

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION 1781

Human reason (insani dimagh/tark) apne cognition (samajh) ke ek sphere mein aise sawal face karta hai jinhe wo ignore nahi kar sakta, kyunki ye questions uski apni nature dwara hi present kiye gaye hain. Lekin wo inka answer bhi nahi de sakta, kyunki ye mind ki har faculty (shamta) ke pare (transcend) hain.

Reason is mushkil mein apni kisi galti ki wajah se nahi padta. Ye un principles ke saath shuruat karta hai jo experience ki field mein zaruri hain, aur jinki sachayi experience se hi confirm hoti hai. In principles ke saath, apni nature ke laws ko follow karte hue, ye aur bhi high aur remote conditions ki taraf badhta hai. Lekin jaldi hi isse realize hota hai ki is tarah se uska kaam kabhi poora nahi hoga, kyunki naye sawal aana kabhi band nahi hote; aur isliye ye majboor ho jata hai un principles ka sahara lene ke liye jo experience ke region se bahar hain (transcend karte hain), lekin jinhe common sense bina kisi shaq ke maanta hai. Is wajah se ye confusion aur contradictions mein fans jata hai, jisse ye andaza lagata hai ki kahin na kahin chupe hue errors (latent errors) hain, lekin ye unhe dhoond nahi pata, kyunki jo principles ye use kar raha hai wo experience ki limits se bahar hone ke karan test nahi kiye ja sakte. In endless ladaiyon ke maidan (arena) ko Metaphysic kaha jata hai.

Ek time tha jab Metaphysic ko sabhi sciences ki rani (queen) kaha jata tha; aur agar hum intentions ko dekhein, toh apne subject-matter ki high importance ki wajah se wo is title ko deserve bhi karti thi. Lekin ab, fashion badal gaya hai aur log ispar scorn aur contempt (bezzati) dikhate hain; aur ye budhi aurat (matron) ab akeli aur lachaar hokar shok mana rahi hai, bilkul Hecuba ki tarah:

Modo maxima rerum,
Tot generis, natisque potens...
Nunc trahor exul, inops.
—Ovid, Metamorphoses. xiii

Shuru mein, dogmatists ke administration ke under, iski sarkar ek absolute despotism (tanashahi) thi. Lekin, kyunki legislative (kanoon banane wale) purane barbaric rule ke traces dikhate rahe, uska empire dhire-dhire toot gaya, aur aapsi ladaiyon (intestine wars) ne anarchy (arajakta) ka raaj la diya; jabki sceptics, jo nomadic tribes ki tarah the aur kisi permanent ghar ya settled life se nafrat karte the, unhone time-to-time un logon par attack kiya jinhone khud ko civil communities mein organize kiya tha. Lekin khushkismati se unki sankhya kam thi; isliye wo un logon ki koshishon ko puri tarah nahi rok paye jo nayi buildings khadi karne mein lage the, bhale hi unka koi settled plan nahi tha. Recent times mein, hume umeed dikhi thi ki ye jhagde khatam ho jayenge aur uske claims ki legitimacy establish ho jayegi ek tarah ki "physiology of human understanding" ke zariye—jo celebrated Locke ne di thi. Lekin ye paya gaya ki—halanki ye dawa kiya gaya tha ki ye so-called queen apna vansh (descent) common experience se upar

nahi bata sakti, ek aisi baat jisne uske claims par shaq paida kiya—kyunki ye genealogy (vanshawali) hi galat thi, usne apni sovereignty (prabhutva) ke claims ko choda nahi. Is tarah Metaphysics wapas dogmatism ke purane aur sade hue constitution mein gir gayi, aur phirse usi bezzati (contempt) ka shikar ho gayi jisse use bachane ki koshish ki gayi thi. Aaj ke time mein, jabki maana jata hai ki sabhi methods bekar try kiye ja chuke hain, scientific world mein sirf thakavat aur complete indifferentism (laparwahi) ka raaj hai—jo chaos aur night ki maa hai, lekin sath hi sath, ye us science ke re-creation aur re-installation ka source, ya kam se kam prelude (shuruat) hai, jo galat efforts ki wajah se confusion, andhere aur disuse mein gir gayi thi.

[Unlock PDF](#)

Asal mein, aisi inquiries ke prati indifference dikhana bekar hai, jinka object humanity ke liye indifferent nahi ho sakta. Iske alawa, ye dhongi indifferentists, bhale hi ye khud ko popular style aur school ki language badal kar chupane ki koshish karein, ye ghum-fir kar unhi metaphysical declarations aur propositions mein fans jate hain jinki taraf ye itna contempt dikhate hain. Sath hi sath, ye indifference, jo science ki duniya mein uthi hai, aur jo us tarah ki knowledge se related hai jise hum sabse last mein destroy hote dekhna chahenge, ye ek aisa phenomenon hai jo hamara attention aur reflection deserve karta hai. Ye clear hai ki ye zamane ke halkepan (levity) ka asar nahi hai, balki matured judgement^[1] ka result hai, jo ab illusory knowledge (dhokhe wali knowledge) se entertain hone se mana kar raha hai. Ye, fact mein, reason ke liye ek call hai, ki wo sabse mushkil kaam phirse shuru kare—yaani self-examination ka, aur ek tribunal (adalat) establish kare, jo uske well-grounded claims ko secure kare, aur sabhi baseless assumptions aur pretensions ke khilaf faisla sunaye, kisi arbitrary tareeke se nahi, balki apne eternal aur unchangeable laws ke hisab se. Ye tribunal aur kuch nahi balki Critical Investigation of Pure Reason hai.

[1] Hum aksar aaj ke zamane ke shallow hone ki aur profound science ke decay hone ki shikayat sunte hain. Lekin mujhe nahi lagta ki wo sciences jo secure foundation par tiki hain, jaise mathematics, physical science, etc., is ilzaam ko deserve karti hain, balki wo apni purani fame maintain kiye hue hain, aur latter case (physics) mein toh use surpass bhi kar gayi hain. Baaki tarah ki cognition ke sath bhi yahi hota agar unke principles firmly establish hote. Is security ki absence mein, indifference, doubt, aur finally, severe criticism, asal mein thought ki profound habit ke signs hain. Hamara zamana criticism ka zamana hai, jiske samne sab kuch jhukna chahiye. Religion ki pavitrata, aur legislation (kanoon) ki authority, kai log inhe is tribunal ki jaanch se exemption ka ground mante hain. Lekin, agar wo exempted hain, toh wo shaq (suspicion) ka subject ban jate hain, aur us sincere respect ka claim nahi kar sakte jo reason sirf unhi ko deta hai jo free aur public examination ke test par khare utarte hain.

Isse mera matlab books aur systems ka criticism nahi hai, balki reason ki faculty (shamta) ki critical inquiry hai, un cognitions ke reference mein jinhe ye bina experience ki madad ke paane ki koshish karti hai; dusre shabdon mein, metaphysics ki possibility ya impossibility ke sawal ka solution, aur is science ke origin, extent aur limits ko determine karna. Ye sab kuch principles ke basis par hona chahiye.

[Unlock Full PDF](#)

Ye raasta—jo ab akela bacha hai—maine chun liya hai; aur main khud ko flatter karta hoon (garv karta hoon) ki maine, is tarah se, un sabhi errors ka cause dhoond liya hai—aur consequently unhe hatane ka tareeka bhi—jinhone ab tak reason ko non-empirical thought ke sphere mein khud se hi ladne par majboor kiya hua tha. Maine reason ke sawalon ka koi gol-mol (evasive) jawab nahi diya hai ye kehkar ki mind ki faculties limited hain; balki, maine unhe principles ki light mein poori tarah examine kiya hai, aur un doubts aur contradictions ka cause dhoondne ke baad jisme reason gir gaya tha, maine unhe uski perfect satisfaction ke liye solve kar diya hai. Ye sach hai ki in sawalon ka solution waisa nahi hai jaisa dogmatism ne apne vain fancies (bekar ki kalpanaon) mein expect kiya tha; kyunki wo sirf magical arts se satisfy ho sakta hai, aur mujhe unki koi knowledge nahi hai. Lekin ye hamari mental powers ki range mein bhi nahi aate; aur ye philosophy ki duty thi ki wo un illusions (bhram) ko destroy kare jo misconceptions se paida hue the, bhale hi iski explanations se kitni bhi pyari umeed aur valued expectations barbad kyun na ho jayein. Is work mein mera main aim thoroughness (poori gehrayi) raha hai; aur main ye kehne ki himmat karta hoon ki ek bhi metaphysical problem aisi nahi hai jiska solution, ya kam se kam solution ki chabi (key), yahan na mile. Pure reason ek perfect unity hai; aur isliye, agar iska present kiya hua principle un sawalon mein se kisi ek ka bhi solution dene mein na-kaafi (insufficient) nikle jo reason ki nature se paida hote hain, toh hume use reject kar dena chahiye, kyunki fir hum baaki sawalon ke liye uski sufficiency par bharosa nahi kar sakte.

Ye kehte hue, mujhe lagta hai ki main reader ke chehre par dissatisfaction aur contempt ke signs dekh raha hoon, jab wo aise declarations sunta hai jo itne boastful (shekhi bhare) aur extravagant lagte hain; aur fir bhi ye un davor se kahin zyada moderate hain jo commonest philosophical programme ke commonest author karte hain, jisme dogmatist soul ki simple nature, ya primal being (God) ki necessity ko demonstrate karne ka dawa karta hai. Aisa dogmatist human knowledge ko possible experience ki limits ke paar le jane ka waada karta hai; jabki main humbly confess karta hoon ki ye meri power ke bilkul bahar hai. Aisi kisi koshish ke bajaye, main khud ko sirf reason aur uske pure thought ke examination tak seemit rakhta hoon; aur mujhe iski cognition ka sum-total dhoondne ke liye door jane ki zarurat nahi hai, kyunki iski seat mere apne mind mein hai. Iske alawa, common logic mujhe reason ke sabhi simple operations ka ek complete aur systematic catalogue deti hai; aur mera kaam ye sawal answer karna hai ki reason kitna aage ja sakta hai, bina us material ke jo experience dwara diya jata hai.

Toh ye thi baat completeness aur thoroughness ki jo present task ke execution ke liye zaruri hai. Jo aims hamare samne hain wo arbitrarily propose nahi kiye gaye hain, balki cognition ki nature ne khud hum par impose kiye hain.

[Join HindiMindBytes](#)

Upar di gayi baatein hamari critical inquiry ke matter (vishey) se related hain. Jahan tak form (roop) ki baat hai, do indispensable conditions hain, jo har us vyakti ko पूरी कर्नी होंगी जो critique of pure reason जैसा मुश्किल task uthata hai. Ye conditions hain certitude (nischittata) aur clearness (spashtata).

Jahan tak certitude ki baat hai, maine khud ko पूरी तरह convince कर लिया है कि, thought के इस sphere में, opinion (raye) बिल्कुल admissible नहीं है, और हर वो चीज जो hypothesis (अनुमान) जैसी दिखती है उसे exclude कर देना चाहिये, क्योंकि अیसी discussions में उसकी कौन सी value नहीं है. Kyunki ye har us cognition ki necessary condition hai jo à priori grounds par establish honi hai ki use absolutely necessary माना जाये; और ये बात उस कوشिश के साथ और भी ज्यादा लागू होती है जो सभी pure à priori cognition को determine करने और सभी apodeictic (philosophical) certitude का standard—और consequently example—देंने की कوشिश कर रही हो. Main apne dawa में safal hua हूँ या नहीं, ये decide करना reader का काम है; author का काम सिर्फ grounds और reasons देना है, बिना ये determine किये कि इनका judges के mind पर क्या असर होना चाहिये. लेकिन, कहीं अیसा ना हो कि उसने जो कुछ कहा है वो उनके दिमाग में doubt का innocent cause बन जाये, या उस effect को कमजोर कर दे जो उसके arguments produce कर सकते थे—use allow किया जाना चाहिये कि वो उन passages को point out करे जो mistrust या difficulty पैदा कर सकते हैं, हालांकि ये present work के main purpose से concern नहीं रखते. वो अیसा सिर्फ इसीलिए कर रहा है ताकि reader के mind से वो doubts हटाये जा सकें जो work को as a whole judge करते वक़्त और उसके ultimate aim के regarding असर डाल सकते हैं.

Mujhe कौन भी investigation उससे ज्यादा जरूरी नहीं लगती उस faculty की nature में full insight पाने के लिये जिसे हम understanding कहते हैं, और साथ ही उसके use के rules और limits determine करने के लिये, जो maine "Transcendental Analytic" के second chapter में "Deduction of the Pure Conceptions of the Understanding" title के under की हैं; और इनमें मुझे सबसे ज्यादा मेहनत भी लगी है—अیसी मेहनत जो, मुझे उम्मीद है, बेकार नहीं जायेगी. Wahan जो view लिया गया है, जो subject में काफी गहरी तक जाता है, उसके दो sides हैं. Ek side pure understanding के objects से relate करती है, और इसका इरादा उसके à priori conceptions की objective validity को demonstrate करना और comprehensible बनाना है; और इस वजह से ये Critique का एक essential part बनता है. Dusra side pure understanding को खुद consider करता है, इसकी possibility और cognition की powers को—यांनी कि, एक subjective point of view से; और, हालांकि ये exposition बहुत important है, ये work के main purpose का essential hissa नहीं है, क्योंकि बड़ा sawal ये है कि reason और understanding, experience से अलग, क्या और कितना cognize (जान) सकते हैं, ना कि ये कि thought की faculty खुद कैसे possible है? Kyunki ye latter (बाद वाला) एक given effect के cause की inquiry है, और इसीलिए इसमें hypothesis होने का कुछ semblance (ज्वालक) है (हालांकि, जैसा कि मैं किसी और मौके पर दिखाऊंगा, ये fact नहीं है), अیसा लग सकता है कि, इस instance में, मैं खुद को सिर्फ एक opinion देने की चहूँत दी है, और इसीलिए reader अलग अलग opinion रखने के लिये. लेकिन मैं उसे याद दिलाना चाहूंगा कि, अगर मेरा subjective deduction उसके mind में certitude का वो conviction पैदा नहीं करता जिसका मैंने aim किया था, तो भी objective deduction, जिसे ये present work properly concerned है, हर respect में satisfactory है.

Jahan tak clearness की बात है, reader को हाक है demand करने का, पहले, discursive या logical

clearness, yaani conceptions ke basis par, aur dusra, intuitive ya aesthetic clearness, intuitions ke zariye, yaani examples ya dusre illustration ke modes se in concreto. Maine pehli tarah ki intelligibility ke liye jo ban saka wo kiya. Ye mere purpose ke liye essential tha; aur isliye ye accidental cause ban gaya ki main dusri requirement ke sath poora insaaf nahi kar paya. Is work ke progress ke dauran main hamesha confusion mein raha ki is sawal ko kaise settle karun. Examples aur illustrations mujhe hamesha zaruri lage, aur Critique ke pehle sketch mein, wo naturally apni sahi jagah par aa gaye the. Lekin mujhe jaldi hi apne task ke magnitude (vishalta) aur un numerous problems ka ehsaas ho gaya jinke sath main engage hone wala tha; aur, jab maine dekha ki ye critical investigation, agar driest scholastic manner mein bhi deliver ki jaye, tab bhi choti nahi hogi, toh mujhe ye theek nahi laga ki main isse examples aur explanations ke sath aur bada karun, jo sirf popular point of view se zaruri hain. Main is course ko lene ke liye is consideration se bhi majboor hua ki present work popular use ke liye nahi hai, aur jo log science ke liye devoted hain unhe aisi madad ki zarurat nahi hoti, halanki ye hamesha acceptable hoti hain, aur ye mere present purpose mein materially interfere karti. Abbé Terrasson ne badi sahi baat kahi hai ki, agar hum kisi work ka size uske pages ke number se nahi, balki us time se estimate karein jo hume use master karne mein lagta hai, toh kai kitabon ke liye kaha ja sakta hai—ki wo bahut choti hoti, agar wo itni choti na hoti. Dusri taraf, agar hum speculative cognition ke system ki comprehensibility ki baat karein jo ek single principle ke under connected hai, toh hum utne hi justice ke sath keh sakte hain: kai kitabein kahin zyada clear hoti, agar unhe itna zyada clear banane ka irada na kiya gaya hota. Kyunki explanations aur examples, aur intelligibility ki dusri helps, hume parts ko samajhne mein madad karti hain, lekin wo attention ko distract karti hain, reader ki mental power ko dissipate (bhatka) deti hain, aur uske whole ka clear conception form karne ke raaste mein khadi ho jati hain; kyunki wo system ka survey jaldi nahi kar pata, aur jo colouring aur embellishments (sazawat) uspar lagayi gayi hain wo use system ke articulation ya organization ko observe karne se rokti hain—jo uske liye sabse important consideration hai, jab wo uski unity aur stability ko judge karne aata hai.

Reader ke paas naturally ek strong inducement (prerna) honi chahiye present author ke sath co-operate karne ke liye, agar usne metaphysical science ki ek complete aur solid building khadi karne ka irada kiya hai, us plan ke mutabik jo ab uske samne rakha gaya hai. Metaphysics, jaisa yahan represent kiya gaya hai, akeli aisi science hai jo completion (poora hone) ko admit karti hai—aur wo bhi kam mehnat ke sath, agar ye united ho, toh kam waqt mein; taaki future generations ke liye kuch na bache sivaye use didactically illustrate aur apply karne ke task ke. Kyunki ye science aur kuch nahi balki un sab cheezon ki inventory (list) hai jo hume pure reason dwara di gayi hain, systematically arranged. Kuch bhi hamari nazar se bach nahi sakta; kyunki jo reason khud se produce karta hai wo chupa nahi reh sakta, balki reason dwara hi light mein laya jana chahiye, jaise hi hum un ideas ka common principle dhoond lete hain jo hum dhoond rahe hain. Is tarah ke cognitions ki perfect unity, jo pure conceptions par based hain, aur kisi empirical element ya kisi peculiar intuition jo determinate experience ki taraf le jati hai usse uninfluenced hain, is completeness ko na sirf practicable banati hai, balki necessary bhi.

[Translated By HindiMindBytes](#)

Tecum habita, et nôris quam sit tibi curta supellex.

—Persius. Satirae iv. 52. (Matlab: Khud ke sath raho, aur tum jaan jaogee ki tumhare ghar ka saaman [furnishing] kitna kam hai.)

Pure speculative reason ke aise system ko main Metaphysic of Nature [2] title ke under publish karne ki umeed karta hoon. Is work ka content (jo aadha bhi lamba nahi hoga) present Critique se kahin zyada rich hoga, jiska kaam is cognition ke sources ko discover karna aur iski possibility ki conditions ko expose karna hai, aur sath hi scientific building ke liye ek fit foundation ko saaf aur level karna hai. Present work mein, main ek judge ki patient hearing aur impartiality ki umeed karta hoon; dusre mein, ek co-labourer ki good-will aur assistance ki. Kyunki, bhale hi is system ke liye principles ki list Critique mein kitni bhi complete ho, system ki correctness demand karti hai ki koi bhi deduced conceptions absent na hon. Inhe à priori present nahi kiya ja sakta, balki gradually discover karna hoga; aur, jabki conceptions ka synthesis Critique mein fully exhaust kar liya gaya hai, ye zaruri hai ki, proposed work mein, unke analysis ke sath bhi aisa hi ho. Lekin ye kaam se zyada ek amusement (manoranjan) hoga.

[2] Metaphysic of Ethics ke contradistinction (virodh) mein. Ye work kabhi publish nahi hua.
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION 1787

Hamari knowledge ka wo hissa jo pure reason ke province (kshetra) mein aata hai, kya wo us undeviating certainty (kabhi na dagmagane wali nischittata) ke sath aage badh raha hai jo science ki progress ko characterize karti hai, ye determine karne mein hume koi dikhat nahi hogi. Agar hum dekhte hain ki jo log metaphysical pursuits mein lage hain, wo us method par agree nahi kar pa rahe jo unhe follow karna chahiye; agar hum dekhte hain ki wo, sabse elaborate preparations ke baad, hamesha goal tak pahunchne se pehle hi ruk jate hain, aur apne kadam wapas lene aur naye raaston par chalne ke liye majboor ho jate hain, toh hum poori sure feel kar sakte hain ki wo scientific progress ki certainty paane se bahut door hain aur bajaye iske wo sirf andhere mein tatol (groping) rahe hain. In halaat mein hum reason ki ek important service karenge agar hum bas wo raasta indicate karne mein safal ho jayein jisper use chalna chahiye, taaki kisi result tak pahuncha ja sake—bhale hi iske liye un kai aims ko chodna pade jo, bina soche-samjhe, iski attainment ke liye propose kiye gaye the.

Ki Logic is sure course par chali hai, even purane times se, ye is fact se zahir hai ki, Aristotle ke baad se, ye ek kadam bhi aage nahi badh payi hai aur, is tarah, har appearance mein ye apni completion tak pahunch chuki hai. Kyunki, agar kuch moderns ne socha hai ki wo iska domain bada kar sakte hain psychological discussions (jaise imagination aur wit), metaphysical discussions (knowledge ka origin aur certitude ke different kinds), ya anthropological discussions (prejudices, unke causes aur remedies) daal kar: toh in authors ki ye koshish sirf logical science ki peculiar nature ke baare mein unki ignorance (agyan) dikhati hai. Hum sciences ko bada nahi karte balki disfigure (bigad) karte hain jab hum unki respective limits ko bhool jate hain aur unhe ek dusre mein mix hone dete hain. Ab logic un limits ke andar enclosed

hai jo perfectly clear definition admit karti hain; ye ek science hai jiska object aur kuch nahi balki all thought ke formal laws ka exposition aur proof hai, chahe wo à priori ho ya empirical, chahe uska origin ya object kuch bhi ho, aur chahe wo human mind mein kaise bhi difficulties—natural ya accidental—encounter kare.

Logic ki early success exclusively uske field ki narrowness ko attribute ki jani chahiye, jisme abstraction kiya ja sakta hai, ya rather kiya jana chahiye, cognition ke sabhi objects ka unke characteristic distinctions ke sath, aur jisme understanding ko sirf khud se aur apne forms se deal karna hota hai. Obviously, reason ke liye science ke sure path par chalna kahin zyada mushkil task hai, jahan use sirf khud se nahi, balki objects se deal karna hai jo usse external hain. Isliye, logic properly sirf ek propaedeutic hai—maano sciences ka vestibule (pravesha-dwar) banata hai; aur jabki ye knowledge ki various branches ke regarding correct judgement form karne ke liye zaruri hai, fir bhi real, substantive knowledge ka acquisition sirf sciences mein dhoonda jana chahiye jo properly so called hain, yaani ki, objective sciences mein.

Ab in sciences mein, agar inhe rational kaha ja sakta hai, toh inmein à priori cognition ke elements hone chahiye, aur ye cognition apne object ke sath twofold relation mein khada ho sakta hai. Ya toh ise object ke conception ko determine karna ho sakta hai—jo extraneously supply kiya jana chahiye, ya fir ise uski reality ko establish karna ho sakta hai. Pehla theoretical hai, dusra practical rational cognition hai. Dono mein, pure ya à priori element ko pehle treat kiya jana chahiye, aur use carefully distinguish kiya jana chahiye usse jo dusre sources se supply kiya jata hai. Koi aur method sirf irremediable confusion ki taraf le jayega.

Mathematics aur Physics do theoretical sciences hain jinhe apne objects ko à priori determine karna hota hai. Pehli wali purely à priori hai, dusri wali partially so hai, lekin wo cognition ke dusre sources par bhi dependent hai.

Earliest times mein jiska history hume record deti hai, mathematics ne science ke sure course par entry le li thi, us wonderful nation, Greeks ke beech mein. Fir bhi ye nahi socha jana chahiye ki is science ke liye us 'royal road' ko dhoondna, ya construct karna, utna hi aasan tha jitna logic ke liye, jisme reason ko sirf khud se deal karna hota hai. Iske vipreet, mujhe lagta hai ki ye lambe samay tak—chiefly Egyptians ke beech—apne true aims aur destination ke liye blind groping (andhere mein tatolne) ki stage mein rahi hogi, aur ye ki ye ek revolution tha jo ek aadmi ke happy idea se aaya, jisne wo raasta strike out aur determine kiya jise is science ko follow karna chahiye, aur jo indefinite advancement admit karta hai. Is intellectual revolution ki history—jo results mein celebrated Cape of Good Hope ke round passage ki discovery se kahin zyada important hai—aur iske author ki history, preserve nahi ki gayi hai. Lekin Diogenes Laertius, jo geometrical demonstration ke kuch simplest elements ke supposed discoverer ka naam leta hai—aise elements jo, ordinary opinion ke hisab se, prove karne ki zarurat bhi nahi rakhte—ye zahir karta hai ki is naye raaste ke first indication se introduce kiya gaya change, us zamane ke mathematicians ke liye utmost importance ka laga hoga, aur is tarah ye oblivion (bhulaye jane) ke chance se secure ho gaya. Ek nayi roshni us pehle aadmi (Thales, ya uska

naam jo bhi ho) ke dimaag mein chamki hogi jisne isosceles triangle ki properties demonstrate ki. Kyunki usne paya ki figure par meditate karna kaafi nahi tha, jaise wo uski aankhon ke samne tha, ya uska conception, jaise wo uske mind mein tha, aur is tarah uski properties ki knowledge paane ki koshish karna, balki ye zaruri tha ki in properties ko produce kiya jaye, maano, ek positive à priori construction ke zariye; aur ye ki à priori cognition tak certainty ke sath pahunchne ke liye, use object ko koi aur properties attribute nahi karni chahiye sivaye unke jo usne khud, apne conception ke accordance mein, object mein place ki thi.

Ek kahin lamba period beeta isse pehle ki Physics ne science ke highway par entry li. Kyunki ye sirf dedh sadi (century and a half) pehle ki baat hai jab wise BACON ne physical studies ko ek nayi direction di, ya rather—kyunki dusre log pehle se hi right track par the—is nayi direction ke pursuit ko fresh vigour (taqat) di. Yahan bhi, mathematics ke case ki tarah, hume ek rapid intellectual revolution ka evidence milta hai. Jo remarks follow karenge unmein main khud ko natural science ke empirical side tak confine rakhunga.

Jab GALILEI ne inclined plane par definite weight ki balls ke sath experiment kiya, jab TORRICELLI ne hawa se ek weight uthwaya jise usne pehle se calculate kiya tha ki wo ek definite column of water ke barabar hoga, ya jab STAHL ne, baad ke period mein, metals ko lime mein convert kiya, aur lime ko wapas metal mein, kuch elements ke addition aur subtraction se;^[3] tab sabhi natural philosophers ke liye ek roshni jal gayi. Unhone seekha ki reason sirf wahi perceive karta hai jo wo khud apne design ke hisab se produce karta hai; ki use nature ke leading-strings (bachon ko chalana sikhane wali rassi) mein, maano, peeche nahi chalna chahiye, balki unvarying laws ke hisab se judgement ke principles ke sath aage badhna chahiye, aur nature ko compel karna chahiye uske sawalon ka jawab dene ke liye. Kyunki accidental observations, jo bina kisi preconceived plan ke kiye gaye hain, kisi necessary law ke under unite nahi kiye ja sakte. Lekin yahi wo cheez hai jo reason dhoondta hai aur require karta hai. Sirf reason ke principles hi concordant phenomena ko laws ki validity de sakte hain, aur sirf tab jab experiment in rational principles dwara direct kiya jata hai tabhi uski koi real utility ho sakti hai. Reason ko nature ke paas jana chahiye, haan, usse information lene ke view se, lekin, ek pupil (shishya) ke character mein nahi, jo wo sab sunta hai jo uska master bolna chahta hai, balki ek judge ke character mein, jo witnesses ko compel karta hai un sawalon ka jawab dene ke liye jo wo khud propose karna theek samajhta hai. Is single idea ko wo revolution ascribe kiya jana chahiye, jiske dwara, itni sadiyon tak andhere mein tatolne ke baad, natural science ko ant mein certain progress ke raaste par laya gaya.

[Unlock Full Text](#)

[3] Main yahan experimental method ki history ko exactness ke sath follow nahi kar raha hoon, jiske, waakai, pehle steps kuch obscurity (dhundh) mein involved hain.

Ab hum aate hain Metaphysics par, ek purely speculative science, jo ek completely isolated position occupy karti hai aur experience ki teachings se entirely independent hai. Ye mere conceptions se deal karti hai—mathematics ki tarah nahi, jo intuition par apply kiye gaye

conceptions se deal karti hai—aur ismein, reason khud ka hi pupil hai. Ye sciences mein sabse purani hai, aur tab bhi survive karegi, agar baaki sab ek all-destroying barbarism ke abyss (khaayi) mein nigal liye jayein. Lekin iski kismat abhi itni achi nahi rahi hai ki ye sure scientific method ko attain kar sake. Ye zahir ho jayega; agar hum wo tests apply karein jo humne shuruat mein propose kiye the. Hum pate hain ki reason hamesha ruk jata hai (comes to a stand), jab wo à priori un laws ka perception paane ki koshish karta hai jinhe most common experience bhi confirm karta hai. Hum pate hain ki ye innumerable instances mein apne kadam wapas lene par majboor ho jata hai, aur us raaste ko chodne par jispar usne entry ki thi, kyunki ye desired result tak nahi le jata. Hum ye bhi pate hain ki jo log metaphysical pursuits mein engage hain wo aapas mein agree karne se bahut door hain, balki iske vipreet, ye science ek aisa arena (akhada) provide karti dikhti hai jo specially mock-contests (nakli ladaiyon) mein skill dikhane ya taqat ki exercise ke liye adapted hai—ek aisa field jisme kisi combatant ne aaj tak ek inch zameen bhi nahi jeeti, jisme, kam se kam, kisi victory ko aaj tak permanent possession (kabza) ka taj nahi pehnaya gaya.

Ye hume inquire karne ki taraf le jata hai ki aisa kyun hai ki, metaphysics mein, science ka sure path ab tak nahi mila hai. Kya hum ye maan lein ki ise dhoondna impossible hai? Toh fir nature ne hamare reason ko iske liye restless aspirations (bechain icchaon) ke sath kyun visit kiya, maano ye hamare sabse bhari concerns mein se ek ho? Aur toh aur, hume apne reason par confidence rakhne ka kitna kam karan milega, agar ye hume us mamle mein chod deta hai jiske baare mein, sabse zyada, hum sach janna chahte hain—aur sirf yahi nahi, balki hume vain phantoms (bekar ke saaye) ke peeche bhagne ke liye allure (lubhata) karta hai, sirf end mein dhokha देने ke liye? Ya, agar raasta ab tak bas miss hua hai, toh hamare paas kya indications hain jo hume ek renewed investigation mein guide karein, aur hume greater success ki umeed karne ke liye enable karein jo hamare predecessors ke hisse mein nahi aayi?

Mujhe aisa lagta hai ki mathematics aur natural philosophy ke examples, jo, jaisa humne dekha, ek sudden revolution dwara apni present condition mein laye gaye, kaafi remarkable hain hamara attention us change ke essential circumstances par fix karne ke liye jo unke liye itna advantageous sabit hua, aur hume ye experiment karne ke liye induce karne ke liye ki hum unhe imitate karein, jahan tak wo analogy permit kare jo, rational sciences hone ke naate, wo metaphysics ke sath rakhte hain. Ab tak ye assume kiya gaya hai ki hamare cognition ko objects ke conform (anuroop) hona chahiye; lekin in objects ke baare mein à priori kuch bhi janne ki sabhi koshishen, conceptions ke zariye, aur is tarah hamari knowledge ki range badhane ki, is assumption ki wajah se abortive (fail) ho gayi hain. Toh chalo ye experiment karte hain ki kya hum metaphysics mein zyada successful ho sakte hain, agar hum ye assume karein ki objects ko hamare cognition ke conform hona chahiye. Ye, har haal mein, hamare end (lakshya) ko paane ki possibility ke sath behtar accord karta hai, yaani ki, objects ke à priori cognition tak pahunchne ki, objects ke baare mein kuch determine karne ki, unke hume diye jane se pehle. Hum yahan wahi karne ka propose karte hain jo COPERNICUS ne celestial movements ko explain karne ki koshish mein kiya. Jab usne paya ki wo ye assume karke koi progress nahi kar pa raha ki sabhi heavenly bodies spectator (dekhne wale) ke chaaro taraf ghoomti hain, toh usne process ko reverse kiya, aur ye assume karke experiment try kiya ki

spectator ghoom raha hai, jabki stars rest par hain. Hum objects ke intuition ke regard mein same experiment kar sakte hain. Agar intuition ko objects ki nature ke conform hona hai, toh mujhe nahi dikhta ki hum unke baare mein à priori kuch kaise jaan sakte hain. Agar, dusri taraf, object hamari faculty of intuition ki nature ke conform karta hai, toh main tab easily aise à priori knowledge ki possibility conceive kar sakta hoon. Ab kyunki main mere intuitions mein rest nahi kar sakta, balki—agar unhe cognitions banana hai—toh mujhe unhe, representations ke taur par, kisi cheez se refer karna hoga, object ke taur par, aur latter ko former ke zariye determine karna hoga, yahan fir se mere liye do raaste khule hain. Ya toh, pehla, main ye assume karun ki conceptions, jinke द्वारा main ye determination effect karta hoon, object ke conform hain—aur is case mein main wapas usi perplexity (duvidha) mein aa jata hoon jo pehle thi; ya dusra, main ye assume karun ki objects, ya, jo same cheez hai, experience, jisme akele wo given objects ke taur par cognize kiye jate hain, mere conceptions ke conform karta hai—aur tab mujhe aage badhne mein koi dikkat nahi hogi. Kyunki experience khud cognition ka ek mode hai jo understanding require karta hai. Isse pehle ki objects mujhe diye jayein, yaani à priori, mujhe khud mein understanding ke laws presuppose karne honge jo conceptions à priori mein express hote hain. In conceptions ke anusaar, tab, experience ke sabhi objects ko necessarily conform hona chahiye. Ab kuch objects hain jinhe reason sochta hai, aur wo bhi necessarily, lekin jo experience mein nahi diye ja sakte, ya, kam se kam, waise nahi diye ja sakte jaise reason unhe sochta hai. In objects ko sochne ki koshish baad mein thought ke naye method ka excellent test furnish karegi jo humne adopt kiya hai, aur jo is principle par based hai ki hum cheezon mein à priori sirf wahi cognize (jaante) karte hain jo hum khud unmein place karte hain.[4]

[Want To Read Full Text?](#)

[4] Ye method, accordingly, jo humne natural philosopher se borrow kiya hai, pure reason ke elements ko usmein dhoondne mein consist karta hai jo experiment द्वारा confirmation ya refutation admit karta hai. Ab pure reason ke propositions, khaaskar jab wo possible experience ki limits ko transcend karte hain, apne objects ke sath koi experiment karna admit nahi karte, jaisa natural science mein hota hai. Isliye, un conceptions aur principles ke regard mein jo hum à priori assume karte hain, hamara only course ye hoga ki hum unhe do different sides se view karein. Humein ek hi conception ko regard karna hoga, ek taraf, experience ke relation mein senses aur understanding ke object ke taur par, dusri taraf, reason ke relation mein, isolated aur experience ki limits ko transcend karte hue, mere thought ke object ke taur par. Ab agar hum paate hain ki, jab hum cheezon ko is double point of view se regard karte hain, toh result pure reason ke principle ke sath harmony mein hai, lekin jab hum unhe single point of view se regard karte hain, toh reason self-contradiction mein involve ho jata hai, tab ye experiment is distinction ki correctness ko establish karega.

Ye koshish utni hi successful hoti hai jitna hum desire kar sakte hain, aur metaphysics ko, uske first part mein—yaani, jahan wo à priori conceptions ke sath occupied hai, jinke corresponding objects experience mein diye ja sakte hain—science ka certain course promise karti hai. Kyunki is naye method se hum à priori cognition ki possibility ko perfectly explain karne mein enabled hain, aur, jo isse bhi zyada hai, un laws ko satisfactorily demonstrate karne mein jo nature ke

foundation par à priori lay karte hain, experience ke objects ke sum ke taur par—jinmein se koi bhi ab tak follow kiye gaye procedure ke according possible nahi tha. Lekin metaphysics ke first part mein à priori cognition ki faculty ke is deduction se, hum ek surprising result derive karte hain, aur ek aisa result jo, har appearance mein, metaphysics ke great end (lakshya) ke khilaf militate (ladta) karta hai, jaisa second part mein treat kiya gaya hai. Kyunki hum is conclusion par aate hain ki hamari cognition ki faculty possible experience ki limits ko transcend karne mein unable hai; aur fir bhi ye precisely is science ka most essential object hai. Hamari rational cognition à priori ka estimate jispar hum pahunchte hain wo ye hai ki iska lena-dena sirf phenomena (jaisi cheezein dikhti hain) se hai, aur ki things in themselves (cheezein jaisi wo khud mein hain), real existence possess karte hue bhi, iske sphere ke beyond (pare) hain. Yahan hum is estimate ke justice (sahi hone) ko test par daal sakte hain. Kyunki wo jo hume necessity ke sath experience aur sabhi phenomena ki limits ko transcend karne ke liye impel (dhakelta) karta hai wo unconditioned hai, jise reason absolutely require karta hai things as they are in themselves mein, taaki conditions ki series ko complete kiya ja sake. Ab, agar ye dikhta hai ki jab, ek taraf, hum assume karte hain ki hamara cognition conform karta hai uske objects se as things in themselves, toh unconditioned ko bina contradiction ke socha nahi ja sakta, aur ki jab, dusri taraf, hum assume karte hain ki things as they are given to us ka representation conform nahi karta in things se as they are in themselves, balki ye objects, as phenomena, hamare mode of representation ko conform karte hain, toh contradiction gayab ho jata hai: tab hum us cheez ki sachayi ke liye convince ho jayenge jo humne experiment ke liye assume karke shuru ki thi; hum ise established maan sakte hain ki unconditioned un cheezon mein nahi hai jaisa hum unhe jaante hain, ya jaisa wo hume di gayi hain, balki un cheezon mein hai jaisi wo khud mein (in themselves) hain, hamari cognition ki range ke beyond.[5]

[5] Pure reason ka ye experiment Chemists ke experiment se bahut similarity rakhta hai, jise wo reduction ka experiment kehte hain, ya, more usually, synthetic process. Metaphysician ka analysis pure cognition à priori ko do heterogeneous elements mein separate karta hai, viz., things as phenomena ka cognition, aur things in themselves ka. Dialectic inhe fir se combine karti hai necessary rational idea of the unconditioned ke sath harmony mein, aur paati hai ki ye harmony kabhi result nahi karti sivaye upar wale distinction ke through, jo, isliye, just (sahi) conclude kiya jata hai.

Lekin, iske baad ki humne speculative reason ki power ko deny kar diya hai supersensible ke sphere mein koi progress karne se, ye abhi bhi hamare consideration ke liye bachta hai ki kya practical cognition mein aise data exist nahi karte jo hume unconditioned ke transcendent conception ko determine karne mein enable karein, sabhi possible experience ki limits ke beyond rise karne ke liye ek practical point of view se, aur is tarah metaphysics ke great ends ko satisfy karne ke liye. Speculative reason ne is tarah, kam se kam, hamari knowledge ke aise extension ke liye room (jagah) bana di hai: aur, agar ise ye space khali chodna padta hai, tab bhi ye humse wo liberty (azadi) nahi cheenta ki hum use fill up karein, agar hum kar sakte hain, practical data ke zariye—balki, ye hume attempt karne ke liye challenge bhi karta hai.[6]

[6] Toh heavenly bodies ke movements ke central laws ne us sachayi ko establish kiya jise

Copernicus ne, pehle, sirf ek hypothesis ke taur par assume kiya tha, aur, same time par, us invisible force (Newtonian attraction) ko light mein laya jo universe ko sath hold karti hai. Latter hamesha ke liye undiscovered rehti, agar Copernicus ne us experiment par venture na kiya hota—senses ke contrary lekin fir bhi just (sahi)—ki observed movements ko heavenly bodies mein nahi balki spectator mein dekha jaye. Is Preface mein main naye metaphysical method ko ek hypothesis ki tarah treat karta hoon is view se ki method ke aise change ke first attempts apparent ho sakein, jo hamesha hypothetical hote hain. Lekin Critique mein khud ye demonstrate kiya jayega, hypothetically nahi, balki apodeictically (nischit roop se), space aur time ke hamare representations ki nature se, aur understanding ke elementary conceptions se.

Metaphysics ke procedure mein ek complete revolution introduce karne ki ye koshish, geometricians aur natural philosophers ke example ke baad, Critique of Pure Speculative Reason ka aim constitute karti hai. Ye us method par ek treatise (granth) hai jise follow kiya jana hai, na ki science ka system khud. Lekin, same time par, ye is science ki external boundaries aur internal structure dono ko mark out aur define karta hai. Kyunki pure speculative reason ki ye peculiarity (khasiyat) hai, ki, thought ke various objects choose karte hue, ye apni faculties ki limits define karne mein able hai, aur yahan tak ki apne aap ko problems propose karne ke possible modes ka complete enumeration (ginti) dene mein, aur is tarah metaphysics ka entire system sketch out karne mein. Kyunki, ek taraf, cognition à priori mein, objects ko kuch bhi attribute nahi kiya jana chahiye sivaye uske jo thinking subject khud se derive karta hai; aur, dusri taraf, reason, cognition ke principles ke regard mein, ek perfectly distinct, independent unity hai, jisme, ek organized body ki tarah, har member dusron ke liye exist karta hai, aur sabhi each ke liye, taaki kisi principle ko, safety ke sath, ek relationship mein view nahi kiya ja sakta, jab tak use, same time par, pure reason ke total use ke relation mein view na kiya jaye. Isliye, bhi, metaphysics ko ye singular advantage hai—ek aisa advantage jo kisi aur science ke hisse mein nahi aata jiska objects se lena-dena hai—ki, agar ek baar ise science ke sure path par conduct kar diya jaye, is criticism ke zariye, toh ye apne cognitions ke whole sphere ko le sakti hai, aur is tarah apna kaam complete kar sakti hai, aur ise posterity (aane wali peedi) ke use ke liye chod sakti hai, ek aise capital (punji) ke taur par jo kabhi fresh accessions (badhotri) receive nahi kar sakta. Kyunki metaphysics ko sirf principles se aur apne employment ki limitations se deal karna hai jo in principles dwara determined hain. Is perfection ko attain karne ke liye ye, therefore, bound hai, fundamental science hone ke naate, aur is par ye maxim (kahaavat) justly apply ho sakti hai:

Nil actum reputans, si quid superesset agendum.

(Matlab: Wo kisi kaam ko kiya hua nahi maanta, agar kuch bhi karna baki reh gaya ho.)

[Full PDF Available For Members Only Join Now](#)

Lekin, ye poocha jayega, ki ye kis tarah ka khazaana (treasure) hai jo hum aane wali generation (posterity) ko virasat mein dene ka propose kar rahe hain? Is metaphysics ke system ki real value kya hai, jise criticism (alochna) ke through purify kiya gaya hai, aur is wajah se ek

permanent condition mein la diya gaya hai? Is work par ek cursory (upri) nazar daalne se ye supposition (maan-na) banega ki iska use sirf negative hai, ki ye hume sirf warn karta hai ki hum speculative reason (soch-vichar wala tark) ke sath experience ki limits ke pare na jayein. Ye, fact mein, iska primary use hai. Lekin ye turant ek positive value assume kar leta hai, jab hum observe karte hain ki wo principles jinke sath speculative reason apni limits ko cross karne ki koshish karta hai, wo inevitably (lazmi taur par) reason ke use ko badhane (extension) ki bajaye ghata (contraction) dete hain, kyunki wo sensibility (indriyan/senses) ki limits ko—jo ki unka proper sphere hai—pure thought ke realm par failane ki dhamki dete hain aur, is tarah, reason ke pure (practical) use ko hatane (supplant) ki koshish karte hain.

Toh ab tak, jahan tak ye criticism speculative reason ko uski proper boundaries mein rakhne mein occupied hai, ye sirf negative hai; lekin, kyunki ye usi waqt, ek aisi rukawat ko hatata hai jo practical reason ke use ko rokti hai aur destroy karne ki dhamki bhi deti hai, iski ek positive aur bahut important value hai. Ise manne ke liye, hume sirf ye convince hona padega ki pure reason ka ek absolutely necessary use hai—jo ki moral use hai—jisme ye inevitably sensibility ki limits ko cross karta hai, bina speculation ki madad ke, aur ise sirf us speculation ke effects se bache rehne ki zarurat hoti hai jo ise khud ke sath contradiction mein daal sakti hai.

Is criticism ki service ke positive advantage ko deny karna utna hi absurd (be-tuka) hoga jitna ye kehna ki police ka system koi positive benefit nahi deta, kyunki uska main kaam wo violence rokna hai jo ek citizen dusre citizen se darta hai, taaki har koi apna kaam shanti aur security se kar sake.

Ki space aur time sirf sensible intuition ke forms hain, aur isliye ye sirf cheezon ke existence ki conditions hain as phenomena (jaisi wo dikhti hain); ki, iske alawa, hamare paas understanding ke koi conceptions nahi hain, aur consequently, cheezon ko janne (cognition) ke liye koi elements nahi hain, sivaye tab tak jab tak in conceptions ke liye koi corresponding intuition na di jaye; ki, accordingly, hum kisi object ki cognition nahi kar sakte as a thing in itself (cheez asal mein kaisi hai), balki sirf sensible intuition ke object ke taur par, yaani ki, as phenomenon—ye sab kuch Critique ke analytical part mein prove kiya gaya hai; aur isse sabhi possible speculative cognition ki limitation sirf experience ke objects tak, ek necessary result ke taur par follow karti hai.

Saath hi saath, ye dhyan mein rakhna zaruri hai ki, jabki hum cognizing (janne) ki power ko surrender karte hain, hum abhi bhi objects ko thinking (sochne) ki power reserve rakhte hain, as things in themselves.[7] Kyunki, warna, hume ek aisi appearance (dikhawat) ke existence ko affirm karna padega jiske peeche koi appearing cheez hi na ho—jo ki absurd hoga.

[7] Kisi object ko cognize (janne) ke liye, mujhe uski possibility prove karni padti hai, ya toh uski reality se jo experience se gawah hai, ya à priori, reason ke zariye. Lekin main wo soch sakta hoon jo main chahta hoon, basharte main khud ko contradict na karun; yaani ki, basharte mera conception ek possible thought ho, bhale hi main possibilities ke sum mein corresponding object ke existence ka jawab na de sakun. Lekin kisi conception ko objective validity, yaani real

possibility attribute karne ke liye kuch aur chahiye hota hai—dusri possibility sirf logical hoti hai. Hum, halanki, is additional requirement ko satisfy karne ke liye cognition ke theoretical sources tak simit nahi hain, balki hum inhe practical sources se bhi derive kar sakte hain.

[unlock full text](#)

Ab maan lijiye, ek pal ke liye, ki humne ye criticism undertake nahi kiya hota aur, accordingly, objects of experience aur things as they are in themselves ke beech zaruri distinction (farak) nahi kiya hota. Toh causality ka principle, aur consequence ke taur par, nature ka mechanism jo causality se determine hota hai, wo sabhi cheezon par absolute validity rakhta as efficient causes. Tab main ye assert (dawa) nahi kar pata, ek hi being ke regarding, example ke liye, human soul (atma) ke liye, ki iski will (marzi) free hai, aur fir bhi, usi waqt, natural necessity ke subject hai, yaani ki, free nahi hai, bina ek saaf contradiction mein gire. Kyunki dono propositions mein main soul ko same meaning mein leta, as a thing in general, as a thing in itself—kyunki, bina previous criticism ke, main use kisi aur tarah nahi le sakta tha.

Dusri taraf, ab suppose kariye ki humne ye criticism kiya hai, aur ye seekh liya hai ki ek object ko do senses mein liya ja sakta hai: pehla, as a phenomenon (dikhawat), dusra, as a thing in itself (asal cheez); aur ye ki, understanding ke conceptions ke deduction ke hisab se, causality ka principle sirf pehle sense (phenomenon) wali cheezon par lagu hota hai. Tab hum dekhte hain ki isme koi contradiction nahi hai ye assert karne mein, ki ek taraf, will, phenomenal sphere mein—visible action mein—necessarily nature ke law ko obey karti hai, aur is had tak, free nahi hai; aur, dusri taraf, ki wo thing in itself ko belong karti hai, wo us law ke subject nahi hai, aur accordingly, free hai.

Ab, ye sach hai ki main speculative reason ke zariye, aur empirical observation se toh bilkul bhi nahi, apni soul ko as a thing in itself cognize (jaan) nahi sakta aur consequently, liberty (azadi) ko us being ki property ke taur par cognize nahi kar sakta jise main sense ki duniya mein effects ascribe karta hoon. Kyunki, aisa karne ke liye, mujhe is being ko existing cognize karna hoga, lekin time mein nahi, jo ki—kyunki main apne conception ko kisi intuition se support nahi kar sakta—impossible hai. Same time par, jabki main cognize nahi kar sakta, main freedom ko kaafi ache se think (soch) sakta hoon, yaani ki, mera representation iska kam se kam koi contradiction involve nahi karta, agar hum do modes of representation (sensible aur intellectual) ke critical distinction ko aur pure understanding ke conceptions aur unse nikalne wale principles ki limitation ko dhyan mein rakhein.

Ab suppose kariye ki morality necessarily liberty ko presuppose karti hai, strictest sense mein, hamari will ki property ke taur par; suppose kariye ki reason mein kuch practical, original principles à priori hain, jo is presupposition ke bina absolutely impossible the; aur suppose kariye, same time par, ki speculative reason ne ye prove kar diya tha ki liberty ko socha hi nahi ja sakta. Toh ye follow karega ki moral presupposition ko speculative affirmation ke aage jhukna padega, jiska opposite ek obvious contradiction involve karta hai, aur ki liberty aur, uske saath, morality ko nature ke mechanism ke aage yield karna (haar maanna) padega; kyunki morality

ka negation (inkar) koi contradiction involve nahi karta, sivaye liberty ke presupposition par. Ab morality liberty ki speculative cognition require nahi karti; ye kaafi hai ki main ise think kar sakun, ki iska conception koi contradiction involve na kare, ki ye nature ke mechanism ke saath interfere na kare. Lekin ye requirement bhi hum satisfy nahi kar sakte the, agar humne wo twofold sense (do tarah ka matlab) nahi seekha hota jisme cheezon ko liya ja sakta hai; aur sirf isi tarah se morality ki doctrine aur nature ki doctrine apni proper limits mein confined rehti hain. Is result ke liye, fir, hum us criticism ke karzdaar hain jo hume things in themselves ke regarding hamari unavoidable ignorance (agyan) ke baare mein warn karta hai, aur hamari theoretical cognition ko sirf phenomena tak limit karta hai.

[Read Full PDF Now](#)

Pure reason ke critical principles ki positive value, God aur soul ki simple nature ke conception ke relation mein, similar exemplification admit karti hai; lekin is point par main rukunga nahi. Main God, freedom, aur immortality ka assumption (dharna) bhi nahi bana sakta—jaisa ki morality ke practical interests require karte hain—agar main speculative reason ko uski transcendent insight ke dawaon se deprive (vanchit) na karun. Kyunki in tak pahunchne ke liye, use un principles ka use karna padega jo, fact mein, sirf possible experience ke objects tak extend karte hain, aur jo is sphere ke pare objects par apply nahi kiye ja sakte bina unhe phenomena mein convert kiye, aur is tarah pure reason ke practical extension ko impossible banaye bina.

Isliye, mujhe knowledge (gyan) ko abolish (khatam) karna pada, taaki belief (astha/vishwas) ke liye room (jagah) bana sakun. Metaphysics ka dogmatism, yaani ki ye presumption ki bina previous criticism ke metaphysics mein aage badhna possible hai, wahi us unbelief (jo hamesha dogmatic hota hai) ka true source hai jo morality ke khilaf ladta hai.

Is tarah, jabki posterity (aane wali peedi) ko ek legacy (virasat) dena koi bahut mushkil kaam nahi ho sakta, ek metaphysics ke system ki shape mein jo Critique of Pure Reason ke hisab se banaya gaya ho, fir bhi aise bequest (uphaar) ki value ko kam (depreciate) nahi samjha jana chahiye. Ye reason ko ek important service dega, scientific method ki certainty ko us random groping (andhere mein tatolna) ki jagah substitute karke, jo bina principles ki guidance ke results dhoondti thi, jo ab tak metaphysical studies ko characterize karta tha. Ye youth ke inquiring mind ko ek important service dega, student ko apni powers ko genuine science ki cultivation mein lagane ke liye lead karke, bajaye iske ki wo unhe waste kare, jaisa abhi hota hai, un speculations par jo kabhi kisi result tak nahi le ja sakti, ya naye ideas aur opinions invent karne ki bekar koshishon par.

Lekin, sabse upar, ye morality aur religion par ek inestimable benefit confer karega, ye dikha kar ki unke khilaf uthaye gaye sabhi objections ko hamesha ke liye silence kiya ja sakta hai Socratic method se, yaani ki, objector (virodh karne wale) ki ignorance (agyan) ko prove karke. Kyunki, jaise duniya kabhi bhi bina metaphysics ke system ke (kisi na kisi tarah ke) nahi rahi hai, aur, no doubt, kabhi rahegi bhi nahi, ye philosophy ka highest aur weightiest concern hai ki wo ise

nuksan pahunchane ke liye powerless bana de, error ke sources ko band karke.

Sciences ki field mein ye important change, ye uske fancied possessions (kalpanik sampatti) ka loss, jise speculative reason ko submit karna padega, kisi bhi tarah se humanity ke general interests ke liye detrimental (nuksandayak) prove nahi hota. Wo advantages jo duniya ne pure reason ki teachings se derive kiye hain, wo bilkul bhi impair (kharab) nahi hote. Ye loss, apne poore extent mein, schools (academic circles) ki monopoly par girta hai, lekin mankind ke interests ko slightest degree mein bhi touch nahi karta. Main sabse obstinate (ziddi) dogmatist se appeal karta hoon, ki kya soul ke death ke baad continued existence ka proof, jo uske substance ki simplicity se derive kiya gaya hai; ya will ki freedom ka proof jo nature ke general mechanism ke opposition mein hai, jo subjective aur objective practical necessity ke subtle lekin impotent distinction se liya gaya hai; ya God ke existence ka proof, jo ens realissimum ke conception se deduce kiya gaya hai—changeable ki contingency aur prime mover ki necessity se—kya ye kabhi schools ki limits ke pare ja saka hai, public mind mein penetrate kar saka hai, ya uske convictions par slightest influence daal saka hai?

Ye admit karna padega ki aisa case nahi raha hai aur ki, common understanding ki unfitness ki wajah se aisi subtle speculations ke liye, ye kabhi expect bhi nahi kiya ja sakta ki aisa hoga. Iske opposite, ye saaf hai ki future life ki umeed us feeling se arise hoti hai, jo har aadmi ke seene mein exist karti hai, ki temporal (dunyavi waqt) uski nature ki demands ko meet aur satisfy karne ke liye inadequate (na-kaafi) hai. Isi tarah, isme koi doubt nahi kiya ja sakta ki duties ka clear exhibition, inclination (jhukav) ke sabhi claims ke opposition mein, freedom ki consciousness ko janam deta hai, aur ki glorious order, beauty, aur providential care, jo nature mein har jagah displayed hai, wo Universe ke ek wise aur great Author mein belief ko janam dete hain.

[Read Full Text](#)

Aisa hi in general convictions ka genesis (janam) hai mankind mein, jahan tak wo rational grounds par depend karte hain; aur ye public property na sirf undisturbed rehti hai, balki aur greater importance tak raise ho jati hai, us doctrine se ki schools ko koi haq nahi hai apne aap mein ek zyada profound insight arrogate (hathiyane) karne ka ek aise matter mein jo general human concernment ka hai, us insight se zyada jo great mass of men (aam log), jo humari nazar mein highest estimation mein rehte hain, bina difficulty ke attain kar sakte hain, aur ki schools ko, isliye, khud ko in universally comprehensible aur, moral point of view se, amply satisfactory proofs ke elaboration (vistar) tak confine rakhna chahiye. Isliye, ye change sirf schools ke arrogant pretensions (ghamandi davor) ko affect karta hai, jo khushi se apne exclusive possession mein us key (chabi) ko rakhna chahenge un truths ki jo wo public ko dete hain.

Quod mecum nescit, solus vult scire videri.

(Jise wo mere sath nahi jaanta, wo dikhana chahta hai ki wo akela jaanta hai.)

Same time par, ye speculative philosopher ko uske just title se deprive nahi karta ki wo us science ka sole depositor (eklauta rakhwala) hai jo public ko benefit karti hai bina unki knowledge ke—mera matlab hai, Critique of Pure Reason. Ye kabhi popular nahi ho sakta aur, indeed, ise hone ka koi occasion (karan) bhi nahi hai; kyunki useful truths ke favour mein finespun (baarik) arguments public mind par utna hi kam impression daalte hain jitna ki equally subtle objections jo in truths ke khilaf laye jate hain. Dusri taraf, kyunki dono inevitably har us aadmi par force karte hain jo speculation ki height tak uthta hai, ye schools ki manifest duty ban jati hai ki wo speculative reason ke rights ki thorough investigation karein aur, is tarah, us scandal ko prevent karein jo metaphysical controversies (vivad) der-saber masses ke liye bhi cause karenge hi.

Ye sirf criticism ke zariye hai ki metaphysicians (aur, as such, theologians bhi) in controversies se aur apne doctrines ke consequent perversion (bigadne) se bachaye ja sakte hain. Criticism akela materialism, fatalism, atheism, free-thinking, fanaticism, aur superstition ki jad par chot maar sakta hai, jo universally injurious (nuksandayak) hain—aur saath hi idealism aur scepticism par bhi, jo schools ke liye dangerous hain, lekin mushkil se hi public tak pahunchte hain. Agar governments learned logon ke affairs mein interfere karna theek samjhti hain, toh ye science ke interests ke liye, aur society ke interests ke liye, wise regard ke sath zyada consistent hoga ki wo is tarah ke criticism ko favour karein, jiske zariye akele reason ki mehnat ko firm basis par establish kiya ja sakta hai, bajaye iske ki wo schools ke ridiculous despotism (tanashahi) ko support karein, jo public danger ka shor machate hain cobwebs (makdi ke jaalon) ke destroy hone par, jinki taraf public ne kabhi dhyan bhi nahi diya, aur jinka loss, isliye, wo kabhi feel nahi kar sakti.

[Click To Unlock PDF](#)

Ye critical science pure cognition mein reason ke dogmatic procedure ke opposed nahi hai; kyunki pure cognition hamesha dogmatic hona chahiye, yaani ki, sure principles à priori se strict demonstration par rest karna chahiye—balki ye dogmatism ke opposed hai, yaani ki, us presumption ke ki pure cognition ke sath koi progress karna possible hai, jo (philosophical) conceptions se derive kiya gaya ho, un principles ke according jinhe reason lambe samay se employ karne ki aadat mein hai—bina pehle ye inquire kiye ki kis tarah aur kis haq se reason in principles ke possession mein aaya hai. Dogmatism is tarah pure reason ka dogmatic procedure hai bina apni powers ke previous criticism ke, aur is procedure ko oppose karte hue, hume ye nahi samajhna chahiye ki hum us loquacious shallowness (baatuni khokhlapan) ko support de rahe hain jo khud ko popularity ka naam deti hai, aur na hi scepticism ko, jo metaphysics ki poori science ka kaam tamaam kar deta hai.

Iske opposite, hamara criticism ek thoroughly scientific system of metaphysics ke liye necessary preparation hai jo apna task entirely à priori perform karega, speculative reason ki complete satisfaction ke liye, aur isliye, ise popularly nahi, balki scholastically treat kiya jana chahiye. Us plan ko carry out karne mein jo Critique prescribe karta hai, yaani ki, future system of metaphysics mein, hume celebrated WOLF ke strict method ka sahara lena hoga, jo sabhi dogmatic philosophers mein greatest the. Wo pehle the jinhone fixed principles establish karne,

conceptions ko clearly define karne, aur demonstrations ko most severe scrutiny (jaanch) ke subject banane ki necessity point out ki, bajaye iske ki conclusions par rashly jump kiya jaye. Jo example unhone set kiya usne profound aur thorough investigation ki spirit ko jagane ka kaam kiya jo Germany mein abhi extinct (khatam) nahi hui hai. Wo metaphysical studies ko truly scientific character dene ke liye peculiarly well fitted hote, agar unhe ye khayal aaya hota ki field ko organum ke criticism se, yaani ki, pure reason ke khud ke criticism se prepare karein. Ki wo aise procedure ki necessity ko perceive karne mein fail hue, ye thought ke us dogmatic mode ko ascribe kiya jana chahiye jo unki age (zamane) ko characterize karta tha, aur is point par unke time ke philosophers, aur sabhi previous times ke bhi, ek dusre ko kuch reproach (ilzaam) nahi de sakte.

Jo log Wolf ke method ko, aur Critique of Pure Reason ke method ko turant reject karte hain, unka koi aur aim nahi ho sakta sivaye science ki bediyon (fetters) ko todne ke, mehnat ko khel mein badalne ke, certainty ko opinion mein, aur philosophy ko philodoxy (opinion ka pyar) mein badalne ke.

Is second edition mein, maine koshish ki hai, jahan tak possible ho, un difficulties aur obscurity (dhundhlapan) ko hatane ki, jinhone, shayad meri galti ke bina, acute thinkers ke beech bhi kai misconceptions ko janam diya hai. Propositions mein khud, aur un demonstrations mein jisse wo supported hain, aur saath hi work ke form aur entire plan mein, mujhe badalne ke liye kuch nahi mila; jo partly us long examination ko attribute kiya jana chahiye jo maine public ko offer karne se pehle pure work par kiya tha aur partly case ki nature ko. Kyunki pure speculative reason ek organic structure hai jisme kuch bhi isolated ya independent nahi hai, balki har single part baaki sabke liye essential hai; aur isliye, slightest imperfection, chahe defect ho ya positive error, use mein khud ko betray kiye bina nahi reh sakti.

Main, further, hope karne ki himmat karta hoon, ki ye system future ke liye same unalterable character maintain karega. Mujhe ye confidence entertain karne ke liye vanity (ghamand) nahi, balki wo evidence lead karta hai jo result ki equality afford karti hai, jab hum proceed karte hain, pehle, simplest elements se pure reason ke complete whole tak aur, aur fir, backwards whole se har part tak. Hum paate hain ki kisi bhi part mein slightest alteration (badlav) karne ki koshish inevitably contradictions ki taraf le jati hai, na sirf system mein, balki human reason mein khud.