



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

A Critical Study Of 'Philosophy Of Time' In The Light Of Vaisesika And Kant

Rahena Mallick, Department of Philosophy, Calcutta University

Abstract:

Philosophy of time is a branch of philosophy concerned with the issue surrounding the ontology, epistemology and character of time. While such ideas have been central to Philosophy of time was an inspiration for and a central aspect of early analytic philosophy. The subject focuses on a number of basic issue, including whether time exist independently of the mind, whether they exist independently of one another what accounts for time other than the present moment exist and questions about the nature of identity (particularly the nature of identity over time)Hitherto, There has been a lot of work on philosophy of time, but the comparative study on the concept of time has not been rendered in the perspective of Kant and Vaisesika while bringing out the quintessence of time and philosophy, the previous researcher have done on time and philosophy in general, but I am going to render it specifically on the foreground of Kant and Vaisesika philosophy. In my study it critically examines Vaisesika and Kant philosophy of time and sought to identify their similarities and distinctiveness. And analyze the reason for their similarities and differences. The objective of this paper is not to be finalize the philosophical argument about the philosophy of time but to attempt to come to a certain level conclusion that have similar qualities as well as different qualities to certain characteristics of time in Immanuel Kant's and Vaisesikas philosophy and I have tried to point out of which view is more acceptable in my view point's, so some questions come up in this context-

- 1.How to make a comparative study between time in Vaisesika and Kants view point.
- 2.Has Kant indirectly acknowledge time as the cause of our cognition as Vaisesika.
- 3.Why does not Kant accept time as substance like Vaisesika?

The following are the objectives of the study-

- To examine critically the influence of time on Vaisesika philosophy and Kants philosophy.
- The importance of philosophy of time is mainly due to the comparative study of Vaisesika and Kants view point.
- In kants or the Vaisesikas view is more consistent with the general view of time and the views of ther philosophers.
- I will analyze in my view point who is less erroneous about time.

I shall make a close textual analysis of "Critic of Pure Reason"and "Vaisesika Sutra"as the primary material of my research.

Thereafter, I shall analyze them critically. Then using descriptive, analytical and comparative methodology & shall study the influences of time in Kant and Vaisesika philosophy. In addition, as a second material I shall take the help of various thesis research papers, essays and encyclopedia.

Keywords: Time, Vaisesika, Kant, Metaphysics, A priori intuition, Indian Philosophy

Introduction:

The intelligent and thoughtful man never limited his/her intellect and thinking ability. Different kind of questions arises in his/her mind, sometimes about the world, sometimes about life. And in this way philosophical inquiries has been created. Different types of ideas, theories, different information etc have been published, the discussion and relevance of which are very important in philosophy. The relevance and discussion of time is also such an important issue. There is general argument among philosophers that time is continuous (i.e we do not experience it as stopping and starting or doing about at random) and that it has an intrinsic direction or order. (i.e we all agree that event progress from past to future) Discussion of the nature of time and of various issue related to time, have always featured prominently in philosophy but they have been especially important since the twentieth century. Many philosophers (such as Plato, Aristotle and Kant) many school of Indian philosophy (such as Vaisesika, Jain, Theravada Buddhist) and scientist (such as Isaac Newton and Albert Einstein) have tried to conceptualize analyze time in many ways-

Plato in the Timaeus, identified time with the period of motion of the heavenly bodies. For Plato, time was related to regular physical events such as the motion of celestial bodies which are ideal. Instrument to measure time since their orbital periods are regular and eternal and therefore, can be used to identify human time such as the duration of one day (sunrise to sunset) and the duration of month (lunar cycle) (Weinert, 2013, 9)

Aristotle in book iv of his physics, defined time as the number of changes with respect to before and after and the place of an object as the innermost motionless boundary of that which surrounds it. Aristotle supports the idea of subjective time since he suggested that there is no time without a soul.

Sir Isaac Newton defined time as an absolute entity which is real, not relative to or depending on others and therefore mathematically true and objective. On the other hand, Rene Descartes, John Lock, David Hume, argued that time depends on the mind to acknowledge it.

According to Buddhist philosophy, time appears in our consciousness during the process of knowing which consist the existence of matter first, then the interaction between matters, then functions of our consciousness (our sense), then the process of knowing that occur in our consciousness and finally, that occur in our consciousness. Buddhist philosophy suggests that time is subjective and does not have real existence.

So there are two main concepts about time recognized as firstly physical time that is objective and secondly psychological time that is subjective.

In Vaisesika philosophy, the idea that time exist independently is quite significant because Vaisesika accept time as substance and according to vaisesika substance signifies the self-subsistence, the absolute and independent nature of things. Vaisesika suggests that time is one each, eternal and all-pervading. It is imperceptible and infinite substance. In vaisesika philosophy, time is recognized as an eternal, fixed substance there is no such thing as past, present and future in the form of time itself. Past present and future are used by various event dependent on time. In vaisesika philosophy time is regarded as an individual entity or separate entity. According to the vaisesika time is the reservoir at the material world. Time will continue to exist even if the object located in time are removed. So it turns out, Vaisesikas opinion about time is objective.

Although many western thinkers were interested in investigation the concept of time, only some of them agreed to the idea that the existence of the time depends on the mind. Immanuel Kant, a German philosopher, who discuss time in transcendental aesthetic section of his book 'A Critique of Pure Reason' is one among a few who supported the idea that time is mind dependent, he describes time as an 'A Priori Notion' Kant holds that time is one but not a substance. According to Kant time is a form of intuition not understanding but substance is a form of understanding. Kant holds that time is an elements of systematic frame work we used to structure on experience.

Temporal measurements are used to be quantitatively compare the interval between (or duration of) events. Although time is hold to be transcendently ideal in this sense that is mind dependent they are also empirically real that is.

According to Kant definition a prior feature of experience and therefore not simply subjective variable or accidental perception in a given consciousness.

Time is not an empirical concept that has been derived from any experience. Time is a necessary representation that underlines all the appearances only as effect accidentally added by the particular constitution of the sense organs. Accidentally they are not apriori representation, but are grounded in sensation.

According to Kant, time has only one dimension different times are not simultaneous but successive. Time is not a discursive or what is called a general concept but a pure form of sensible intuition.

Kant suggested that time is nothing but the form of inner sense, that is of the intuition of ourselves and our inner state. All the relation of time allows of being expressed in an outer intuition, it is evident that the representation is itself an intuition.

So, according to Kant time is not mind neutral independent entity, time is a form of intuition that exists in our mind prior to sense perception that is, Kants view of time is subjective.

Similarities: While their conclusion on the nature of time differ-Kant sees it as internal(subjective)and Vaisesika sees it as external(Objective) their structural description of how time functions are remarkably similar.

Time as an all pervasive framework both system agree that the time is not a 'thing' you can pick up rather an omnipresent constrainer or condition that allows everything else to happen.

Because Kant views is that time is a formal condition of all phenomena. It is not something that exists out in the world independently; rather it is the "form of inner sense" that allows us to organize our experience and Vaisesika views is that Time(Kala)is one of nine Dravyas(Substance)

It is considered all pervading (Vibhu) and eternal. Like Kant views it is the necessary background for any change to occur.

2.The basic of sequence and simultaneity.

This is the strongest point of content. Both Kant and Vaisesika thinkers (Prasasta Pada) argue that our ideas of 'before' 'after' and at the same time regular time as foundational reality.

Because without an underlying principle of time we could not distinguished between two events happening one after another versus two events happening together.

Vaisesika terms: they use time to explain concepts like paratva(Priority/older) Aparatva (Pasteriovity/younger)

Kants terms:In his critique of pure reason,Kant argues that the 'Modes of Time' are duration succession and coexistence.

3.Time as a unitary entity,neither system believes there are "Many Times" both argue that time is fundamentally one. Because Kant says we cannot represent different times as existing simultaneously, but only as part of one and the same universal time and Vaisesikas says while we use labels like "Second" "Days" or "Years" these are merely Upadhi(Limiting Adjuncts)or convenient labels for our own use. In reality 'Kala' is single undivided substance.

Difference:

For Kant, Time is subjective. It is not something you find "out there" in world, rather It's the "lens" "through which your mind processes reality.

Because Kant argues that time is a prior form of intuition. This means you don't learn about through experience; you need time already "Installed" "in your mind to have any experience at all.

Time does not belong to "things in themselves" (Noumena).If you remove all conscious subjects from the univers,time would vanish because it is a property of the observer not the object.

It is a necessary frame work that allows us to perceive change and succession.

For Vaisesika time as an objective substance.

The Vaisesika schools (one of the six classical schools of indian philosophy) takes a realist approach.To them time(Kala)is a physical reality.

Because time is classified as one of the nine dravyas(substance)it is real, objective and exists whether humans are there to watch it or not.

Time is the instrumental cause of all that is produced.It is the force that allows things to be born,grow,decay and die.

Vaisesika argues that time is actually one eternal and all pervading. We only perceive it as seconds, hours and days because of the movement at physical objects (like the sun) which act as limiting adjuncts(Upadhis)

So main 'clash' here is about reality. Kant would tell a Vaisesika philosopher, "You are mistaken; you only think time is a substance because your mind is forced to project it onto the world" The Vaisesika philosopher would respond, "No time is very fabric that allows to move and change it; it is a real pillar of the universe".

Conclusion:

Kant famously argued that time is not something that exist “out there “in the universe instead he claimed it is a transcendental aesthetic- a built in “software “of human mind. Time is a form of intuition.

We cannot perceive objects without time, but that’s because our minds process all sensory data through a temporal filler.

The “Thing-in-Itself”;Kant argued that while we experience things in time, “Noumena”(things as they truly are independent of our perception)are like timeless.

So this view is highly acceptable in modern philosophy and neuroscience, which study how to brain construct the flow of time.

The ancient school of Vaisesika takes a ‘Realist’ approach. They categorize time(Kala)as one of the nine fundamental substances(Dravyas)that make up reality.

Time is an all pervading eternal, and independent reality.It exists whether humans ae there to perceive it or not.

It is cause of our nations of “Past, Present and Future “and “Fast and Slow “It is the instrumental cause of all moving things.

Imagine the universe as a massive stage; for the Vaisesika,,Time is the stage itself.

So this align closely with classical(Newtonian) physics where time is an absolute back drop.

If we learn toward science and physics: The Vaisesika view feels more intuitive. We measure time with atomic clocks and observe its effect on stars; it feels like an objective part of the ‘Hardware’ of the universe. However, Einstein’s relativity complicates this by showing time is linked to space and gravity, making it less of a “fired substance “and more of a flexible dimension.

If we learn toward philosophy and psychology; Kants view is often considered more profound. He explains why can’t image “the end of the time “not because time is infinite, but because our minds lack the capacity to process information without it.

In contemporary philosophy, Kants views is often seen as more robust because it addresses the “human element” of experience. However, if we are looking for a description of the physical world, Vaisesikas realism provides a more practical framework for everyday life.

Bibliography:

1. Kant,Immanuel, Critique of pure reason,Trans NK Smith,Macmillan Press,1986
2. Kant,Immanuel Prolegomena to any future metaphysic that will be able to present itself as a science,Trans by Lucas Peter.G.Manchester University Press,1959
3. Kant,Immanuel, Dissertation on the form and principles of the sensible and intelligent World,Tans by Handyside open court,Chicago,1972
4. A hand book to Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason,Kitab limited hind publishers,1949
5. Gupta,Kalyan Ch. And Biswas,Bibhuti Bhusan,Paschatya Darshaner Itihas(Bengal)Naryan Printing.
6. Sengupta, Promodhbandhu, Paschatya Darshner Sankhipta Itihas(Immanuel Kant)Banarjee Publication 1976
7. Sarkar,Swapan, Paschatya Darshan Samiksha,Pragatisheel Pulication,2009
8. Hossain,Dr.Tafajol,Immanuel Kanter Pratham Kritik Ekti Upasthapanana-Vol1,2017 Naryan Printing.
9. Kanada,The Vaisesika Sutras-Trans by Nandalal Sinha,1923
10. Annambhatta1999, New Bharatiya Book.
11. Sharma,Chandradhar:Indian Philosophy A Critical survey ,Barnes & Nobel,INC 1962
12. Bhattacharya,Sri Panchanan Tarka Ratna,Vaisesika Darshan,Jaikali Press 2012.