind. His threefold division bears a superficial—perhaps only a verbal—resemblance to Aquinas' division of mental acts into conception, judgment, and reasoning.

According to Aquinas, judgment is the second of the three acts of a single cognitive faculty variously called "mind" or "intellect" or "reason." This faculty, he writes, "first apprehends something about a thing, such as its essence, and this is its first and proper object; and then it understands the properties, accidents, and various dispositions affecting the essence. Thus it necessarily relates one thing with another by composition or division; and from one composition and division it necessarily proceeds to another, and this is *reasoning."*

The first act of the mind is conception, *i.e.,* the simple apprehension of the essence and properties of a thing. Judgment, the second act, unites or separates concepts by affirming or denying one or another. As in the Kantian analysis, judgment is a kind of mediating link; for after the judgment is formed by what Aquinas calls the "composition or division" of concepts, it in turn serves as the unit of the mind's third act, which is reasoning. Reasoning is the process of going from judgment to judgment.

The act of judgment is that act of the mind, and the only act, which can have the quality of truth or falsity. "Truth," Aquinas writes, "resides in the intellect composing and

dividing"; for when the intellect "judges that a thing corresponds to the form which it apprehends about that thing, then it first knows and expresses truth ... In every proposition," the mind "eithe applies to, or remoyes from, the thing signified by the subject some form signified by the predicate." M oreover, the judgment involves assertion or denial as the concept does not. Whatever truth there is implicitly in concepts must be explicated in judgments and the truth of the conclusion in reasoning depends upon the truth of the judgments which are the premises. The judgment, therefore, is the basic unit of knowledge.

On this last point Kant seems to be in agreement with earlier writers. It is possible, therefore, to compare Kant's classification of judgments or propositions with the classifications of Aristotle, Descartes, or Locke. But it is necessary, first, to consider the relation between judgment and proposition. After that we can examine the difference between theoretical and practical judgments. With respect to the theoretical judgment (or proposition), we shall be able to state opposite views of the nature of the judgment and diverse views of the formal structure of judgments, their material content, their relation to one another and to the whole process of knowing.

THE SENTENCE "all men are mortal" can be interpreted as expressing a judgment or a proposition. From certain points of view, the choice of interpretation makes no difference; for example, it does not matter whether, in a consideration of "ail men are mortal" and "some men are not mortal," the comparison is expressed in terms of universal and partic ular, affirmative and negative, judgments *or* propositions, or whether it is said that these are contradictory judgments *or* contradictory propositions. The basic problems of logic seem to be conceived in the same way by writ ers like Aristotle and Locke, who tend to use "proposition" in place of "judgment," and by writers like Aquinas, Descartes, and Kant, who tend to use both words with some difference in meaning.

What is the difference? It is sometimes understood as a difference between an act of the mind, asserting or denying, and the subject matter being asserted or denied. The proposition is that which may be either asserted or denied; or in the third alternative stressed by Descartes, the mind may suspend judgment and merely entertain the proposition. It may decline to judge it true or false, and so refuse to assert or deny it. The fact that the proposition is itself either affirmative or negative does not signify its assertion or denial by a judgment of the mind, for an affirmative proposition can be denied and a negative can be affirmed.

Judgment adds to the proposition in question the mind's decision with respect to its truth or falsity. That decision may be right or wrong. A proposition which is in fact true may be denied. The truth of the proposition is unaffected by the falsity of the judgment, or if the mind suspends judgment on a proposition which is true, the truth of the proposition has failed to elicit a judgment. This seems to confirm the separation between the proposition and the judgment.

According to Russell, "in every act of judgement there is a mind which judges, and there are terms concerning which it judges." These terms are the constituent elements of the proposition judged to be true or false—affirmed or denied.

Sometimes the difference between the judgment and the proposition is found in the difference between the mind's act of "composing" or "dividing" concepts and the formulation of that act in words. On this view, the proposition is related to the judgment as the term to the concept, as the physical to the mental word, as language to thought. In consequence, there is no separation for either the judgment or the proposition between that which can be asserted or denied and the assertion or denial of it. The affirmative judgment 25 an assertion, the negative a denial; and the same holds for the affirmative and the negative proposition.

But on either theory of the difference, it is thought necessary to distinguish between the sentence and the proposition, especially when the proposition is also regarded as a verbal formulation—a statement of thought in words. This is particularly important in a

logical treatise like Aristotle's, which analyzes *terms, propositions,* and *syllogisms* rather than *concepts, judgments,* and *reasonings.*

In both the "Categories," which deals with terms, and the treatise "On Interpretation," which deals with propositions, Aristotle differentiates between a grammatical and a logical handling of the units of language. His distinction, for example, between simple and composite expressions (words and phrases on the one hand, and sentences on the other) is related to, but it is not identical with, his distinction between terms and propositions. Not every simple expression can be used as a term. For example, prepositions and conjunctions cannot be used as terms, as nouns and verbs can be. Nor can every sentence be used as a proposition.

"A sentence is a significant portion of speech," Aristotle writes, "some parts of which have an independent meaning, that is to say, as an utterance, though not as the expression of any positive judgment.. . Every sentence has meaning," he goes on, "by convention. Yet every sentence is not a proposition; only such are propositions as have in them truth or falsity. Thus a prayer is a sentence, but is neither true nor false. Let us therefore dismiss all other types of sentence but the proposition, for this last concerns our present inquiry, whereas the investigation of the others belongs rather to the study of rhetoric or of poetry."

It seems possible to relate the two separate distinctions we have been considering—that between sentence and proposition and that between proposition and judgment. As the proposition can be regarded as a sentence logically (rather than grammatically) construed, so it can also be regarded as the linguistic expression of a judgment *oi* the mind. The proposition thus appears to be a kind of middle ground between language and thought, for when a sentence is used for the purpose of stating a proposition it can also express a judgment. When a judgment is expressed in words, the verbal statement is also a proposition. The proposition is thus the logical aspect of a sentence and the verbal aspect of a judgment. A similar consideration of terms in relation to words and concepts occurs in the chapter on IDEA.

WHAT IS PERHAPS the most fundamental division in the sphere of judgments—the separation of the practical from the theoretical or speculative—can be initially explained by reference *to* the forms of language. Aristotle's remark about sentences and propositions tends to identify propositions with declarative sentences. Sentences in the subjunctive mood state prayers or wishes, not propositions. An interrogative sentence asks a question to which the answers may be propositions, or they may be hopes and desires. The imperative sentence issues a command to act in a certain way, whether the command is a direction for others or a decision for one's self. This last type of sentence represents the practical mood of thought as well as speech—thought concerned with actions to be done or not done, rather than with what does or does not exist.

The imperative sentence is not the only kind of practical statement. It is merely the most terse and emphatic. It is also the expression of that type of practical judgment which most immediately precedes action itself, or the execution of a command. There are other sentences which, because they are apparently declarative in form, conceal their imperative mood. Yet upon examination their essentially practical rather than theoretical significance can be discovered.

Sentences which contain the words "ought" or "should" are of this sort, *e.g.,* "Men ought to seek the truth," "You should work for peace," "I ought to make this clear." By omitting "should" or "ought," these sentences can be changed into the strictly declarative mood of theoretical propositions, *e.g.,* "Men do seek the truth," "You will work for peace," "I shall make this clear." They can also be made plainly imperative, *e.g.,* "Seek the truth," etc. The chief difference between the blunt form of the imperative and its indicative expression using "ought" or "should" is that the latter indicates the person to whom the command is addressed.

The contrast in significance between a declarative and an imperative statement does,

therefore, convey the distinction between a theoretical and a practical proposition or judgment. Kant's further division of practical judgments into the hypothetical and the categorical simply differentiates commands or "oughts" which involve no preamble from those which propose that action be taken to achieve a certain end, or which base a direction to employ this or that means on the supposition that a certain end is desired or sought. Examples of hypothetical or conditional imperatives would be such judgments as "If you want to be happy, seek the truth" or "Seek the truth in order to be happy."

The distinction between theoretical and practical judgments is currently made in terms of the contrast between statements of fact and statements of value or, as in judicial procedure, between statements of fact and rules of law. A rule of law has the form of a general practical statement, usually a conditional rather than a categorical imperative; whereas the decision of a court applying the rule to a case is a particular practical judgment.

Beginning with Francis Bacon, the distinction between the theoretical and the practical is also made in terms of the difference between the pure sciences and their applications in technology. Technical judgments, prescribing the way to make something or produce a certain effect, are traditionally associated, under the head of the practical, with moral judgments concerning the good to be sought and the ways of seeking it. Both are prescriptive of conduct rather than descriptive of existence or nature in the manner of theoretical statements.

Thinkers like Aristotle, Aquinas, and Kant, who divide science or philosophy into the theoretical disciplines *(e.g.,* physics, mathematics, metaphysics) and the practical or moral disciplines *[e.g.,* ethics, economics, politics), place the discussion of the difference between theoretical and practical judgments in the context of other distinctions; as, for example, between the speculative and the practical reason, or between theoretical and practical knowledge; or in the context of considering the kinds of truth appropriate to each, and the modes *oi* inference or demonstration in each. These related distinctions and considerations are treated in the chapters on KNOWLEDGE, MIND, REASONING, and TRUTH.

For the most part, however, the great books in the tradition of logic itself do not give an analysis of practical judgments or reasoning in any way comparable to their treatment of the theoretical forms of thought and statement. The logical problems concerning propositions or judgments, now to be considered, apply only to the theoretical forms.

Two BASIC ISSUES in the theory of propositions or judgments have their origin in the tradition of the great books, but for their explicit and full development other works must be consulted—the special treatises on logic, of relatively recent date, listed in the Additional Readings. One of these two issues has already been briefly commented on, but for the full implications of the distinction between propositions and judgments one must go to such writers as G. W. F. Hegel, F. H. Bradley, Bernard Bosanquet, John Cook Wilson, W. E. Johnson, and John Dewey, who make this distinction the crux of a controversy over the scope of formal logic.

The other basic issue lies in the opposition between what has come to be called "subject-predicate logic" and "relational logic." Here one side is fully represented by the *Organon* of Aristotle and by the later books which adopt the Aristotelian logic of predication. The other logical theory is intimated but not fully developed by such writers as Locke, Hume, Kant, and William James who, though they sometimes employ the subject-predicate formulation, tend to construct the unit of knowledge—the proposition or judgment—as a relation between ideas or concepts.

The fact that Kant places substance and accident under the category of relation can be taken as exemplifying this tendency, as can Locke's emphasis on the connection of, and agreement or disagreement between, our ideas. Nevertheless, these are at most intimations of the theory that the proposition is a relation of two or more terms, not the application of a predicate *to* a subject. As indicated in the chapter on LOGIC, the relational theory does not receive an adequate exposition

until the modern development of symbolic or mathematical logic, beginning with the writings of George Boole, William Stanley Jevons, and John Venn, and culminating in such works as the *Principia Matbematica* of Russell and Whitehead.

In the Aristotelian logic, simple propositions consist of a subject and a predicate—what is being talked about and what is said of it. The copula "is" is the sign of predication; it also signifies an affirmation of the unity of subject and predicate. For example, in "Socrates is a man" the predicate *man* is applied to the subject *Socrates,* and the unity of *being Socrates* and *being a man* is affirmed. All the terms of discourse can be classified according to their character as subjects and predicates; so, too, can propositions be classified by reference to the type of subject-term and the type of predicate-term which comprise them. The formal structure not only of the proposition, but also of the syllogism, is determined by the order of subjects and predicates. "When one term is predicated of another," Aristotle writes, "any term which is predicable of the predicate will also be predicable of its subject."

According to the theory of the proposition as a relation of terms or of classes, predication represents merely one type of relationship—the membership of an individual in a class, or the inclusion of one class in another. There are many other types of relation which, it is held, cannot be reduced to class-membership or class-inclusion; as, for example, the relationship stated by the proposition "John hit James," or the proposition "January comes before February." Propositions can be classified according to the number of terms involved in a single relationship, or by reference to the type of relation which organizes them, whether it is symmetrical or asymmetrical, transitive or intransitive, reflexive or irreflexive. In this theory it is the character of the relationship, not the character of the terms, which is the fundamental element in logical analysis, and this determines the formal structure of inference as well as of propositions.

It has been claimed for each of these logical theories that it is the more general analysis and that it is able to reduce the formulations of the opposite theory to its own terms or subsume them as a special case. Certainly it is verbally possible to convert all predications into statements of relationship, or all relational statements into subject-predicate propositions. But this by itself does not seem to resolve the issue to the satisfaction of either theory; each side contends that such reductions violate its fundamental principles. Stated in its most drastic form, the unresolved question is whether there is one logic or two—or perhaps more.

WITHIN THE tradition of Aristotelian logic, there are divergent schemes for classifying propositions or judgments. So far as the great books are concerned, this can be best illustrated by mentioning Kant's departures in analysis.

Aristotle distinguishes between simple and composite propositions, the former consisting of a single subject and predicate, the latter "compounded of several propositions." For example, since the two predicates in the proposition "This man is good and a shoemaker" do not form a unity, the sentence expresses a conjunction of two simple propositions: "This man is good" and "This man is a shoemaker." Other types of compound propositions are the hypothetical and the disjunctive, *e.g.,* "If Socrates is a man, Socrates is mortal," and "Either all men are mortal or no men are mortal." Kant treats these distinctions under the head of *relation.* He calls the proposition which is a "relation of the predicate to the subject, categorical" and he regards the hypothetical or disjunctive judgment (based on relations of cause and effect or of the parts of a whole) as concerned with propositions "in relation to each other."

Aristotle classifies simple propositions by reference to their quantity and quality. In regard to quantity he distinguishes between the universal {*e.g.,* "All men are mortal") and the particular (*e.g.,* "Some men are mortal"). To these he adds the indefinite proposition which leaves the quantity (*all* or *some*) undetermined. Under the head of quantity, Kant makes a threefold division according to unity, plurality, and totality. He adds the singular proposition "Socrates is mortal" to Aristo-

tie's particular and universal. The difference between the singular on the one hand, and the particular and the universal on the other, seems to be represented in Aristotle's thought by the distinction between propositions about an individual subject and propositions about a universal subject.

The quality of categorical propositions, according to Aristotle, is either affirmative *(i.e.,* positive) or negative, *e.g.,* "All men are mortal" and "Some men are *not* mortal." To these two Kant adds a third type of judgment under the head of *quality*—the infinite judgment which affirms a negative predicate of a subject, *e.g.,* "The soul is non-mortal." Though Aristotle recognizes the special character of a term like "non-mortal," since it is both negative and indefinite, he does not seem to think that the use of such terms affects the quality of a proposition.

Finally, Aristotle divides propositions according to whether they are simple assertions of fact or are assertions qualified by the notions of necessity or contingency *(i.e.,* possibility). Every proposition, he says, "states that something either is or must be or may be the attribute of something else." The distinction between the necessary and contingent modes of statement has come to be called a difference in "modality," and statements which have one or another modality are called "modal propositions."

It is sometimes thought that the Aristotelian classification treats only necessary and contingent propositions, with their several opposites, as modal propositions, and separates the simple or pure assertion from them as non-modal. In contrast *to* this, Kant makes a threefold division of judgments under the head of modality: the "problematical" *(i.e.,* the possible, what *may be),* the "assertoric" *(i.e.,* the existent, what *is),* and the "apodictk" *(i.e.,* the necessary, what *must be).*

THE CLASSIFICATION of the types of judgment or proposition is usually preliminary in logical analysis to a consideration of their order and connection.

The formal pattern of what is traditionally called "the square *oi* opposition" is determined by the quality and quantity of the simple propositions which are therein related as contradictory, contrary, and subcontrary, Two propositions are contradictory if they are opposite in both quality and quantity *(e.g.,* "All men are mortal" is contradicted by "Some men are not mortal"). Two universal propositions are contrary if one is affirmative and the other negative *(e.g.,* "All men are mortal" is contrary to "No men are mortal"); and an affirmative and a negative particular proposition are related as subcontraries *(e.g.,* "Some men are mortal" and "Some men are not mortal"). The significance of these three basic relationships for the truth and falsity of the opposed propositions is discussed in the chapter on OPPOSITION; and in the chapter on NECESSITY AND CONTINGENCY the special problems of opposition among modal propositions are examined.

Other than their opposition, the only formal relationship of propositions or judgments occurs in the structure of inference or reasoning. According to the traditional analysis, the implication of one proposition by another—insofar as that is determined by the form of each—is immediate inference. In contrast, the pattern of *mediated* inference or reasoning always involves at least three propositions, ordered not only with respect to the sequence from premises to conclusion, but also by the relation of the premises to one another. These matters are discussed in the chapter on REASONING.

With respect to their origin, status, or import, judgments or propositions are subject to further distinctions in type. The certainty or probability with which propositions are asserted or judgments are made is connected by some writers with the distinction between knowledge and opinion, by others with the difference between science and dialectic, and by others with the difference between knowing the relation of ideas and knowing matters *ot* fact or real existence. Propositions which express certain knowledge are, furthermore, divided by some analysts into those which are axiomatic, self-evident, or immediate and those which are known only by mediated inference, reasoning, or demonstration, not

by intuition or induction. The former are also sometimes called "principles," the latter "conclusions."

Locke's distinction between "trifling" and "instructive" propositions, like Kant's distinction between "analytic" and "synthetic" judgments, is made in the general context of an examination of how we learn or know.

Trifling propositions, according to Locke, "are universal propositions which, though they be certainly true, yet they add no light to our understanding; bring no increase to our knowledge." All "purely identical propositions" are of this sort—propositions such as "body is body" or "a vacuum is a vacuum." Such propositions "teach nothing but what every one who is capable of discourse knows without being told, *viz.,* that the same term is the same term, and the same idea the same idea." They are all instances of the law of identity; or, as Locke expresses it, they are all "equivalent to this proposition, *viz., what is, is."* If the trifling proposition, the analytic judgment, or what in our day is called a "tautology," goes beyond the statement of an identity between subject and predicate, it goes no further than the explication of a definition. It predicates, Locke says, "a part of the definition of the word defined," as, for example, in the proposition "Lead is a metal."

Analytic or explicative judgments, Kant says in the *Prolegomena,* "express nothing in the predicate but what has already been actually thought in the concept of the subject .. . When I say, 'all bodies are extended,' I have not amplified in the least my concept of body, but have only analyzed it... On the contrary, this judgment, 'All bodies have weight,' contains in its predicate something not actually thought in the general concept of body; it amplifies my knowledge, by adding something to my concept, and must therefore be called synthetical."

For Locke not all axioms or self-evident propositions are trifling or tautological, for some go beyond statements of identity or the explication of definitions, as, for example, that the whole is greater than the part. Nor are they all useless. Some which Locke distinguishes from the rest by calling them "maxims," are of use, he maintains, "in the ordinary methods of teaching sciences as far as they are advanced, but of little or none in advancing them further. They are of use in disputes, for the silencing of obstinate wranglers, and bringing those contests to some conclusion."

For Kant there is a further division of judgments into the *a posteriori* and the *a priori,* according as their truth is or is not grounded in the data of experience. The former are empirical in origin, the latter transcendental, that is, they have a foundation which transcends experience. These two types of judgment express two corresponding types of knowledge—*a priori* knowledge by which Kant understands "not such as is independent of this or that kind of experience, but such as is absolutely so of *all* experience. Opposed to this is empirical knowledge, or that which is possible only *a posteriori,* that is, through experience."

In Kant's view, there is no problem about the truth of analytic judgments, for these have an *a priori* foundation in the principle of contradiction. (The contradictory of an analytic judgment is always self-contradictory.) Nor do synthetic judgments which are empirical or *a posteriori* raise any special difficulties. The central question in the theory of knowledge concerns the possibility and validity of synthetic judgments *a priori.*

"If I go out of and beyond the conception A, in order to recognize another, B, as connected with it, what foundation have I to rest on," Kant asks, "whereby to render the synthesis possible? I have here no longer the advantage of looking out in the sphere of experience for what I want. Let us take, for example, the proposition, 'everything that happens has a cause.' In the conception of *something that happens,* I indeed think an existence which a certain time antecedes, and from this I can derive analytical judgments. But the conception of a cause lies quite outside the above conception, and indicates something entirely different from 'that which happens,' and is consequently not contained in that conception. How then am I able to assert concerning the general conception—'that which happens'—something entirely different from that conception, and to recognize the

conception of cause although not contained in it, yet as belonging to it, and even necessarily? What is here the unknown X, upon which the understanding rests when it believes it has found, outside the conception A, a foreign predicate B, which it nevertheless considers to be connected with it?" It is the discovery and solution of this problem which Kant believes to be the signal contribution of his transcendental logic of the judgment.

It may be wondered whether this problem can be stated in terms other than those peculiar to Kant's analytic vocabulary. Other writers admit that propositions which are particular and contingent have "existential import." Their truth concerns real existences, and so whether they are true or not can and must be learned from experience. These are like Kant's synthetic judgments *a posteriori.* Universal and necessary propositions, on the other hand, are sometimes interpreted as having no existential significance. Instead of being read as asserting that anything exists, they are taken simply as statements of the relation between our own ideas. These, for Locke and Hume, are like Kant's *a priori* analytic judgments.

What remains is to discover a parallel for Kant's synthetic judgments *a priori.* In terms other than Kant's, the most likely parallel seems to be the universal and necessary proposition conceived as a statement about reality rather than about relations in the realm of our own concepts. When universal propositions are so interpreted, two questions arise. How do we establish that the subjects of such propositions really exist? What is the ultimate ground for the truth of such propositions, the unlimited universality of which outruns experience? In these two questions we find a problem which is at least analogous to Kant's problem of the possibility of synthetic judgments *a priori.*