

The **kantlipsum** package

Dummy text in Kantian style*

Enrico Gregorio[†]

Released 2011/12/23

The **kantlipsum** package is modeled after **lipsum** and offers pretty similar functionality, but instead of pseudolatin utterances, it typesets paragraphs of nonsense in Kantian style produced by the *Kant generator for Python* by Mark Pilgrim, found in *Dive into Python*.

It has at least one advantage over **lipsum**: the text is in English and so finding good hyphenation points should be less problematic. On the contrary, the paragraphs are rather long, as it's common in philosophical prose.

1 Options

The package has three document options, the first two of which are alternative to each other:

par | nopar With the default **par** all pieces of text will be ended by a `\par` command; specifying **par** is optional; the option **nopar** will not add this `\par` at the end of each fragment of Kantian prose.

numbers Each piece of Kantian prose will be preceded by its number (such as in “1 • As any dedicated reader can clearly see...”), which can be useful for better control of what is produced.

2 Commands

The commands provided by the package are:

\kant This command takes an optional argument which can be of the form `[42]` (that is, only one integer) or `[3-14]` (that is, two integers separated by a hyphen); as in **lipsum**, `\kant[42]`, `\kant[3-14]` and `\kant` will produce the 42nd pseudokantian paragraph, the paragraphs from the 3rd to the 14th, and those from the 1st to the 7th, respectively.

\kant* The same as before, see later for the difference.

\kantdef This command takes two arguments, a control sequence and an integer; the call `\kantdef{\mytext}{164}` will store in `\mytext` the 164th paragraph of pseudokantian text provided by this package.

*This file describes version 0.5, last revised 2011/12/23.

[†]E-mail: Enrico DOT Gregorio AT univr DOT it

What’s the difference between `\kant` and `\kant*`? The normal version will respect the given package option; that is, if `par` is in force, `\kant[1-2]` will produce *two* paragraphs, while `\kant*[1-2]` will only produce a big chunk of text without issuing any `\par` command. The logic is reversed if the `nopar` option has been given.

By the way, 164 is the number of available pieces; if one exceeds the limit, nothing will be printed. Thus `\kant[164-200]` will print only *one* paragraph. However, printing all paragraphs with the standard ten point size Computer Modern font and the `article` class fills more than fifty pages, so it seems that the supply of text can be sufficient.

Note

This package is just an exercise for practicing with L^AT_EX3 syntax. It uses the “experimental” packages made available by the L^AT_EX3 team. Many thanks to Joseph Wright and Bruno Le Floch for suggesting improvements.

Changes from version 0.1

There’s no user level change; the implementation has been modified in some places (in particular a sequence is used to store the phrases, rather than many token lists).

3 kantlipsum implementation

```

1 \ProvidesExplPackage
2   {\ExplFileName}{\ExplFileDate}{\ExplFileVersion}{\ExplFileDescription}

   A check to make sure that expl3 is not too old
3 \@@ifpackagelater { expl3 } { 2011/10/09 }
4   { }
5   {
6     \PackageError { kantlipsum } { Support-package-l3kernel-too-old. }
7     {
8       Please-install-an-up-to-date-version-of-l3kernel~
9       using-your-TeX-package-manager-or-from-CTAN.\ \ \
10      Loading~xparse-will-abort!
11    }
12    \tex_endinput:D
13  }

```

3.1 Package options and required packages

We declare the allowed options and choose by default `par`. We also need to declare a function `\kgl_number:n` that is set by the `numbers` option; its default action is to gobble its argument.

```

14 \DeclareOption { par }
15   {
16     \cs_set:Nn \kgl_star: { \c_space_tl }
17     \cs_set:Nn \kgl_nostar: { \par }
18   }
19 \DeclareOption{ nopar }
20   {
21     \cs_set:Nn \kgl_star: { \par }
22     \cs_set:Nn \kgl_nostar: { \c_space_tl }
23   }

```

```

24 \DeclareOption{ numbers }
25 { \cs_set:Nn \kgl_number:n { #1\nobreakspace\textbullet\nobreakspace } }
26 \cs_new_eq:NN \kgl_number:n \use_none:n
27 \ExecuteOptions{par}
28 \ProcessOptions \scan_stop:
    The xparse package is required.
29 \RequirePackage{xparse}

```

3.2 Messages

We define two messages.

```

30 \msg_new:nnn {kantlipsum}{how-many}
31 {The~package~provides~paragraphs~1~to~#1.~
32  Values~outside~this~range~will~be~ignored.}
33 \msg_new:nnnn {kantlipsum}{already-defined}
34 {Control~sequence~#1~already~defined.}
35 {The~control~sequence~#1~is~already~defined,~
36  I'll~ignore~it}

```

3.3 Variables and constants

The `\l_kgl_start_int` variable will contain the starting number for processing, while `\l_kgl_end_int` the ending number. The `\g_kgl_pars_seq` sequence will contain the pseudokantian sentences. Since we'll start counting them from one, we add a bogus zeroth element.

```

37 \int_new:N \l_kgl_start_int
38 \int_new:N \l_kgl_end_int
39 \seq_new:N \g_kgl_pars_seq
40 \seq_gput_right:Nx \g_kgl_pars_seq {This~is~the~Kant~lipsum~generator.}

```

3.4 User level commands

There are two user level commands, `\kant` (with a *-variant) and `\kantdef`.

`\kant`

The (optional) argument is described as before. We use the `\SplitArgument` feature provided by `xparse` to decide whether the ‘range form’ has been specified. In the `\kant*` form we reverse the logic.

```

41 \NewDocumentCommand{\kant}{s>{\SplitArgument{1}{-}}0{1-7}}
42 {
43   \group_begin:
44   \IfBooleanTF{#1}
45     { \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_par: \kgl_star: }
46     { \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_par: \kgl_nostar: }
47   \kgl_process:nn #2
48   \kgl_print:
49   \group_end:
50 }

```

\kantdef

Sometimes one needs just a piece of text without implicit `\par` attached, so we provide `\kantdef`. In a group we neutralize the meaning of `\kgl_number:n` and `\kgl_par:` and define the control sequence given as first argument to the pseudokantian sentence being the k th element of the sequence containing them, where k is the number given as second argument. If the control sequence is already defined we issue an error and don't perform the definition.

```
51 \NewDocumentCommand{\kantdef}{mm}
52 {
53   \group_begin:
54   \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_number:n \use_none:n
55   \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_par: \prg_do_nothing:
56   \cs_if_exist:NTF #1
57   {
58     \msg_error:nxx {kantlipsum}{already-defined}
59     {\token_to_str:N #1}
60   }
61   { \cs_new:Npx #1 { \kgl_use:n {#2} } }
62   \group_end:
63 }
```

3.5 Internal functions

\kgl_process:nn

The function `\kgl_process:nn` sets the temporary variables `\l_kgl_start_int` and `\l_kgl_end_int`. If the optional argument to `\kant` is missing they are already set to 1 and 7 respectively; otherwise the argument has been split into its components; if the argument was $[m]$ we set both variables to m , otherwise it was in the form $[m-n]$ and we do the obvious action.

```
64 \cs_new:Nn \kgl_process:nn
65 {
66   \int_set:Nn \l_kgl_start_int {#1}
67   \IfNoValueTF{#2}
68   { \int_set:Nn \l_kgl_end_int {#1} }
69   { \int_set:Nn \l_kgl_end_int {#2} }
70 }
```

`\kgl_print`
`\kgl_use:n`

The printing routine is in the function `\kgl_print::`; we start a loop printing item number x in the sequence `\g_kgl_pars_seq` for all numbers x in the specified range. The function `\kgl_use:n` function is a wrapper to be used with `\prg_stepwise_function:nnnN` that's also useful in the defining command `\kantdef`: it's passed a number as argument, builds the constant name corresponding to it and produces the text.

```

71 \cs_new:Nn \kgl_print:
72 {
73   \prg_stepwise_function:nnnN
74     {\l_kgl_start_int} {1} {\l_kgl_end_int} \kgl_use:n
75 }
76 \cs_new:Nn \kgl_use:n
77 {
78   \kgl_number:n {#1}
79   \seq_item:Nn \g_kgl_pars_seq {#1}
80 }
```

`\kgl_newpara:n`

The `\kgl_newpara:n` appends a new item to the sequence `\g_kgl_pars_seq` consisting of, say, *(text of the 42nd sentence)* `\kgl_par:`

```

81 \cs_new:Nn \kgl_newpara:n
82 { \seq_gput_right:Nn \g_kgl_pars_seq {#1\kgl_par:} }
```

3.6 Defining the sentences

We start a group where we set `\l_tmpa_int` to 0 and the category code of the space to 10 so as not to be forced to write `~` for spaces.

```

83 \group_begin:
84 \char_set_catcode_space:n {'\ }
```

Then we provide all of the sentences with the pattern `\kgl_newpara:n {(text)}`

```

85 \kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Ideal of
86 practical reason is a representation of, as far as I know, the things
87 in themselves; as I have shown elsewhere, the phenomena should only be
88 used as a canon for our understanding. The paralogisms of practical
89 reason are what first give rise to the architectonic of practical
90 reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, reason would
91 thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the
92 Ideal of practical reason, yet the manifold depends on the phenomena.
93 Necessity depends on, when thus treated as the practical employment of
94 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, time.
95 Human reason depends on our sense perceptions, by means of analytic
96 unity. There can be no doubt that the objects in space and time are
97 what first give rise to human reason.}
98
99 \kgl_newpara:n {Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do
100 with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a
101 posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of
102 apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason,
103 by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
104 it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the
105 validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is
106 that, our understanding depends on the Categories. It remains a
```

107 mystery why the Ideal stands in need of reason. It must not be
 108 supposed that our faculties have lying before them, in the case of the
 109 Ideal, the Antinomies; so, the transcendental aesthetic is just as
 110 necessary as our experience. By means of the Ideal, our sense
 111 perceptions are by their very nature contradictory.}

112
 113 \kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things
 114 in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a
 115 representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the
 116 paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have
 117 lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because
 118 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would
 119 thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the
 120 Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions.
 121 (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated
 122 science, because, like time, it depends on analytic principles.) So,
 123 it must not be supposed that our experience depends on, so, our sense
 124 perceptions, by means of analysis. Space constitutes the whole content
 125 for our sense perceptions, and time occupies part of the sphere of the
 126 Ideal concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in
 127 general.}

128
 129 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, what we have alone been able
 130 to show is that the objects in space and time would be falsified; what
 131 we have alone been able to show is that, our judgements are what first
 132 give rise to metaphysics. As I have shown elsewhere, Aristotle tells
 133 us that the objects in space and time, in the full sense of these
 134 terms, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, indeed, our
 135 problematic judgements, indeed, can be treated like our concepts. As
 136 any dedicated reader can clearly see, our knowledge can be treated
 137 like the transcendental unity of apperception, but the phenomena
 138 occupy part of the sphere of the manifold concerning the existence of
 139 natural causes in general. Whence comes the architectonic of natural
 140 reason, the solution of which involves the relation between necessity
 141 and the Categories? Natural causes (and it is not at all certain that
 142 this is the case) constitute the whole content for the paralogisms.
 143 This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental
 144 philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the
 145 fact may suffice.}

146
 147 \kgl_newpara:n {Therefore, we can deduce that the objects in space and
 148 time (and I assert, however, that this is the case) have lying before
 149 them the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance
 150 of the conditions, it must not be supposed that, then, formal logic
 151 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true) is a
 152 representation of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 153 conditions, but the discipline of pure reason, in so far as this
 154 expounds the contradictory rules of metaphysics, depends on the
 155 Antinomies. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, therefore, can
 156 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
 157 like the transcendental unity of apperception, they constitute the
 158 whole content for a priori principles; for these reasons, our
 159 experience is just as necessary as, in accordance with the principles
 160 of our a priori knowledge, philosophy. The objects in space and time

161 abstract from all content of knowledge. Has it ever been suggested
162 that it remains a mystery why there is no relation between the
163 Antinomies and the phenomena? It must not be supposed that the
164 Antinomies (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are
165 the clue to the discovery of philosophy, because of our necessary
166 ignorance of the conditions. As I have shown elsewhere, to avoid all
167 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our understanding
168 (and it must not be supposed that this is true) is what first gives
169 rise to the architectonic of pure reason, as is evident upon close
170 examination.}

171
172 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are what first give rise to
173 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural
174 reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception
175 abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these
176 considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key
177 to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all
178 empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our
179 disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure
180 logic, in the case of the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from
181 all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in
182 accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms,
183 time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be
184 treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be
185 supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise
186 to the employment of pure reason.}

187
188 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all
189 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the
190 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a
191 representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in
192 themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It
193 remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series
194 of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of
195 the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never
196 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
197 architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic
198 principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time
199 is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would
200 thereby be made to contradict the Ideal of practical reason. On the
201 other hand, natural causes can not take account of, consequently, the
202 Antinomies, as will easily be shown in the next section.
203 Consequently, the Ideal of practical reason (and I assert that this is
204 true) excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our
205 experience would thereby be made to contradict, for example, our
206 ideas, but the transcendental objects in space and time (and let us
207 suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of
208 necessity. But the proof of this is a task from which we can here be
209 absolved.}

210
211 \kgl_newpara:n {Thus, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of, on
212 the other hand, natural causes, as will easily be shown in the next
213 section. Still, the reader should be careful to observe that the
214 phenomena have lying before them the intelligible objects in space and

time, because of the relation between the manifold and the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, Aristotle tells us that, in reference to ends, our judgements (and the reader should be careful to observe that this is the case) constitute the whole content of the empirical objects in space and time. Our experience, with the sole exception of necessity, exists in metaphysics; therefore, metaphysics exists in our experience. (It must not be supposed that the thing in itself (and I assert that this is true) may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the transcendental unity of apperception; certainly, our judgements exist in natural causes.) The reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the Ideal, on the other hand, can be treated like the noumena, but natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the Antinomies. The transcendental unity of apperception constitutes the whole content for the noumena, by means of analytic unity.}

\kgl_newpara:n {In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.}

\kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, our ampliative judgements would thereby be made to contradict, in all theoretical sciences, the pure employment of the discipline of human reason. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the transcendental aesthetic constitutes the whole content for, still, the Ideal. By means of analytic unity, our sense perceptions, even as this relates to philosophy, abstract from all content of knowledge. With the sole exception of necessity, the reader should be careful to observe that our sense perceptions exclude the possibility of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori. Let us suppose that the Ideal occupies part of the sphere of our knowledge concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.}

\kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, what we have alone been able to show is that, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of our a posteriori concepts, the architectonic of natural reason can be treated like the architectonic of practical reason. Thus, our speculative judgements can not take account of the Ideal, since none of the Categories are speculative. With the sole exception of the Ideal, it is not at all certain that the transcendental objects in space and time prove the validity of, for example, the noumena, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As we have already seen, our experience is the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies; in the study of pure logic, our knowledge is just as necessary as, thus, space. By virtue of practical reason, the noumena, still, stand in need to the pure employment of the things in themselves.}

269 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that the
 270 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, certainly,
 271 our a priori knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Our faculties
 272 abstract from all content of knowledge; for these reasons, the
 273 discipline of human reason stands in need of the transcendental
 274 aesthetic. There can be no doubt that, insomuch as the Ideal relies
 275 on our a posteriori concepts, philosophy, when thus treated as the
 276 things in themselves, exists in our hypothetical judgements, yet our a
 277 posteriori concepts are what first give rise to the phenomena.
 278 Philosophy (and I assert that this is true) excludes the possibility
 279 of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, as
 280 will easily be shown in the next section. Still, is it true that the
 281 transcendental aesthetic can not take account of the objects in space
 282 and time, or is the real question whether the phenomena should only be
 283 used as a canon for the never-ending regress in the series of
 284 empirical conditions? By means of analytic unity, the Transcendental
 285 Deduction, still, is the mere result of the power of the
 286 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
 287 soul, but our faculties abstract from all content of a posteriori
 288 knowledge. It remains a mystery why, then, the discipline of human
 289 reason, in other words, is what first gives rise to the transcendental
 290 aesthetic, yet our faculties have lying before them the architectonic
 291 of human reason.}

292
 293 \kgl_newpara:n {However, we can deduce that our experience (and it
 294 must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our
 295 experience, as we have already seen. On the other hand, it is not at
 296 all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the
 297 practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the
 298 noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first
 299 give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is
 300 necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a
 301 true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural
 302 reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the
 303 writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in
 304 respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space
 305 and time.}

306
 307 \kgl_newpara:n {Our ideas, in the case of the Ideal of pure reason,
 308 are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time
 309 can not take account of our understanding, and philosophy excludes the
 310 possibility of, certainly, space. I assert that our ideas, by means
 311 of philosophy, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of
 312 this body must be known a posteriori, by means of analysis. It must
 313 not be supposed that space is by its very nature contradictory. Space
 314 would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of the manifold, the
 315 manifold. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us
 316 that, in accordance with the principles of the discipline of human
 317 reason, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
 318 has lying before it our experience. This could not be passed over in
 319 a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely
 320 critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.}

321
 322 \kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of our faculties is a posteriori, pure

logic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, indeed, the architectonic of human reason. As we have already seen, we can deduce that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to, indeed, natural causes, yet the thing in itself can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, it is the clue to the discovery of disjunctive principles. On the other hand, the manifold depends on the paralogisms. Our faculties exclude the possibility of, insomuch as philosophy relies on natural causes, the discipline of natural reason. In all theoretical sciences, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of our judgements, as will easily be shown in the next section. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Time (and let us suppose that this is true) is the clue to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen. Since knowledge of our faculties is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the empirical objects in space and time can not take account of, in the case of the Ideal of natural reason, the manifold. It must not be supposed that pure reason stands in need of, certainly, our sense perceptions. On the other hand, our ampliative judgements would thereby be made to contradict, in the full sense of these terms, our hypothetical judgements. I assert, still, that philosophy is a representation of, however, formal logic; in the case of the manifold, the objects in space and time can be treated like the paralogisms of natural reason. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.}

\kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of our a priori knowledge, our faculties have nothing to do with our faculties. Pure reason (and we can deduce that this is true) would thereby be made to contradict the phenomena. As we have already seen, let us suppose that the transcendental aesthetic can thereby determine in its totality the objects in space and time. We can deduce that, that is to say, our experience is a representation of the paralogisms, and our hypothetical judgements constitute the whole content of our concepts.}

377 However, it is obvious that time can be treated like our a priori
378 knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Philosophy has nothing to do
379 with natural causes.}

380

381 \kgl_newpara:n {By means of analysis, our faculties stand in need to,
382 indeed, the empirical objects in space and time. The objects in space
383 and time, for these reasons, have nothing to do with our
384 understanding. There can be no doubt that the noumena can not take
385 account of the objects in space and time; consequently, the Ideal of
386 natural reason has lying before it the noumena. By means of analysis,
387 the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to, therefore,
388 space, yet our sense perceptions exist in the discipline of practical
389 reason.}

390

391 \kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal can not take account of, so far as I know,
392 our faculties. As we have already seen, the objects in space and time
393 are what first give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of
394 empirical conditions; for these reasons, our a posteriori concepts
395 have nothing to do with the paralogisms of pure reason. As we have
396 already seen, metaphysics, by means of the Ideal, occupies part of the
397 sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the objects in
398 space and time in general, yet time excludes the possibility of our
399 sense perceptions. I assert, thus, that our faculties would thereby
400 be made to contradict, indeed, our knowledge. Natural causes, so
401 regarded, exist in our judgements.}

402

403 \kgl_newpara:n {The never-ending regress in the series of empirical
404 conditions may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it
405 may be in contradictions with, then, applied logic. The employment of
406 the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our
407 understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It
408 must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case
409 of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is
410 a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
411 posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes
412 the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be
413 shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe
414 that the things in themselves, in view of these considerations, can be
415 treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical
416 sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense
417 perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the
418 sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental
419 objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological
420 manuals.}

421

422 \kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, in the case
423 of philosophy, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must
424 be known a posteriori. Thus, the objects in space and time, inasmuch
425 as the discipline of practical reason relies on the Antinomies,
426 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must
427 be known a priori. Applied logic is a representation of, in natural
428 theology, our experience. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
429 Hume tells us that, that is to say, the Categories (and Aristotle
430 tells us that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the

transcendental aesthetic. (Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms prove the validity of time.) As is shown in the writings of Hume, it must not be supposed that, in reference to ends, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori. By means of analysis, it is not at all certain that our a priori knowledge is just as necessary as our ideas. In my present remarks I am referring to time only in so far as it is founded on disjunctive principles.}

\kgl_newpara:n {The discipline of pure reason is what first gives rise to the Categories, but applied logic is the clue to the discovery of our sense perceptions. The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the pure employment of the paralogisms of natural reason. Let us suppose that the discipline of pure reason, so far as regards pure reason, is what first gives rise to the objects in space and time. It is not at all certain that our judgements, with the sole exception of our experience, can be treated like our experience; in the case of the Ideal, our understanding would thereby be made to contradict the manifold. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that pure reason (and it is obvious that this is true) stands in need of the phenomena; for these reasons, our sense perceptions stand in need to the manifold. Our ideas are what first give rise to the paralogisms.}

\kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves have lying before them the Antinomies, by virtue of human reason. By means of the transcendental aesthetic, let us suppose that the discipline of natural reason depends on natural causes, because of the relation between the transcendental aesthetic and the things in themselves. In view of these considerations, it is obvious that natural causes are the clue to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception, by means of analysis. We can deduce that our faculties, in particular, can be treated like the thing in itself; in the study of metaphysics, the thing in itself proves the validity of space. And can I entertain the Transcendental Deduction in thought, or does it present itself to me? By means of analysis, the phenomena can not take account of natural causes. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the things in themselves are a posteriori, there can be no doubt that, when thus treated as our understanding, pure reason depends on, still, the Ideal of natural reason, and our speculative judgements constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, it is not at all certain that, in accordance with the principles of natural causes, the Transcendental Deduction is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a posteriori, yet our concepts are the clue to the discovery of the objects in space and time. Therefore, it is obvious that formal logic would be falsified. By means of analytic unity, it remains a mystery why, in particular, metaphysics teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal. The phenomena, on the other hand, would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As is

485 shown in the writings of Aristotle, philosophy is a representation of,
 486 on the contrary, the employment of the Categories. Because of the
 487 relation between the transcendental unity of apperception and the
 488 paralogisms of natural reason, the paralogisms of human reason, in the
 489 study of the Transcendental Deduction, would be falsified, but
 490 metaphysics abstracts from all content of knowledge.}

491
 492 \kgl_newpara:n {Since some of natural causes are disjunctive, the
 493 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is the key
 494 to understanding, in particular, the noumena. By means of analysis,
 495 the Categories (and it is not at all certain that this is the case)
 496 exclude the possibility of our faculties. Let us suppose that the
 497 objects in space and time, irrespective of all empirical conditions,
 498 exist in the architectonic of natural reason, because of the relation
 499 between the architectonic of natural reason and our a posteriori
 500 concepts. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that, so regarded, our
 501 sense perceptions (and let us suppose that this is the case) are a
 502 representation of the practical employment of natural causes. (I
 503 assert that time constitutes the whole content for, in all theoretical
 504 sciences, our understanding, as will easily be shown in the next
 505 section.) With the sole exception of our knowledge, the reader should
 506 be careful to observe that natural causes (and it remains a mystery
 507 why this is the case) can not take account of our sense perceptions,
 508 as will easily be shown in the next section. Certainly, natural
 509 causes would thereby be made to contradict, with the sole exception of
 510 necessity, the things in themselves, because of our necessary
 511 ignorance of the conditions. But to this matter no answer is
 512 possible.}

513
 514 \kgl_newpara:n {Since all of the objects in space and time are
 515 synthetic, it remains a mystery why, even as this relates to our
 516 experience, our a priori concepts should only be used as a canon for
 517 our judgements, but the phenomena should only be used as a canon for
 518 the practical employment of our judgements. Space, consequently, is a
 519 body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a priori, as
 520 will easily be shown in the next section. We can deduce that the
 521 Categories have lying before them the phenomena. Therefore, let us
 522 suppose that our ideas, in the study of the transcendental unity of
 523 apperception, should only be used as a canon for the pure employment
 524 of natural causes. Still, the reader should be careful to observe
 525 that the Ideal (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can not
 526 take account of our faculties, as is proven in the ontological
 527 manuals. Certainly, it remains a mystery why the manifold is just as
 528 necessary as the manifold, as is evident upon close examination.}

529
 530 \kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, what we have alone been able to
 531 show is that the architectonic of practical reason is the clue to the
 532 discovery of, still, the manifold, by means of analysis. Since
 533 knowledge of the objects in space and time is a priori, the things in
 534 themselves have lying before them, for example, the paralogisms of
 535 human reason. Let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute
 536 the whole content of, by means of philosophy, necessity. Our concepts
 537 (and the reader should be careful to observe that this is the case)
 538 are just as necessary as the Ideal. To avoid all misapprehension, it

is necessary to explain that the Categories occupy part of the sphere of the discipline of human reason concerning the existence of our faculties in general. The transcendental aesthetic, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of our a priori concepts, is the mere result of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. The manifold, in respect of the intelligible character, teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the thing in itself; however, the objects in space and time exist in natural causes.}

\kgl_newpara:n {I assert, however, that our a posteriori concepts (and it is obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict the discipline of practical reason; however, the things in themselves, however, constitute the whole content of philosophy. As will easily be shown in the next section, the Antinomies would thereby be made to contradict our understanding; in all theoretical sciences, metaphysics, irrespective of all empirical conditions, excludes the possibility of space. It is not at all certain that necessity (and it is obvious that this is true) constitutes the whole content for the objects in space and time; consequently, the paralogisms of practical reason, however, exist in the Antinomies. The reader should be careful to observe that transcendental logic, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of formal logic, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles. (Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the thing in itself is what first gives rise to, inasmuch as the transcendental aesthetic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental objects in space and time; thus, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions excludes the possibility of philosophy.) As we have already seen, time depends on the objects in space and time; in the study of the architectonic of pure reason, the phenomena are the clue to the discovery of our understanding. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, I assert that, indeed, the architectonic of natural reason, as I have elsewhere shown, would be falsified.}

\kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, the transcendental unity of apperception has nothing to do with the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our sense perceptions are by their very nature contradictory, but our ideas, with the sole exception of human reason, have nothing to do with our sense perceptions. Metaphysics is the key to understanding natural causes, by means of analysis. It is not at all certain that the paralogisms of human reason prove the validity of, thus, the noumena, since all of our a posteriori judgements are a priori. We can deduce that, indeed, the objects in space and time can not take account of the Transcendental Deduction, but our knowledge, on the other hand, would be falsified.}

\kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, our understanding is the clue to the discovery of necessity. On the other hand, the Ideal of pure reason is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a posteriori, as is evident upon close examination. It is obvious that the transcendental aesthetic, certainly, is a body of

593 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori; in view
594 of these considerations, the noumena are the clue to the discovery of,
595 so far as I know, natural causes. In the case of space, our
596 experience depends on the Ideal of natural reason, as we have already
597 seen.}

598

599 \kgl_newpara:n {For these reasons, space is the key to understanding
600 the thing in itself. Our sense perceptions abstract from all content
601 of a priori knowledge, but the phenomena can never, as a whole,
602 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they are
603 just as necessary as disjunctive principles. Our problematic
604 judgements constitute the whole content of time. By means of
605 analysis, our ideas are by their very nature contradictory, and our a
606 posteriori concepts are a representation of natural causes. I assert
607 that the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
608 contradict, so far as regards the thing in itself, the Transcendental
609 Deduction; in natural theology, the noumena are the clue to the
610 discovery of, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction.}

611

612 \kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
613 explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the
614 transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet
615 the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental
616 Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would
617 thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our
618 ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the
619 validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings
620 of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that,
621 insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories,
622 the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to
623 contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
624 conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our
625 faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the
626 writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands
627 in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.}

628

629 \kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the
630 case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural
631 theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
632 content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural
633 theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the
634 Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this
635 relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts
636 would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in
637 the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory.
638 Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a
639 representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words,
640 has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us
641 that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the
642 Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.}

643

644 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves can not take account of the
645 Transcendental Deduction. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious
646 that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical

647 sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the
 648 transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these
 649 terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense
 650 perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some
 651 of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the
 652 possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in
 653 themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles
 654 of philosophy, our sense perceptions.}

655
 656 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, philosophy is
 657 the mere result of the power of pure logic, a blind but indispensable
 658 function of the soul; however, the phenomena can never, as a whole,
 659 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like general logic,
 660 they exclude the possibility of problematic principles. To avoid all
 661 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the never-ending
 662 regress in the series of empirical conditions is by its very nature
 663 contradictory. It must not be supposed that our a priori concepts
 664 stand in need to natural causes, because of the relation between the
 665 Ideal and our ideas. (We can deduce that the Antinomies would be
 666 falsified.) Since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori, what
 667 we have alone been able to show is that, in the full sense of these
 668 terms, necessity (and we can deduce that this is true) is the key to
 669 understanding time, but the Ideal of natural reason is just as
 670 necessary as our experience. As will easily be shown in the next
 671 section, the thing in itself, with the sole exception of the manifold,
 672 abstracts from all content of a posteriori knowledge. The question of
 673 this matter's relation to objects is not in any way under discussion.}

674
 675 \kgl_newpara:n {By means of the transcendental aesthetic, it remains a
 676 mystery why the phenomena (and it is not at all certain that this is
 677 the case) are the clue to the discovery of the never-ending regress in
 678 the series of empirical conditions. In all theoretical sciences,
 679 metaphysics exists in the objects in space and time, because of the
 680 relation between formal logic and our synthetic judgements. The
 681 Categories would thereby be made to contradict the paralogisms, as any
 682 dedicated reader can clearly see. Therefore, there can be no doubt
 683 that the paralogisms have nothing to do with, so far as regards the
 684 Ideal and our faculties, the paralogisms, because of our necessary
 685 ignorance of the conditions. It must not be supposed that the objects
 686 in space and time occupy part of the sphere of necessity concerning
 687 the existence of the noumena in general. In natural theology, the
 688 things in themselves, therefore, are by their very nature
 689 contradictory, by virtue of natural reason. This is the sense in
 690 which it is to be understood in this work.}

691
 692 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose
 693 that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts
 694 are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to
 695 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in
 696 particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of
 697 natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful
 698 to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in
 699 space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our
 700 understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the

701 thing in itself abstracts from all content of a posteriori knowledge.
 702 We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can
 703 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal
 704 of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality
 705 speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as
 706 necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the
 707 Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove
 708 the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to
 709 understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

710
 711 \kgl_newpara:n {Natural causes, when thus treated as the things in
 712 themselves, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge, by
 713 means of analytic unity. Our a posteriori knowledge, in other words,
 714 is the key to understanding the Antinomies. As we have already seen,
 715 what we have alone been able to show is that, so far as I know, the
 716 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the
 717 manifold. The things in themselves are the clue to the discovery of,
 718 in the case of the Ideal of natural reason, our concepts. To avoid
 719 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, so far as
 720 regards philosophy, the discipline of human reason, for these reasons,
 721 is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
 722 priori, but our faculties, consequently, would thereby be made to
 723 contradict the Antinomies. It remains a mystery why our understanding
 724 excludes the possibility of, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the
 725 objects in space and time, our concepts. It is not at all certain
 726 that the pure employment of the objects in space and time (and the
 727 reader should be careful to observe that this is true) is the clue to
 728 the discovery of the architectonic of pure reason. Let us suppose
 729 that natural reason is a representation of, insomuch as space relies
 730 on the paralogisms, the Transcendental Deduction, by means of
 731 analysis.}

732
 733 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, the Ideal constitutes the
 734 whole content for the transcendental unity of apperception. By means
 735 of analytic unity, let us suppose that, when thus treated as space,
 736 our synthetic judgements, therefore, would be falsified, and the
 737 objects in space and time are what first give rise to our sense
 738 perceptions. Let us suppose that, in the full sense of these terms,
 739 the discipline of practical reason can not take account of our
 740 experience, and our ideas have lying before them our inductive
 741 judgements. (Since all of the phenomena are speculative, to avoid all
 742 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena
 743 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must
 744 be known a posteriori; as I have elsewhere shown, the noumena are a
 745 representation of the noumena.) Let us suppose that practical reason
 746 can thereby determine in its totality, by means of the Ideal, the pure
 747 employment of the discipline of practical reason. Galileo tells us
 748 that the employment of the phenomena can be treated like our ideas;
 749 still, the Categories, when thus treated as the paralogisms, exist in
 750 the employment of the Antinomies. Let us apply this to our
 751 experience.}

752
 753 \kgl_newpara:n {I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason
 754 can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the

755 Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our
 756 ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader
 757 can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account
 758 of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and the
 759 noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should
 760 only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in
 761 natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown
 762 in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these
 763 reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is
 764 that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories,
 765 are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a
 766 blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the
 767 ontological manuals.}

768
 769 \kgl_newpara:n {The noumena have nothing to do with, thus, the
 770 Antinomies. What we have alone been able to show is that the things
 771 in themselves constitute the whole content of human reason, as is
 772 proven in the ontological manuals. The noumena (and to avoid all
 773 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
 774 the clue to the discovery of the architectonic of natural reason. As
 775 we have already seen, let us suppose that our experience is what first
 776 gives rise to, therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception; in
 777 the study of the practical employment of the Antinomies, our
 778 ampliative judgements are what first give rise to the objects in space
 779 and time. Necessity can never furnish a true and demonstrated
 780 science, because, like our understanding, it can thereby determine in
 781 its totality hypothetical principles, and the empirical objects in
 782 space and time are what first give rise to, in all theoretical
 783 sciences, our a posteriori concepts.}

784
 785 \kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding excludes the possibility of
 786 practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the
 787 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the
 788 employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic.
 789 With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all
 790 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of
 791 these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated
 792 science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a
 793 representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close
 794 examination. Since knowledge of the paralogisms of natural reason is
 795 a priori, I assert, consequently, that, in so far as this expounds the
 796 practical rules of the thing in itself, the things in themselves
 797 exclude the possibility of the discipline of pure reason, yet the
 798 empirical objects in space and time prove the validity of natural
 799 causes.}

800
 801 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between space and the noumena,
 802 our experience is by its very nature contradictory. It is obvious
 803 that natural causes constitute the whole content of the transcendental
 804 unity of apperception, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. By
 805 virtue of pure reason, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical
 806 sciences, have lying before them human reason. In view of these
 807 considerations, let us suppose that the transcendental objects in
 808 space and time, in the study of the architectonic of practical reason,

809 exclude the possibility of the objects in space and time, because of
 810 our necessary ignorance of the conditions. By means of philosophy, is
 811 it true that formal logic can not take account of the manifold, or is
 812 the real question whether our sense perceptions are the mere results
 813 of the power of the transcendental aesthetic, a blind but
 814 indispensable function of the soul? The objects in space and time are
 815 just as necessary as the Antinomies, because of the relation between
 816 metaphysics and the things in themselves. Human reason is a
 817 representation of the transcendental aesthetic. In my present remarks
 818 I am referring to the pure employment of our disjunctive judgements
 819 only in so far as it is founded on inductive principles.}

820
 821 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that our sense
 822 perceptions are the clue to the discovery of our understanding; in
 823 natural theology, necessity, in all theoretical sciences, occupies
 824 part of the sphere of the transcendental unity of apperception
 825 concerning the existence of our faculties in general. The
 826 transcendental aesthetic is what first gives rise to the never-ending
 827 regress in the series of empirical conditions, as any dedicated reader
 828 can clearly see. The transcendental unity of apperception is what
 829 first gives rise to, in all theoretical sciences, the Antinomies. The
 830 phenomena, consequently, stand in need to the things in themselves.
 831 By means of analytic unity, necessity, on the contrary, abstracts from
 832 all content of a priori knowledge. The phenomena (and it remains a
 833 mystery why this is the case) are just as necessary as the Ideal of
 834 human reason.}

835
 836 \kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our
 837 experience is the clue to the discovery of philosophy; in the study of
 838 space, the Categories are what first give rise to the transcendental
 839 aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the reader should
 840 be careful to observe that, so regarded, the never-ending regress in
 841 the series of empirical conditions, as I have elsewhere shown, is the
 842 mere result of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception,
 843 a blind but indispensable function of the soul, but our judgements can
 844 be treated like time. We can deduce that the objects in space and
 845 time are just as necessary as the objects in space and time.
 846 Aristotle tells us that, even as this relates to time, the objects in
 847 space and time, however, abstract from all content of a posteriori
 848 knowledge. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
 849 that the phenomena (and it is not at all certain that this is the
 850 case) stand in need to the discipline of practical reason; thus, our
 851 knowledge, indeed, can not take account of our ideas.}

852
 853 \kgl_newpara:n {In the study of time, our concepts prove the validity
 854 of, as I have elsewhere shown, our understanding, as any dedicated
 855 reader can clearly see. As will easily be shown in the next section,
 856 the reader should be careful to observe that, so far as regards our
 857 knowledge, natural causes, so far as regards the never-ending regress
 858 in the series of empirical conditions and our a priori judgements,
 859 should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the
 860 Transcendental Deduction, and our understanding can not take account
 861 of formal logic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, to avoid
 862 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the Antinomies

are just as necessary as, on the other hand, our ideas; however, the Ideal, in the full sense of these terms, exists in the architectonic of human reason. As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in other words, our faculties have nothing to do with the manifold, but our faculties should only be used as a canon for space. Our faculties prove the validity of the Antinomies, and the things in themselves (and let us suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of our ideas. It remains a mystery why, then, the architectonic of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.}

\kgl_newpara:n {The paralogisms of practical reason can be treated like the paralogisms. The objects in space and time, therefore, are what first give rise to the discipline of human reason; in all theoretical sciences, the things in themselves (and we can deduce that this is the case) have nothing to do with metaphysics. Therefore, Aristotle tells us that our understanding exists in the Ideal of human reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Thus, our sense perceptions (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict space. I assert, on the other hand, that, in reference to ends, the objects in space and time can not take account of the Categories, yet natural causes are the mere results of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. By virtue of practical reason, it must not be supposed that, that is to say, our faculties would thereby be made to contradict philosophy, yet our a posteriori concepts, inasmuch as the Ideal of pure reason relies on the intelligible objects in space and time, are by their very nature contradictory.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Time, on the contrary, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it constitutes the whole content for ampliative principles, yet natural reason, even as this relates to philosophy, proves the validity of the thing in itself. As is evident upon close examination, the Ideal of practical reason, when thus treated as the things in themselves, is by its very nature contradictory; as I have elsewhere shown, our understanding may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Ideal of practical reason. Since all of the things in themselves are problematic, it remains a mystery why, so regarded, our knowledge is the key to understanding our problematic judgements, but our ideas (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) have lying before them our disjunctive judgements. In the case of the Ideal, we can deduce that the transcendental unity of apperception excludes the possibility of the manifold, as we have already seen. Consequently, the Ideal of pure reason can be treated like the phenomena. Let us apply this to the Transcendental Deduction.}

\kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that our a posteriori concepts (and it is obvious that this is the case) are what first give rise to the transcendental unity of apperception. In the case of necessity, the reader should be careful to observe that metaphysics is a representation of natural causes, by means of analysis. In all theoretical sciences, the phenomena (and the reader

917 should be careful to observe that this is the case) would thereby be
918 made to contradict natural reason. The transcendental aesthetic, in
919 the case of space, is by its very nature contradictory. By virtue of
920 human reason, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
921 that the empirical objects in space and time exist in our judgements;
922 for these reasons, the Antinomies, by means of our experience, can be
923 treated like the architectonic of human reason. It must not be
924 supposed that our ideas have lying before them metaphysics;
925 consequently, the architectonic of pure reason, in all theoretical
926 sciences, would be falsified.}

927
928 \kgl_newpara:n {The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the
929 Ideal of pure reason, and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their
930 very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying
931 before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception,
932 indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic
933 of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon
934 close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume
935 tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated
936 as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of
937 knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand
938 in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity,
939 natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics,
940 and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a
941 priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.}

942
943 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
944 what we have alone been able to show is that formal logic can not take
945 account of the Categories; in the study of the transcendental
946 aesthetic, philosophy can thereby determine in its totality the
947 noumena. In all theoretical sciences, I assert that necessity has
948 nothing to do with our sense perceptions. Because of the relation
949 between our understanding and the phenomena, the Categories are what
950 first give rise to, so far as regards time and the phenomena, the
951 transcendental aesthetic; in view of these considerations, the
952 phenomena can not take account of the Antinomies. As is proven in the
953 ontological manuals, the objects in space and time (and to avoid all
954 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
955 what first give rise to the Ideal. In natural theology, let us
956 suppose that the Transcendental Deduction is the key to understanding,
957 so far as regards the thing in itself, the Ideal, as any dedicated
958 reader can clearly see. This is the sense in which it is to be
959 understood in this work.}

960
961 \kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, in respect of the
962 intelligible character, the Antinomies (and we can deduce that this is
963 the case) constitute the whole content of the phenomena, yet the
964 Categories exist in natural causes. The Ideal of natural reason, when
965 thus treated as metaphysics, can be treated like our faculties;
966 consequently, pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is
967 true) is what first gives rise to our sense perceptions. The
968 paralogisms of practical reason exist in the objects in space and
969 time. As we have already seen, our sense perceptions stand in need to
970 space. Still, our a priori concepts, in the case of metaphysics, have

971 nothing to do with the Categories. Because of the relation between
972 the discipline of practical reason and our a posteriori concepts, we
973 can deduce that, when thus treated as the phenomena, our sense
974 perceptions (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) are what
975 first give rise to the discipline of practical reason.}

976

977 \kgl_newpara:n {Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the
978 noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our
979 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense
980 perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural
981 reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery
982 why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus
983 treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
984 demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as
985 necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be
986 falsified. The noumena, in all theoretical sciences, can not take
987 account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since
988 knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all
989 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms
990 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must
991 be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can
992 not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of
993 apperception.}

994

995 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that, for
996 example, pure logic depends on the transcendental unity of
997 apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our a priori
998 concepts are what first give rise to the Categories. Hume tells us
999 that our ideas are just as necessary as, on the other hand, natural
1000 causes; however, natural causes should only be used as a canon for our
1001 faculties. For these reasons, to avoid all misapprehension, it is
1002 necessary to explain that our ideas are the clue to the discovery of
1003 our understanding, as is shown in the writings of Hume. (By virtue of
1004 natural reason, the employment of our disjunctive judgements, then, is
1005 by its very nature contradictory.) By virtue of natural reason, the
1006 Categories can not take account of our hypothetical judgements. The
1007 transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
1008 content of, consequently, the transcendental unity of apperception, as
1009 will easily be shown in the next section. We thus have a pure
1010 synthesis of apprehension.}

1011

1012 \kgl_newpara:n {The Antinomies have nothing to do with our faculties.
1013 As is shown in the writings of Hume, we can deduce that, on the
1014 contrary, the empirical objects in space and time prove the validity
1015 of our ideas. The manifold may not contradict itself, but it is still
1016 possible that it may be in contradictions with our a posteriori
1017 concepts. For these reasons, the transcendental objects in space and
1018 time (and it is obvious that this is the case) have nothing to do with
1019 our faculties, as will easily be shown in the next section. What we
1020 have alone been able to show is that the phenomena constitute the
1021 whole content of the Antinomies; with the sole exception of
1022 philosophy, the Categories have lying before them formal logic. Since
1023 knowledge of the Antinomies is a posteriori, it remains a mystery why
1024 the Antinomies (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) prove

1025 the validity of the thing in itself; for these reasons, metaphysics is
1026 the mere result of the power of the employment of our sense
1027 perceptions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. As I
1028 have elsewhere shown, philosophy proves the validity of our sense
1029 perceptions.}

1030

1031 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
1032 phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our
1033 concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo
1034 tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to
1035 contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our
1036 judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to
1037 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
1038 in space and time exclude the possibility of, insomuch as pure logic
1039 relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of
1040 apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been
1041 suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the
1042 reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection
1043 between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it remains a
1044 mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated
1045 science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be
1046 shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us
1047 suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because
1048 of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of
1049 empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have
1050 some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of
1051 empirical conditions.}

1052

1053 \kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1054 explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human
1055 reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to
1056 do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge
1057 and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our
1058 experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural
1059 causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of
1060 our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what
1061 first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena
1062 have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close
1063 examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation
1064 of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise
1065 to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of
1066 Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.}

1067

1068 \kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that the Ideal of practical reason, even
1069 as this relates to our knowledge, is a representation of the
1070 discipline of human reason. The things in themselves are just as
1071 necessary as our understanding. The noumena prove the validity of the
1072 manifold. As will easily be shown in the next section, natural causes
1073 occupy part of the sphere of our a priori knowledge concerning the
1074 existence of the Antinomies in general. The Categories are the clue
1075 to the discovery of, consequently, the Transcendental Deduction. Our
1076 ideas are the mere results of the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a
1077 blind but indispensable function of the soul. The divisions are thus
1078 provided; all that is required is to fill them.}

1079
1080 \kgl_newpara:n {The never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1081 conditions can be treated like the objects in space and time. What we
1082 have alone been able to show is that, then, the transcendental
1083 aesthetic, in reference to ends, would thereby be made to contradict
1084 the Transcendental Deduction. The architectonic of practical reason
1085 has nothing to do with our ideas; however, time can never furnish a
1086 true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it depends on
1087 hypothetical principles. Space has nothing to do with the Antinomies,
1088 because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. In all
1089 theoretical sciences, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1090 explain that the things in themselves are a representation of, in
1091 other words, necessity, as is evident upon close examination.}

1092
1093 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a
1094 mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the
1095 discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
1096 soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself
1097 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of
1098 natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no
1099 doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the
1100 Antinomies. I assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the
1101 noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our
1102 a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our
1103 ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the
1104 architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to
1105 observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts
1106 are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic
1107 unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory
1108 rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the
1109 power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and
1110 the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of,
1111 however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to
1112 the thing in itself.}

1113
1114 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, we can deduce
1115 that the transcendental unity of apperception depends on the Ideal of
1116 practical reason. Certainly, it is obvious that the Antinomies, in
1117 accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time,
1118 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must
1119 be known a posteriori. Because of the relation between the discipline
1120 of pure reason and our a posteriori concepts, I assert that, for
1121 example, metaphysics, consequently, is by its very nature
1122 contradictory, yet the transcendental aesthetic is the key to
1123 understanding our understanding. By virtue of natural reason, the
1124 objects in space and time are what first give rise to, when thus
1125 treated as the paralogisms of human reason, the things in themselves,
1126 but the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions can
1127 not take account of the architectonic of human reason. What we have
1128 alone been able to show is that natural causes, irrespective of all
1129 empirical conditions, exist in the objects in space and time, as is
1130 shown in the writings of Hume. By virtue of practical reason, our
1131 sense perceptions are what first give rise to, irrespective of all
1132 empirical conditions, necessity. Our sense perceptions, in the study

1133 of necessity, would thereby be made to contradict transcendental
 1134 logic; consequently, natural reason stands in need of the objects in
 1135 space and time. There can be no doubt that, in other words, the
 1136 paralogisms of natural reason have nothing to do with the thing in
 1137 itself, but the paralogisms prove the validity of transcendental
 1138 logic.}

1139
 1140 \kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as
 1141 necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in
 1142 space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do
 1143 with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the
 1144 noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of
 1145 the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
 1146 Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in
 1147 themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
 1148 transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the
 1149 phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions,
 1150 yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
 1151 demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole
 1152 content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense
 1153 perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with
 1154 the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility
 1155 of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is
 1156 still possible that it may be in contradictions with, thus, our sense
 1157 perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
 1158 that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all
 1159 empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.}

1160
 1161 \kgl_newpara:n {It remains a mystery why our sense perceptions prove
 1162 the validity of our a priori concepts. The objects in space and time,
 1163 then, exist in metaphysics; therefore, the things in themselves can
 1164 not take account of the transcendental aesthetic. The Ideal of pure
 1165 reason can thereby determine in its totality, that is to say, our
 1166 ideas, and space constitutes the whole content for the discipline of
 1167 human reason. The paralogisms of pure reason are just as necessary
 1168 as, in all theoretical sciences, our knowledge. The things in
 1169 themselves constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of
 1170 this body must be known a posteriori.}

1171
 1172 \kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, the
 1173 Transcendental Deduction exists in the Ideal. To avoid all
 1174 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that pure reason (and it
 1175 is obvious that this is true) is the key to understanding the
 1176 transcendental unity of apperception. The reader should be careful to
 1177 observe that our experience depends on necessity. It is obvious that
 1178 space, thus, can be treated like the objects in space and time,
 1179 because of the relation between the transcendental unity of
 1180 apperception and the objects in space and time. It must not be
 1181 supposed that, even as this relates to natural reason, the Antinomies
 1182 (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) exclude the
 1183 possibility of the empirical objects in space and time, yet philosophy
 1184 proves the validity of practical reason. The things in themselves, on
 1185 the contrary, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge; in
 1186 all theoretical sciences, the noumena (and there can be no doubt that

1187 this is the case) are just as necessary as the Antinomies. As is
1188 shown in the writings of Galileo, I assert, in natural theology, that
1189 the transcendental aesthetic, thus, exists in our faculties. Our
1190 faculties are just as necessary as the Categories, yet the manifold
1191 has lying before it, certainly, our understanding.}

1192

1193 \kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the never-ending regress in the
1194 series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it is
1195 still possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic
1196 of practical reason. The objects in space and time, so regarded,
1197 should only be used as a canon for the architectonic of human reason,
1198 as is proven in the ontological manuals. In all theoretical sciences,
1199 the Antinomies can not take account of our concepts, because of our
1200 necessary ignorance of the conditions. By means of analysis, the
1201 things in themselves are a representation of our experience; for these
1202 reasons, the paralogisms of practical reason have lying before them
1203 our inductive judgements. Still, the architectonic of pure reason is
1204 just as necessary as the never-ending regress in the series of
1205 empirical conditions.}

1206

1207 \kgl_newpara:n {Thus, transcendental logic (and I assert, for these
1208 reasons, that this is true) depends on the Antinomies. Still, general
1209 logic (and it remains a mystery why this is true) is what first gives
1210 rise to the objects in space and time, because of the relation between
1211 metaphysics and the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next
1212 section, the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
1213 and some of this body must be known a priori. On the other hand, the
1214 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in the
1215 case of the Transcendental Deduction, exists in the noumena, as is
1216 proven in the ontological manuals. By means of analytic unity, it
1217 remains a mystery why our judgements are by their very nature
1218 contradictory; however, the objects in space and time exclude the
1219 possibility of the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly
1220 see, the Antinomies would thereby be made to contradict the
1221 transcendental aesthetic; in natural theology, our faculties
1222 constitute the whole content of, for these reasons, the noumena.
1223 However, the objects in space and time are what first give rise to our
1224 understanding, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.}

1225

1226 \kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the Antinomies have nothing to do
1227 with pure reason, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1228 conditions. Our speculative judgements are what first give rise to
1229 the Categories. Time is the key to understanding natural causes, as
1230 is evident upon close examination. Galileo tells us that the objects
1231 in space and time, irrespective of all empirical conditions, should
1232 only be used as a canon for our sense perceptions, since knowledge of
1233 the noumena is a priori. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction
1234 depends on our concepts. By means of analytic unity, our sense
1235 perceptions constitute the whole content of the manifold. In natural
1236 theology, the discipline of natural reason, on the other hand, would
1237 be falsified, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

1238

1239 \kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the discipline of human reason, it is
1240 obvious that the phenomena, still, are the mere results of the power

1241 of the practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind
1242 but indispensable function of the soul, by means of analysis. As any
1243 dedicated reader can clearly see, Aristotle tells us that natural
1244 causes constitute the whole content of, as I have elsewhere shown, the
1245 pure employment of the paralogisms. Aristotle tells us that,
1246 irrespective of all empirical conditions, the thing in itself, indeed,
1247 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1248 architectonic of practical reason, it has lying before it analytic
1249 principles, yet the Categories have nothing to do with the objects in
1250 space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
1251 human reason is just as necessary as our concepts, yet the practical
1252 employment of the paralogisms is the mere result of the power of
1253 metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For
1254 these reasons, Hume tells us that natural causes have nothing to do
1255 with the transcendental unity of apperception, by means of analytic
1256 unity. The Antinomies can not take account of the Antinomies, because
1257 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. I assert, in all
1258 theoretical sciences, that, that is to say, natural causes would
1259 thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, the Ideal of natural
1260 reason. Hume tells us that our ideas abstract from all content of a
1261 posteriori knowledge, as is evident upon close examination.}

1262
1263 \kgl_newpara:n {The manifold is a representation of the phenomena.
1264 Our judgements constitute the whole content of, on the other hand, the
1265 things in themselves, as will easily be shown in the next section. By
1266 means of analytic unity, the phenomena, in the full sense of these
1267 terms, should only be used as a canon for the Ideal of human reason.
1268 It is obvious that, so far as regards metaphysics and our judgements,
1269 pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is the key
1270 to understanding time. In the study of formal logic, the paralogisms
1271 of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.}

1272
1273 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that the never-ending regress in
1274 the series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it
1275 is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, indeed, our
1276 sense perceptions. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
1277 architectonic of practical reason proves the validity of, in all
1278 theoretical sciences, metaphysics; in view of these considerations,
1279 our knowledge depends on our faculties. Since knowledge of our sense
1280 perceptions is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary
1281 to explain that natural reason is what first gives rise to our
1282 faculties. There can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these
1283 terms, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the Transcendental
1284 Deduction. (In view of these considerations, the empirical objects in
1285 space and time are by their very nature contradictory.) It is obvious
1286 that the objects in space and time can not take account of the
1287 transcendental objects in space and time, as is proven in the
1288 ontological manuals. As is evident upon close examination, what we
1289 have alone been able to show is that the objects in space and time are
1290 the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
1291 function of the soul. The divisions are thus provided; all that is
1292 required is to fill them.}

1293
1294 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, the Antinomies are a

1295 representation of the Categories. Necessity stands in need of the
 1296 Antinomies. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies have lying
 1297 before them the Ideal of pure reason; on the other hand, the
 1298 Antinomies have nothing to do with natural causes. As I have
 1299 elsewhere shown, the reader should be careful to observe that the
 1300 things in themselves would thereby be made to contradict, in so far as
 1301 this expounds the universal rules of our faculties, our ideas. I
 1302 assert that, in so far as this expounds the necessary rules of human
 1303 reason, our concepts (and we can deduce that this is the case) prove
 1304 the validity of space, but our sense perceptions, so far as regards
 1305 the transcendental unity of apperception, can never, as a whole,
 1306 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
 1307 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they have
 1308 nothing to do with disjunctive principles. But we have fallen short
 1309 of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of
 1310 necessity.}

1311
 1312 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
 1313 abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently,
 1314 the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of
 1315 the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories
 1316 in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute
 1317 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
 1318 posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be
 1319 treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for
 1320 example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but
 1321 indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of
 1322 Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not
 1323 be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in
 1324 view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the
 1325 objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of
 1326 the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our
 1327 necessary ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the
 1328 manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first
 1329 gives rise to space.}

1330
 1331 \kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, our experience
 1332 occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal concerning the existence of
 1333 the objects in space and time in general, as will easily be shown in
 1334 the next section. It must not be supposed that our ideas (and it
 1335 remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of the
 1336 intelligible objects in space and time. Consequently, the
 1337 Transcendental Deduction can thereby determine in its totality, in
 1338 other words, our ideas, because of our necessary ignorance of the
 1339 conditions. (In natural theology, our concepts abstract from all
 1340 content of a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological
 1341 manuals.) I assert, in the case of the manifold, that human reason is
 1342 a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
 1343 posteriori, by virtue of human reason. As is proven in the
 1344 ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the thing in itself, so
 1345 far as I know, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
 1346 because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as
 1347 necessary as a priori principles.}

1348

1349 \kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
 1350 explain that philosophy can not take account of our sense perceptions;
 1351 in the study of the discipline of natural reason, our experience, in
 1352 the study of the architectonic of practical reason, is the mere result
 1353 of the power of pure logic, a blind but indispensable function of the
 1354 soul. As is evident upon close examination, the noumena are what
 1355 first give rise to, on the contrary, the phenomena, but natural
 1356 reason, that is to say, excludes the possibility of our hypothetical
 1357 judgements. The objects in space and time are the clue to the
 1358 discovery of the thing in itself, because of our necessary ignorance
 1359 of the conditions. Therefore, there can be no doubt that the
 1360 architectonic of practical reason depends on the Antinomies, because
 1361 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Human reason (and there
 1362 can be no doubt that this is true) depends on our understanding, but
 1363 the Ideal can thereby determine in its totality metaphysics.}
 1364
 1365 \kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
 1366 posteriori, general logic, in respect of the intelligible character,
 1367 is by its very nature contradictory. By means of analytic unity, it
 1368 is not at all certain that space, inasmuch as our understanding relies
 1369 on our sense perceptions, would thereby be made to contradict the
 1370 Ideal. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are just as
 1371 necessary as, indeed, the thing in itself. The manifold, as I have
 1372 elsewhere shown, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it
 1373 must be known a priori. There can be no doubt that, in particular,
 1374 the phenomena are a representation of pure logic, yet our sense
 1375 perceptions have lying before them our sense perceptions. I assert,
 1376 as I have elsewhere shown, that, indeed, our experience (and let us
 1377 suppose that this is true) excludes the possibility of the objects in
 1378 space and time, and the discipline of human reason, in accordance with
 1379 the principles of the transcendental unity of apperception, occupies
 1380 part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of
 1381 the phenomena in general.}
 1382
 1383 \kgl_newpara:n {Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true)
 1384 proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid
 1385 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the employment of
 1386 the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The
 1387 transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the
 1388 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly,
 1389 our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the
 1390 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we
 1391 have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and
 1392 time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance
 1393 with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending
 1394 regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our
 1395 ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the
 1396 phenomena.}
 1397
 1398 \kgl_newpara:n {Necessity, as I have elsewhere shown, is the mere
 1399 result of the power of the architectonic of practical reason, a blind
 1400 but indispensable function of the soul. The paralogisms of pure
 1401 reason are the clue to the discovery of the practical employment of
 1402 the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the never-ending

regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it the
 paralogisms of human reason; with the sole exception of the
 architectonic of pure reason, transcendental logic is just as
 necessary as, then, our judgements. What we have alone been able to
 show is that our synthetic judgements have lying before them, when
 thus treated as space, our knowledge, by means of analysis. By virtue
 of natural reason, the transcendental aesthetic can be treated like
 general logic, yet the objects in space and time are just as necessary
 as the noumena. }
 }
 \kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, let us suppose that
 the Categories exclude the possibility of the never-ending regress in
 the series of empirical conditions. The manifold occupies part of the
 sphere of the thing in itself concerning the existence of the things
 in themselves in general, and formal logic, indeed, would be
 falsified. It is not at all certain that, in reference to ends, the
 discipline of practical reason, for example, occupies part of the
 sphere of the discipline of practical reason concerning the existence
 of our ampliative judgements in general, yet general logic is by its
 very nature contradictory. Since all of our judgements are a priori,
 there can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these terms, the
 phenomena can not take account of the transcendental objects in space
 and time. The architectonic of pure reason (and it is not at all
 certain that this is true) stands in need of the things in themselves.
 Philosophy is the key to understanding, thus, our sense perceptions.
 This is what chiefly concerns us.}
 }
 \kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding would thereby be made to contradict,
 so far as regards the Ideal, necessity. Our faculties, as I have
 elsewhere shown, are the mere results of the power of time, a blind
 but indispensable function of the soul. Time, with the sole exception
 of formal logic, would be falsified, but the Ideal can not take
 account of our sense perceptions. It is not at all certain that the
 Antinomies are what first give rise to our experience; thus, our a
 posteriori concepts are the clue to the discovery of, so regarded, the
 practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Natural causes
 occupy part of the sphere of practical reason concerning the existence
 of the paralogisms of pure reason in general; in view of these
 considerations, the noumena exclude the possibility of the employment
 of the objects in space and time. The manifold is what first gives
 rise to the paralogisms, but our judgements are the clue to the
 discovery of, in the study of the thing in itself, the discipline of
 practical reason.}
 }
 \kgl_newpara:n {Our a priori concepts, with the sole exception of our
 experience, have lying before them our judgements. It must not be
 supposed that the Antinomies are a representation of the discipline of
 human reason, by means of analytic unity. In the study of the
 transcendental aesthetic, the paralogisms constitute a body of
 demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
 posteriori. The Categories are the mere results of the power of the
 thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
 Because of the relation between pure reason and the paralogisms of
 human reason, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain

1457 that, indeed, the objects in space and time (and to avoid all
1458 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
1459 a representation of our concepts, yet the Ideal can be treated like
1460 our inductive judgements. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
1461 our understanding would thereby be made to contradict, thus, the
1462 Transcendental Deduction; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena
1463 abstract from all content of knowledge. The thing in itself excludes
1464 the possibility of philosophy; therefore, space, for example, teaches
1465 us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of metaphysics. We can
1466 deduce that the noumena (and it must not be supposed that this is the
1467 case) are a representation of the transcendental unity of
1468 apperception; with the sole exception of the thing in itself, our
1469 sense perceptions, as I have elsewhere shown, can never, as a whole,
1470 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1471 transcendental unity of apperception, they exclude the possibility of
1472 hypothetical principles.}

1473

1474 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of our faculties are speculative, our ideas
1475 should only be used as a canon for time. With the sole exception of
1476 the manifold, our concepts exclude the possibility of the practical
1477 employment of metaphysics, by means of analysis. Aristotle tells us
1478 that necessity (and it is obvious that this is true) would thereby be
1479 made to contradict the thing in itself, because of our necessary
1480 ignorance of the conditions. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
1481 metaphysics (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby
1482 determine in its totality the Ideal. In the study of the
1483 transcendental unity of apperception, it is obvious that the phenomena
1484 have nothing to do with, therefore, natural causes, by means of
1485 analysis. Has it ever been suggested that it must not be supposed
1486 that there is no relation between the paralogisms of practical reason
1487 and the Antinomies? Time, indeed, is a representation of the
1488 Antinomies. The paralogisms of human reason are the clue to the
1489 discovery of natural causes, by means of analysis. Let us suppose
1490 that, in other words, the manifold, that is to say, abstracts from all
1491 content of knowledge.}

1492

1493 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle
1494 tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated
1495 like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding,
1496 our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The
1497 reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human
1498 reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the
1499 existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the
1500 validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude
1501 the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our
1502 a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series
1503 of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since
1504 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental
1505 aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
1506 like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with
1507 ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.}

1508

1509 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that the objects in space and
1510 time have nothing to do with our judgements. The architectonic of

1511 human reason has nothing to do with the noumena. What we have alone
 1512 been able to show is that natural causes have nothing to do with,
 1513 still, our a priori concepts, as we have already seen. As any
 1514 dedicated reader can clearly see, it remains a mystery why, for
 1515 example, our ideas, with the sole exception of the thing in itself,
 1516 can not take account of the objects in space and time. It remains a
 1517 mystery why our faculties are a representation of the transcendental
 1518 aesthetic. Our ideas, in reference to ends, can never, as a whole,
 1519 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the discipline
 1520 of natural reason, they are a representation of synthetic principles.
 1521 The transcendental unity of apperception is just as necessary as, in
 1522 view of these considerations, our ampliative judgements; with the sole
 1523 exception of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in itself (and it
 1524 remains a mystery why this is true) is the clue to the discovery of
 1525 our speculative judgements.}

1526
 1527 \kgl_newpara:n {As I have elsewhere shown, the Ideal is a body of
 1528 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori, as is
 1529 evident upon close examination. Our ideas abstract from all content
 1530 of knowledge, and the phenomena have nothing to do with, then,
 1531 necessity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the empirical
 1532 objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, in other words,
 1533 our sense perceptions. It must not be supposed that, then, the
 1534 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions stands in
 1535 need of, certainly, the Ideal of natural reason, yet pure reason can
 1536 not take account of the objects in space and time. The noumena, in
 1537 all theoretical sciences, prove the validity of the practical
 1538 employment of the manifold; in natural theology, the phenomena are
 1539 just as necessary as the paralogisms. It is not at all certain that
 1540 our concepts have lying before them our faculties, by means of
 1541 analytic unity. It is not at all certain that the architectonic of
 1542 practical reason, then, is what first gives rise to necessity; still,
 1543 our concepts stand in need to the objects in space and time.}

1544
 1545 \kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are
 1546 the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown
 1547 in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the
 1548 possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason
 1549 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like
 1550 philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic
 1551 principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy,
 1552 our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in
 1553 natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still
 1554 possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The
 1555 thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.)
 1556 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose
 1557 that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the
 1558 things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from
 1559 all content of a priori knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole
 1560 content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the
 1561 necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the
 1562 transcendental aesthetic. }

1563
 1564 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, when

1565 thus treated as the phenomena, the transcendental unity of
 1566 apperception can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of human
 1567 reason. There can be no doubt that natural causes can not take
 1568 account of, certainly, the phenomena, since none of the paralogisms
 1569 are hypothetical. We can deduce that the transcendental aesthetic is
 1570 a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori.
 1571 Hume tells us that, for example, our a posteriori knowledge
 1572 constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, yet the
 1573 discipline of pure reason, when thus treated as our understanding,
 1574 constitutes the whole content for the empirical objects in space and
 1575 time. The discipline of pure reason occupies part of the sphere of
 1576 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
 1577 concerning the existence of the things in themselves in general;
 1578 consequently, the architectonic of natural reason (and what we have
 1579 alone been able to show is that this is true) is the clue to the
 1580 discovery of the objects in space and time.}

1581
 1582 \kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas
 1583 would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects
 1584 in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery
 1585 why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the
 1586 Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of
 1587 empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not
 1588 take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would
 1589 thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in
 1590 natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation
 1591 of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our
 1592 concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the
 1593 Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to
 1594 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
 1595 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore,
 1596 necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere
 1597 of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
 1598 intelligible objects in space and time in general.}

1599
 1600 \kgl_newpara:n {Still, time is by its very nature contradictory. The
 1601 paralogisms of practical reason constitute a body of demonstrated
 1602 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; for these
 1603 reasons, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the
 1604 transcendental aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the
 1605 soul. On the other hand, Aristotle tells us that our a posteriori
 1606 concepts are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the transcendental
 1607 unity of apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the
 1608 discipline of pure reason can not take account of our faculties. It
 1609 must not be supposed that the Ideal, in particular, can never furnish
 1610 a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it is the clue to
 1611 the discovery of problematic principles, since knowledge of the
 1612 objects in space and time is a priori. The Categories are what first
 1613 give rise to the Transcendental Deduction.}

1614
 1615 \kgl_newpara:n {Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist
 1616 in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the
 1617 phenomena. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
 1618 paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our

1619 understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space
1620 and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when
1621 thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated
1622 science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements
1623 stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to
1624 observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole
1625 content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure
1626 logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere
1627 results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
1628 function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding
1629 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
1630 it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be
1631 in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our
1632 knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the
1633 noumena.}

1634

1635 \kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our a posteriori concepts are synthetic,
1636 applied logic has nothing to do with, for example, the noumena. With
1637 the sole exception of philosophy, the Ideal of practical reason is
1638 what first gives rise to our ideas, as is evident upon close
1639 examination. The reader should be careful to observe that the pure
1640 employment of our understanding is what first gives rise to the
1641 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, by virtue
1642 of natural reason. By virtue of natural reason, there can be no doubt
1643 that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the architectonic of
1644 natural reason (and we can deduce that this is true) has nothing to do
1645 with space, but our judgements (and what we have alone been able to
1646 show is that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of the
1647 paralogisms of human reason. (The things in themselves, however,
1648 exist in the thing in itself, and natural causes can not take account
1649 of the objects in space and time.) We can deduce that the thing in
1650 itself has lying before it the Transcendental Deduction, by virtue of
1651 pure reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, to avoid all
1652 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in other words, the
1653 objects in space and time can not take account of the noumena, but the
1654 empirical objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
1655 metaphysics, exist in the empirical objects in space and time. }

1656

1657 \kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the reader should be careful to
1658 observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and
1659 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby
1660 be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of
1661 the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human
1662 reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for
1663 the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the
1664 universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason.
1665 To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
1666 thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have
1667 already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the
1668 noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of
1669 the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical
1670 reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time.
1671 Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case)
1672 prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense

perceptions is a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the employment of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, but our a priori concepts can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, they would thereby be made to contradict problematic principles. What we have alone been able to show is that our sense perceptions have nothing to do with, certainly, the Transcendental Deduction. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of metaphysics; still, the things in themselves are the clue to the discovery of pure reason. The Ideal (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is a representation of our faculties. The discipline of practical reason is a representation of, in other words, the Ideal of pure reason. It is not at all certain that the things in themselves have lying before them the Antinomies; certainly, the employment of our sense perceptions abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. The paralogisms of pure reason should only be used as a canon for time.}

\kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still

1727 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the
1728 intelligible character, the transcendental unity of apperception;
1729 however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying
1730 before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because
1731 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be
1732 careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still,
1733 exists in natural causes.}

1734

1735 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the objects in space and time are
1736 analytic, it remains a mystery why, in the full sense of these terms,
1737 the objects in space and time have lying before them the Categories,
1738 and our ideas (and let us suppose that this is the case) have lying
1739 before them our problematic judgements. In the study of our
1740 understanding, there can be no doubt that necessity (and it is obvious
1741 that this is true) is a representation of the architectonic of natural
1742 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of
1743 the Antinomies is a posteriori, our faculties would thereby be made to
1744 contradict our sense perceptions. As will easily be shown in the next
1745 section, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1746 conditions, in the case of our experience, can be treated like the
1747 phenomena, and the Categories exclude the possibility of, thus, our
1748 knowledge. In which of our cognitive faculties are natural causes and
1749 the objects in space and time connected together? Still, the
1750 Transcendental Deduction stands in need of natural reason. There can
1751 be no doubt that the manifold, when thus treated as the things in
1752 themselves, is by its very nature contradictory.}

1753

1754 \kgl_newpara:n {As I have elsewhere shown, the never-ending regress in
1755 the series of empirical conditions, in the study of the never-ending
1756 regress in the series of empirical conditions, occupies part of the
1757 sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
1758 objects in space and time in general, by means of analytic unity. Our
1759 faculties (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) can not take
1760 account of the discipline of pure reason. As will easily be shown in
1761 the next section, Hume tells us that the phenomena are just as
1762 necessary as, consequently, necessity; for these reasons, formal
1763 logic, that is to say, excludes the possibility of applied logic. As
1764 is shown in the writings of Galileo, I assert, still, that, indeed,
1765 the Ideal, for example, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of
1766 it must be known a priori. As is shown in the writings of Hume, the
1767 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, when thus
1768 treated as the objects in space and time, constitutes the whole
1769 content for the Ideal.}

1770

1771 \kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
1772 manifold and our ideas, the Categories are just as necessary as, in
1773 the study of the architectonic of pure reason, the discipline of human
1774 reason. It must not be supposed that metaphysics is the mere result
1775 of the power of the Ideal of practical reason, a blind but
1776 indispensable function of the soul; in the study of human reason, the
1777 phenomena are a representation of metaphysics. Our understanding
1778 proves the validity of the transcendental unity of apperception;
1779 therefore, human reason depends on natural causes. In the study of
1780 the architectonic of natural reason, what we have alone been able to

show is that our judgements constitute the whole content of, on the other hand, our inductive judgements, as we have already seen. }

\kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however, natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Transcendental logic constitutes the whole content for, for example, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. It remains a mystery why, even as this relates to time, the Ideal excludes the possibility of the Categories, but natural reason, then, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the thing in itself, it is the key to understanding a posteriori principles. What we have alone been able to show is that the Transcendental Deduction is what first gives rise to the

1835 Categories. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is not at all
1836 certain that, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction teaches
1837 us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, with the sole
1838 exception of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1839 conditions, natural causes, but the objects in space and time are the
1840 clue to the discovery of the objects in space and time. The objects
1841 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena. The
1842 transcendental aesthetic, in the case of metaphysics, can be treated
1843 like necessity; for these reasons, the noumena exclude the possibility
1844 of the Ideal.}

1845
1846 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a
1847 posteriori knowledge has lying before it the Categories, as is shown
1848 in the writings of Galileo. Thus, the Categories are the mere results
1849 of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1850 In view of these considerations, it is obvious that the Categories are
1851 just as necessary as, however, the never-ending regress in the series
1852 of empirical conditions, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
1853 Because of the relation between the Ideal of human reason and the
1854 objects in space and time, the empirical objects in space and time
1855 have lying before them natural causes; still, our experience (and it
1856 must not be supposed that this is true) depends on the Transcendental
1857 Deduction. Because of the relation between the employment of the
1858 Transcendental Deduction and the Antinomies, pure logic occupies part
1859 of the sphere of necessity concerning the existence of the objects in
1860 space and time in general; however, the things in themselves, still,
1861 stand in need to our judgements. The Transcendental Deduction proves
1862 the validity of the things in themselves, and our sense perceptions
1863 would thereby be made to contradict our understanding.}

1864
1865 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells
1866 us that natural causes, so far as regards necessity, can never, as a
1867 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1868 manifold, they prove the validity of ampliative principles. Let us
1869 suppose that, in particular, the Ideal of human reason is a body of
1870 demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a posteriori. As is
1871 proven in the ontological manuals, our faculties, consequently, are
1872 the mere results of the power of human reason, a blind but
1873 indispensable function of the soul, but the noumena can never, as a
1874 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like space,
1875 they would thereby be made to contradict analytic principles. As is
1876 shown in the writings of Hume, the intelligible objects in space and
1877 time, in the study of the never-ending regress in the series of
1878 empirical conditions, stand in need to our experience. On the other
1879 hand, Galileo tells us that formal logic is by its very nature
1880 contradictory. With the sole exception of the architectonic of
1881 natural reason, there can be no doubt that our understanding would be
1882 falsified. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

1883
1884 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between philosophy and the
1885 objects in space and time, the Categories, in all theoretical
1886 sciences, are by their very nature contradictory. What we have alone
1887 been able to show is that our knowledge is a representation of the
1888 Categories. With the sole exception of the practical employment of

1889 the noumena, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects
 1890 in space and time would thereby be made to contradict the discipline
 1891 of pure reason, because of the relation between the manifold and our
 1892 ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that, then, the
 1893 Categories are by their very nature contradictory, but space is the
 1894 mere result of the power of the discipline of practical reason, a
 1895 blind but indispensable function of the soul. The noumena are by
 1896 their very nature contradictory. As any dedicated reader can clearly
 1897 see, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
 1898 architectonic of human reason, on the contrary, excludes the
 1899 possibility of the paralogisms. The thing in itself, in view of these
 1900 considerations, is by its very nature contradictory. Let us apply
 1901 this to necessity.}

1902
 1903 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, our sense
 1904 perceptions, as I have elsewhere shown, should only be used as a canon
 1905 for our ideas; in natural theology, the paralogisms, indeed, are by
 1906 their very nature contradictory. By virtue of practical reason, the
 1907 manifold, on the contrary, excludes the possibility of the
 1908 transcendental aesthetic, yet the thing in itself is by its very
 1909 nature contradictory. Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as
 1910 the Categories. As we have already seen, what we have alone been able
 1911 to show is that, in particular, the Ideal of natural reason stands in
 1912 need of, that is to say, our knowledge, but necessity is a body of
 1913 demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori. As we
 1914 have already seen, our judgements, therefore, constitute a body of
 1915 demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a priori.
 1916 Galileo tells us that the objects in space and time (and it is not at
 1917 all certain that this is the case) are a representation of our ideas;
 1918 still, time, with the sole exception of our experience, can be treated
 1919 like our sense perceptions. This is what chiefly concerns us. }

1920
 1921 \kgl_newpara:n {The Categories, as I have elsewhere shown, constitute
 1922 the whole content of necessity. The transcendental unity of
 1923 apperception is just as necessary as the transcendental objects in
 1924 space and time. Consequently, I assert that the thing in itself is a
 1925 representation of, in the full sense of these terms, the objects in
 1926 space and time, because of the relation between the transcendental
 1927 aesthetic and our sense perceptions. The manifold, in particular, can
 1928 thereby determine in its totality metaphysics. Our a posteriori
 1929 concepts, in the case of our experience, prove the validity of the
 1930 transcendental objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in
 1931 the next section. There can be no doubt that necessity, even as this
 1932 relates to necessity, may not contradict itself, but it is still
 1933 possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic of
 1934 human reason.}

1935
 1936 \kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
 1937 priori, it remains a mystery why, in reference to ends, the phenomena
 1938 prove the validity of the paralogisms. As is proven in the
 1939 ontological manuals, the empirical objects in space and time would
 1940 thereby be made to contradict the empirical objects in space and time;
 1941 in the study of the transcendental unity of apperception, the
 1942 Categories exist in our a priori concepts. Because of the relation

1943 between space and our analytic judgements, the reader should be
 1944 careful to observe that the Categories (and I assert that this is the
 1945 case) can not take account of the discipline of pure reason; in the
 1946 study of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 1947 conditions, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and
 1948 demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it is just as necessary
 1949 as problematic principles. In the case of general logic, space (and
 1950 it is obvious that this is true) is just as necessary as the things in
 1951 themselves. By means of analytic unity, I assert, in view of these
 1952 considerations, that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our
 1953 speculative judgements (and it is obvious that this is the case) are
 1954 what first give rise to the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
 1955 the next section, it remains a mystery why our ideas would thereby be
 1956 made to contradict our judgements; therefore, our sense perceptions,
 1957 certainly, exclude the possibility of the noumena. As is shown in the
 1958 writings of Galileo, the objects in space and time exclude the
 1959 possibility of our ideas; thus, the objects in space and time, for
 1960 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies.}

1961
 1962 \kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of the never-ending regress in
 1963 the series of empirical conditions, it is not at all certain that the
 1964 noumena, in so far as this expounds the practical rules of the
 1965 paralogisms of pure reason, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
 1966 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, they
 1967 are just as necessary as ampliative principles, as will easily be
 1968 shown in the next section. As is evident upon close examination, the
 1969 objects in space and time constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
 1970 and all of this body must be known a posteriori, but the architectonic
 1971 of practical reason would be falsified. Because of our necessary
 1972 ignorance of the conditions, it is not at all certain that, then, our
 1973 understanding proves the validity of, on the contrary, formal logic.
 1974 With the sole exception of the Ideal of natural reason, the Categories
 1975 exist in the paralogisms, since knowledge of the Antinomies is a
 1976 posteriori. Since knowledge of our ideas is a priori, it must not be
 1977 supposed that the manifold, as I have elsewhere shown, abstracts from
 1978 all content of knowledge; in the study of the Ideal of practical
 1979 reason, our concepts are the clue to the discovery of our experience.}

1980
 1981 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
 1982 Categories would be falsified. Consequently, there can be no doubt
 1983 that the noumena can not take account of, even as this relates to
 1984 philosophy, the Antinomies, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
 1985 Our judgements (and I assert that this is the case) are what first
 1986 give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 1987 conditions. It is not at all certain that, in the full sense of these
 1988 terms, the objects in space and time stand in need to the Ideal of
 1989 pure reason, yet the Transcendental Deduction, in reference to ends,
 1990 is just as necessary as the Ideal. Has it ever been suggested that it
 1991 must not be supposed that there is a causal connection between the
 1992 transcendental objects in space and time and the discipline of natural
 1993 reason? As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not at all
 1994 certain that the noumena can not take account of the Transcendental
 1995 Deduction. By virtue of human reason, I assert, in the study of the
 1996 manifold, that, indeed, the objects in space and time have lying

1997 before them our faculties, and the architectonic of natural reason
1998 stands in need of the things in themselves.}

1999

2000 \kgl_newpara:n {By means of analytic unity, the objects in space and
2001 time (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the
2002 whole content of the Antinomies, but our ideas have lying before them
2003 the noumena. The Ideal is the key to understanding, that is to say,
2004 the things in themselves. By means of analytic unity, our judgements
2005 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case)
2006 have lying before them the Transcendental Deduction. Aristotle tells
2007 us that metaphysics, in the study of the Ideal of practical reason,
2008 occupies part of the sphere of applied logic concerning the existence
2009 of the paralogisms in general; certainly, metaphysics can not take
2010 account of necessity. But can I entertain human reason in thought, or
2011 does it present itself to me? The things in themselves stand in need
2012 to natural causes, by means of analytic unity. Since knowledge of
2013 natural causes is a posteriori, the empirical objects in space and
2014 time have nothing to do with philosophy. The divisions are thus
2015 provided; all that is required is to fill them.}

2016

2017 \kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, the noumena would
2018 thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the
2019 paralogisms of natural reason. Because of the relation between the
2020 discipline of pure reason and our sense perceptions, we can deduce
2021 that, on the contrary, the Categories are just as necessary as natural
2022 causes, and metaphysics, in the full sense of these terms, can never
2023 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2024 transcendental unity of apperception, it is the clue to the discovery
2025 of speculative principles. We can deduce that natural causes, still,
2026 are by their very nature contradictory, as we have already seen. As
2027 we have already seen, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2028 explain that, so far as I know, the objects in space and time, for
2029 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Ideal of human
2030 reason. The reader should be careful to observe that the manifold,
2031 irrespective of all empirical conditions, is by its very nature
2032 contradictory. }

2033

2034 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that natural
2035 causes (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2036 that this is the case) have lying before them necessity. We can
2037 deduce that our a priori knowledge (and Galileo tells us that this is
2038 true) depends on the employment of the never-ending regress in the
2039 series of empirical conditions. It remains a mystery why the
2040 paralogisms of practical reason, for these reasons, exist in the
2041 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, because of
2042 the relation between the architectonic of pure reason and the
2043 phenomena. Thus, the architectonic of pure reason excludes the
2044 possibility of, on the other hand, the phenomena. And can I entertain
2045 philosophy in thought, or does it present itself to me? Galileo tells
2046 us that, that is to say, the practical employment of the architectonic
2047 of natural reason, with the sole exception of the transcendental
2048 aesthetic, abstracts from all content of knowledge. As is proven in
2049 the ontological manuals, our ideas constitute the whole content of the
2050 objects in space and time, but the objects in space and time (and it

2051 is obvious that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of the
2052 parallogisms.}

2053

2054 \kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is not at
2055 all certain that, on the contrary, the objects in space and time, in
2056 the case of space, stand in need to the objects in space and time, but
2057 the phenomena have lying before them the discipline of human reason.
2058 The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in
2059 other words, is what first gives rise to general logic. Because of
2060 our necessary ignorance of the conditions, our concepts, so far as
2061 regards the Ideal of human reason, exist in the parallogisms; in the
2062 study of time, the thing in itself is the clue to the discovery of the
2063 manifold. I assert that our experience, in natural theology,
2064 abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge; therefore, our ideas
2065 are what first give rise to the Categories. As is evident upon close
2066 examination, our ideas, for these reasons, can not take account of
2067 philosophy. Has it ever been suggested that what we have alone been
2068 able to show is that there is no relation between the architectonic of
2069 human reason and our sense perceptions? Since all of the noumena are
2070 a priori, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the thing
2071 in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can
2072 be no doubt that the empirical objects in space and time constitute a
2073 body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a
2074 posteriori; thus, time is the mere result of the power of the
2075 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
2076 soul. But this need not worry us.}

2077

2078 \kgl_newpara:n {Aristotle tells us that, insomuch as the pure
2079 employment of the Categories relies on our ideas, the things in
2080 themselves are just as necessary as, in all theoretical sciences, the
2081 noumena. Therefore, let us suppose that the phenomena occupy part of
2082 the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of our concepts in
2083 general. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the
2084 architectonic of pure reason is what first gives rise to the
2085 employment of our concepts, by means of analysis. The things in
2086 themselves occupy part of the sphere of the never-ending regress in
2087 the series of empirical conditions concerning the existence of our
2088 sense perceptions in general; thus, metaphysics may not contradict
2089 itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions
2090 with, in other words, the transcendental unity of apperception. By
2091 means of the architectonic of practical reason, our sense perceptions,
2092 irrespective of all empirical conditions, abstract from all content of
2093 knowledge. As is proven in the ontological manuals, metaphysics, so
2094 far as regards the transcendental aesthetic and the intelligible
2095 objects in space and time, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
2096 of it must be known a priori; by means of philosophy, the Categories
2097 are a representation of, in the case of time, the phenomena. As any
2098 dedicated reader can clearly see, the Transcendental Deduction, in
2099 other words, would thereby be made to contradict our understanding;
2100 still, the employment of the noumena is a representation of the
2101 Ideal.}

2102

2103 \kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that the parallogisms of human reason are
2104 a representation of, in the full sense of these terms, our experience.

2105 The thing in itself, in reference to ends, exists in our judgements.
 2106 As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, let us suppose that, in
 2107 respect of the intelligible character, the Categories constitute the
 2108 whole content of our knowledge, yet metaphysics is a representation of
 2109 our judgements. As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
 2110 would thereby be made to contradict the manifold; therefore, pure
 2111 logic is a representation of time. In natural theology, the
 2112 discipline of natural reason abstracts from all content of a priori
 2113 knowledge. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
 2114 that the paralogisms of human reason have lying before them the Ideal
 2115 of pure reason, since none of the things in themselves are a priori.
 2116 Consequently, it remains a mystery why our concepts abstract from all
 2117 content of knowledge, since knowledge of the objects in space and time
 2118 is a posteriori.}

2119
 2120 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between practical reason and
 2121 our problematic judgements, what we have alone been able to show is
 2122 that, in respect of the intelligible character, our faculties,
 2123 insomuch as our knowledge relies on the Categories, can be treated
 2124 like natural reason. In view of these considerations, the reader
 2125 should be careful to observe that the transcendental aesthetic is the
 2126 clue to the discovery of, in view of these considerations, the
 2127 phenomena. As is evident upon close examination, it remains a mystery
 2128 why the objects in space and time occupy part of the sphere of the
 2129 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions concerning
 2130 the existence of the Categories in general; in view of these
 2131 considerations, our experience, indeed, stands in need of the
 2132 phenomena. (However, the phenomena prove the validity of the Ideal,
 2133 by virtue of human reason.) We can deduce that, so regarded, our
 2134 faculties (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are what
 2135 first give rise to the architectonic of pure reason. Our ideas can
 2136 not take account of, by means of space, our knowledge. But we have
 2137 fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind
 2138 when we speak of necessity.}

2139
 2140 \kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that space can not take
 2141 account of natural causes. The Transcendental Deduction can not take
 2142 account of our a priori knowledge; as I have elsewhere shown, the
 2143 objects in space and time (and let us suppose that this is the case)
 2144 can not take account of the objects in space and time. As is shown in
 2145 the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary
 2146 to explain that the Categories have lying before them, as I have
 2147 elsewhere shown, our ideas. The Ideal of human reason excludes the
 2148 possibility of the Ideal of human reason. By virtue of natural
 2149 reason, our ideas stand in need to the Ideal of practical reason. By
 2150 means of analysis, the phenomena, in the study of our understanding,
 2151 can not take account of the noumena, but the paralogisms of natural
 2152 reason, thus, abstract from all content of knowledge. This is not
 2153 something we are in a position to establish.}

2154
 2155 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of our ideas are inductive, our ideas
 2156 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms; consequently, our
 2157 faculties can not take account of metaphysics. As will easily be
 2158 shown in the next section, the Ideal, in reference to ends, may not

2159 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
 2160 contradictions with the Categories; in all theoretical sciences, the
 2161 architectonic of practical reason, in the case of the practical
 2162 employment of our experience, can be treated like necessity. Because
 2163 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the things in themselves
 2164 are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
 2165 function of the soul, and the Transcendental Deduction exists in the
 2166 Antinomies. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the thing in
 2167 itself (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true)
 2168 constitutes the whole content for time. It remains a mystery why our
 2169 understanding (and Aristotle tells us that this is true) may not
 2170 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
 2171 contradictions with our judgements; in all theoretical sciences, the
 2172 objects in space and time constitute the whole content of our ideas.
 2173 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, we can deduce
 2174 that, for example, our concepts, for example, are the mere results of
 2175 the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
 2176 soul, yet the objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
 2177 the manifold, exist in our ideas.}

2178
 2179 \kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, it must not be supposed that the
 2180 objects in space and time, so far as regards the manifold, should only
 2181 be used as a canon for natural reason. The manifold, so far as
 2182 regards our a priori knowledge, teaches us nothing whatsoever
 2183 regarding the content of the Transcendental Deduction. By means of
 2184 analytic unity, we can deduce that, so far as regards our experience
 2185 and the objects in space and time, the objects in space and time would
 2186 thereby be made to contradict the Categories, but our concepts can
 2187 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
 2188 like our experience, they stand in need to ampliative principles. The
 2189 noumena, so far as I know, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
 2190 demonstrated science, because, like the employment of the Categories,
 2191 they have lying before them ampliative principles, yet the phenomena
 2192 are just as necessary as natural causes. The reader should be careful
 2193 to observe that, so far as I know, the Ideal has nothing to do with
 2194 the Categories, but the things in themselves, however, constitute a
 2195 body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
 2196 posteriori. And similarly with all the others.}

2197
 2198 \kgl_newpara:n {Our speculative judgements, therefore, prove the
 2199 validity of the transcendental unity of apperception. Necessity is
 2200 just as necessary as, that is to say, transcendental logic. The
 2201 reader should be careful to observe that the noumena (and it must not
 2202 be supposed that this is the case) can not take account of our
 2203 faculties, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. The Ideal (and
 2204 to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is
 2205 true) can not take account of the transcendental aesthetic, and the
 2206 employment of the manifold has nothing to do with, insomuch as the
 2207 architectonic of natural reason relies on the Antinomies, the
 2208 discipline of human reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
 2209 the paralogisms prove the validity of, as I have elsewhere shown, the
 2210 architectonic of pure reason.}

2211
 2212 \kgl_newpara:n {Space may not contradict itself, but it is still

possible that it may be in contradictions with, for these reasons, the phenomena; with the sole exception of metaphysics, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in natural theology, the thing in itself. What we have alone been able to show is that, for example, the Ideal excludes the possibility of time, yet the noumena (and I assert, in view of these considerations, that this is the case) are just as necessary as the objects in space and time. Because of the relation between metaphysics and the paralogisms, the Categories are the mere results of the power of the discipline of natural reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. The objects in space and time, in other words, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of our faculties is a priori, what we have alone been able to show is that necessity, in reference to ends, constitutes the whole content for metaphysics; still, our understanding (and we can deduce that this is true) excludes the possibility of our experience. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, even as this relates to philosophy, the phenomena (and I assert, with the sole exception of metaphysics, that this is the case) are a representation of the objects in space and time, but the Antinomies should only be used as a canon for our knowledge. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of necessity.}

\kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; in the study of our a posteriori knowledge, the manifold, so far as I know, proves the validity of the Ideal. Hume tells us that, so far as regards time, the phenomena, in view of these considerations, stand in need to the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like our ideas; as I have elsewhere shown, our concepts have lying before them the phenomena. As is proven in the ontological manuals, there can be no doubt that the phenomena, in all theoretical sciences, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori. As is evident upon close examination, the architectonic of natural reason, so regarded, is by its very nature contradictory; for these reasons, the phenomena are a representation of time. In natural theology, the Antinomies (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) constitute the whole content of the Categories, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the Categories.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it is not at all certain that, for example, the thing in itself (and the reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not take account of our experience, and our concepts, in all theoretical sciences, are a representation of the phenomena. Since some of the phenomena are problematic, Hume tells us that metaphysics has lying before it, however, natural causes. By virtue of natural reason, Aristotle tells us that the things in themselves, therefore, should only be used as a canon for our a posteriori judgements. Our understanding can be treated like the transcendental unity of

2267 apperception. The Categories can be treated like space.}

2268

2269 \kgl_newpara:n {Since some of our sense perceptions are hypothetical,
 2270 philosophy proves the validity of natural causes; on the other hand,
 2271 our experience, in other words, can never furnish a true and
 2272 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it depends on
 2273 synthetic principles. Natural causes, in natural theology, constitute
 2274 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
 2275 priori. What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy is a
 2276 representation of our concepts, as will easily be shown in the next
 2277 section. The Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still
 2278 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in the study of the
 2279 transcendental aesthetic, our sense perceptions. (As is shown in the
 2280 writings of Galileo, the reader should be careful to observe that the
 2281 objects in space and time, by means of necessity, are by their very
 2282 nature contradictory.) The Antinomies can not take account of our
 2283 experience, by virtue of natural reason. Therefore, the noumena, in
 2284 view of these considerations, are by their very nature contradictory,
 2285 as will easily be shown in the next section.}

2286

2287 \kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the never-ending regress in the
 2288 series of empirical conditions stands in need of practical reason. As
 2289 will easily be shown in the next section, there can be no doubt that,
 2290 in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the discipline
 2291 of natural reason, metaphysics can be treated like metaphysics. As is
 2292 shown in the writings of Hume, what we have alone been able to show is
 2293 that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
 2294 would be falsified. Our experience can be treated like the
 2295 architectonic of human reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo.
 2296 The thing in itself proves the validity of the phenomena, as is shown
 2297 in the writings of Hume. Certainly, what we have alone been able to
 2298 show is that natural causes, in reference to ends, would be falsified.
 2299 But this need not worry us.}

2300

2301 \kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the objects in space and time are
 2302 speculative, let us suppose that our sense perceptions are the clue to
 2303 the discovery of, in particular, our a posteriori knowledge. Since
 2304 knowledge of the transcendental objects in space and time is a
 2305 posteriori, what we have alone been able to show is that our a
 2306 posteriori concepts exclude the possibility of the never-ending
 2307 regress in the series of empirical conditions; by means of the
 2308 discipline of pure reason, our faculties are the clue to the discovery
 2309 of our a priori knowledge. Because of the relation between the
 2310 transcendental unity of apperception and the things in themselves,
 2311 there can be no doubt that our sense perceptions (and it is obvious
 2312 that this is the case) are what first give rise to the Categories. To
 2313 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
 2314 phenomena can not take account of, with the sole exception of the
 2315 transcendental unity of apperception, the noumena. Certainly, the
 2316 things in themselves are by their very nature contradictory, as is
 2317 shown in the writings of Galileo. Because of our necessary ignorance
 2318 of the conditions, we can deduce that, then, the thing in itself
 2319 constitutes the whole content for, still, the intelligible objects in
 2320 space and time, and space is the clue to the discovery of, in

particular, our a posteriori concepts. }

\kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal of human reason has nothing to do with time. As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, so far as regards the Transcendental Deduction, the transcendental aesthetic, inasmuch as the practical employment of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions relies on the things in themselves, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental unity of apperception, it excludes the possibility of speculative principles, and the Ideal is a representation of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the phenomena (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of our speculative judgements; in all theoretical sciences, our understanding, when thus treated as the noumena, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori. We can deduce that our knowledge, for example, exists in the transcendental unity of apperception. Consequently, I assert, by means of general logic, that the transcendental unity of apperception teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, consequently, the Antinomies, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our concepts are inductive, there can be no doubt that, in respect of the intelligible character, our ideas are the clue to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception, and the paralogisms of natural reason should only be used as a canon for our judgements. Still, I assert that the objects in space and time have lying before them, by means of transcendental logic, the Transcendental Deduction. Our faculties can be treated like our experience; thus, our ideas have lying before them the objects in space and time. Our judgements constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a posteriori. Time can be treated like the manifold. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the employment of the noumena proves the validity of, certainly, human reason, and space excludes the possibility of general logic. Let us suppose that, indeed, the Ideal of pure reason, even as this relates to our a priori knowledge, is the key to understanding the Antinomies, yet the employment of the pure employment of our a posteriori concepts is what first gives rise to, in all theoretical sciences, the noumena.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception is the mere result of the power of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; in all theoretical sciences, natural causes exclude the possibility of the noumena. Let us suppose that the transcendental objects in space and time would thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, natural causes. There can be no doubt that our understanding is the clue to the discovery of the Ideal. Because of the relation between the Ideal of pure reason and the Antinomies, the transcendental unity of apperception, as I have elsewhere shown, can be treated like the paralogisms, yet the phenomena are the clue to the discovery of the Ideal. As I have elsewhere shown, I assert, in view of these considerations, that our faculties, even as this relates to the thing

2375 in itself, occupy part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction
 2376 concerning the existence of the Categories in general.}

2377

2378 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain
 2379 that, that is to say, the Transcendental Deduction is the clue to the
 2380 discovery of, in particular, our knowledge, yet the thing in itself
 2381 would thereby be made to contradict our faculties. As is proven in
 2382 the ontological manuals, it is obvious that, when thus treated as our
 2383 understanding, the Categories have nothing to do with our
 2384 understanding, yet the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2385 conditions occupies part of the sphere of the architectonic of human
 2386 reason concerning the existence of the paralogisms in general. As
 2387 will easily be shown in the next section, general logic has nothing to
 2388 do with, in the full sense of these terms, the discipline of pure
 2389 reason. As is evident upon close examination, the Ideal of human
 2390 reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may
 2391 be in contradictions with the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
 2392 the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that, even
 2393 as this relates to the transcendental unity of apperception, the
 2394 Categories, certainly, should only be used as a canon for the thing in
 2395 itself. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}

2396

2397 \kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that space depends on the things in
 2398 themselves. There can be no doubt that, in particular, the Ideal, in
 2399 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the phenomena, is just
 2400 as necessary as the transcendental unity of apperception. There can
 2401 be no doubt that the manifold can not take account of, so far as
 2402 regards the architectonic of human reason, the things in themselves.
 2403 Thus, it remains a mystery why space depends on the manifold. To
 2404 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our
 2405 understanding (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
 2406 explain that this is true) is a representation of the Antinomies.}

2407

2408 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are a
 2409 representation of metaphysics; in the case of the practical employment
 2410 of the transcendental aesthetic, the Categories are by their very
 2411 nature contradictory. It is not at all certain that the phenomena
 2412 have lying before them the objects in space and time, because of our
 2413 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Because of the relation
 2414 between applied logic and our faculties, it remains a mystery why our
 2415 ideas, consequently, exclude the possibility of philosophy; however,
 2416 the things in themselves prove the validity of, in the case of
 2417 metaphysics, the phenomena. By means of the transcendental aesthetic,
 2418 let us suppose that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated
 2419 doctrine, and all of this body must be known a priori. Since all of
 2420 the objects in space and time are hypothetical, metaphysics is the key
 2421 to understanding the paralogisms, yet the Transcendental Deduction has
 2422 nothing to do with our a posteriori knowledge. There can be no doubt
 2423 that metaphysics is a representation of the transcendental unity of
 2424 apperception, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2425

2426 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that our concepts, in accordance
 2427 with the principles of the noumena, are by their very nature
 2428 contradictory, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. Space is what

2429 first gives rise to, in other words, the Antinomies, and space depends
2430 on the Ideal. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
2431 our experience, indeed, proves the validity of the noumena. Hume
2432 tells us that the phenomena can not take account of transcendental
2433 logic. The objects in space and time, thus, exist in the manifold.
2434 In which of our cognitive faculties are the manifold and the
2435 Categories connected together? As will easily be shown in the next
2436 section, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that
2437 metaphysics, on the contrary, occupies part of the sphere of the thing
2438 in itself concerning the existence of our synthetic judgements in
2439 general. }

2440
2441 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, I assert that,
2442 so far as regards metaphysics, our knowledge proves the validity of,
2443 on the contrary, the manifold, yet the objects in space and time are
2444 what first give rise to, in the study of formal logic, the paralogisms
2445 of pure reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, I
2446 assert, in all theoretical sciences, that our understanding (and the
2447 reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not take
2448 account of our sense perceptions. Because of the relation between the
2449 Transcendental Deduction and our a priori concepts, the phenomena are
2450 what first give rise to the intelligible objects in space and time,
2451 and natural causes, indeed, abstract from all content of a priori
2452 knowledge. By means of analysis, Galileo tells us that the Ideal has
2453 lying before it, on the contrary, our sense perceptions. I assert,
2454 for these reasons, that our knowledge stands in need of the things in
2455 themselves, since knowledge of our faculties is a priori. But this is
2456 to be dismissed as random groping.}

2457
2458 \kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding can not take account of our
2459 faculties; certainly, the never-ending regress in the series of
2460 empirical conditions is what first gives rise to, therefore, the
2461 things in themselves. It is not at all certain that, then, time
2462 occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning
2463 the existence of the paralogisms of practical reason in general. We
2464 can deduce that the thing in itself, on the other hand, abstracts from
2465 all content of knowledge. On the other hand, our a priori knowledge
2466 has lying before it the practical employment of the Antinomies. The
2467 employment of our sense perceptions is what first gives rise to the
2468 Antinomies, but the Categories, for these reasons, are by their very
2469 nature contradictory. In natural theology, it is not at all certain
2470 that our sense perceptions can not take account of our knowledge, by
2471 means of analysis. Thus, the Categories would thereby be made to
2472 contradict the things in themselves, as any dedicated reader can
2473 clearly see.}

2474
2475 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are just as necessary as the
2476 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As any
2477 dedicated reader can clearly see, the architectonic of natural reason
2478 (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby determine in
2479 its totality general logic. As will easily be shown in the next
2480 section, natural causes are a representation of, on the contrary, the
2481 Ideal of pure reason; as I have elsewhere shown, the things in
2482 themselves, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,

2483 and none of this body must be known a priori. As we have already
 2484 seen, our ideas are the clue to the discovery of our faculties.
 2485 Whence comes applied logic, the solution of which involves the
 2486 relation between the noumena and the Transcendental Deduction?
 2487 Therefore, it is obvious that the empirical objects in space and time
 2488 can not take account of the noumena, because of our necessary
 2489 ignorance of the conditions. It is not at all certain that the
 2490 manifold stands in need of, for these reasons, the Antinomies, by
 2491 virtue of human reason.}
 2492
 2493 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of practical reason, there can be no doubt
 2494 that our experience, still, occupies part of the sphere of the
 2495 manifold concerning the existence of our analytic judgements in
 2496 general; as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories can never, as a
 2497 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
 2498 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they are a
 2499 representation of synthetic principles. As is proven in the
 2500 ontological manuals, the Categories are what first give rise to,
 2501 consequently, our faculties. We can deduce that, insomuch as the
 2502 discipline of practical reason relies on our ideas, necessity can be
 2503 treated like the thing in itself, yet the noumena can never, as a
 2504 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
 2505 they are a representation of problematic principles. However, let us
 2506 suppose that the things in themselves are the clue to the discovery
 2507 of, consequently, our judgements, as we have already seen. Whence
 2508 comes time, the solution of which involves the relation between the
 2509 phenomena and the noumena? In the study of our experience, I assert
 2510 that the Ideal can not take account of the discipline of practical
 2511 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The reader should be
 2512 careful to observe that the phenomena are what first give rise to the
 2513 Categories, by virtue of natural reason. As is proven in the
 2514 ontological manuals, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and
 2515 some of it must be known a priori. This may be clear with an
 2516 example.}
 2517
 2518 \kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, so far as
 2519 regards the Ideal of practical reason and the noumena, abstracts from
 2520 all content of a posteriori knowledge, by virtue of human reason. To
 2521 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, that is to
 2522 say, our inductive judgements have nothing to do with, in the case of
 2523 the discipline of human reason, the things in themselves, and the
 2524 paralogisms of natural reason are the clue to the discovery of the
 2525 Transcendental Deduction. It remains a mystery why the noumena, in
 2526 natural theology, would be falsified; however, the things in
 2527 themselves can not take account of the thing in itself. As any
 2528 dedicated reader can clearly see, philosophy, in the study of the
 2529 thing in itself, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
 2530 because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it proves the validity of
 2531 inductive principles, but our sense perceptions, with the sole
 2532 exception of necessity, are the clue to the discovery of the
 2533 transcendental unity of apperception. Let us suppose that the
 2534 Categories can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated
 2535 science, because, like the employment of philosophy, they have nothing
 2536 to do with hypothetical principles. Our ideas have nothing to do with

the transcendental aesthetic.}

\kgl_newpara:n {In the case of philosophy, the Transcendental Deduction proves the validity of necessity, by means of analysis. Our sense perceptions have lying before them, certainly, our experience. There can be no doubt that space (and it remains a mystery why this is true) stands in need of the noumena. As I have elsewhere shown, the transcendental unity of apperception has lying before it, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the Transcendental Deduction. The objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of our faculties, but the thing in itself, in accordance with the principles of our experience, can be treated like the paralogisms. As is proven in the ontological manuals, space has nothing to do with, thus, our ideas, yet the things in themselves, in natural theology, can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic.}

\kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Galileo, it remains a mystery why, so far as I know, the phenomena are the mere results of the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, but the paralogisms (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the transcendental aesthetic. Our experience, in accordance with the principles of transcendental logic, occupies part of the sphere of the manifold concerning the existence of the Categories in general. Our sense perceptions can not take account of the Ideal, by virtue of natural reason. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the objects in space and time (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict the pure employment of space; in the case of the discipline of human reason, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the transcendental aesthetic. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have already seen, it remains a mystery why there is a causal connection between the Ideal of human reason and the Ideal of human reason? What we have alone been able to show is that the Antinomies, for these reasons, stand in need to our judgements. Let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of the Ideal of practical reason, the Antinomies prove the validity of space, but natural causes (and I assert, for these reasons, that this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict the transcendental unity of apperception. But the proof of this is a task from which we can here be absolved. }

\kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the Categories. As is proven in the ontological manuals, our sense perceptions, consequently, are by their very nature contradictory; therefore, our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic of practical reason. We can deduce that the Categories would thereby be made to contradict pure logic; for these reasons, space is by its very nature contradictory. Formal logic is a representation of our faculties. Metaphysics, insomuch as time relies on the Antinomies, stands in need of space. Let us suppose that the Antinomies constitute the whole content of our a priori concepts; on the other hand, the Ideal of natural reason (and there can be no doubt

2591 that this is true) is a representation of the manifold.}

2592

2593 \kgl_newpara:n {I assert, certainly, that, irrespective of all
2594 empirical conditions, the Categories are just as necessary as, on the
2595 other hand, the thing in itself, yet the manifold proves the validity
2596 of, on the other hand, the employment of the transcendental unity of
2597 apperception. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
2598 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in
2599 the architectonic of practical reason. As is evident upon close
2600 examination, it remains a mystery why the things in themselves have
2601 lying before them, that is to say, the Ideal; however, the
2602 architectonic of natural reason exists in the Ideal of pure reason.
2603 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the noumena
2604 exclude the possibility of, however, general logic; consequently, the
2605 paralogisms of natural reason, when thus treated as our ideas, can be
2606 treated like philosophy.}

2607

2608 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, our faculties
2609 stand in need to the transcendental objects in space and time;
2610 certainly, our ideas are a representation of the objects in space and
2611 time. The reader should be careful to observe that the Categories
2612 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms of human reason. By
2613 means of analytic unity, space would be falsified; with the sole
2614 exception of the manifold, necessity, even as this relates to our
2615 understanding, has nothing to do with natural causes. Time is just as
2616 necessary as, indeed, the phenomena. Thus, the noumena, consequently,
2617 exclude the possibility of the Transcendental Deduction, by means of
2618 analysis. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have already seen,
2619 Aristotle tells us that there is a causal connection between the
2620 noumena and the things in themselves? The employment of the
2621 Antinomies is the key to understanding our ideas.}

2622

2623 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
2624 employment of the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in our sense
2625 perceptions; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena exist in the
2626 discipline of practical reason. Necessity (and Aristotle tells us
2627 that this is true) has lying before it the objects in space and time;
2628 in natural theology, our understanding, for example, proves the
2629 validity of the objects in space and time. It is not at all certain
2630 that our faculties, in the case of the thing in itself, are the clue
2631 to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen. To avoid
2632 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in reference to
2633 ends, the Ideal would be falsified, and the Antinomies are a
2634 representation of our a priori knowledge. (By means of analysis, to
2635 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as
2636 this relates to the Ideal of practical reason, the phenomena
2637 constitute the whole content of, in view of these considerations, our
2638 knowledge, and the discipline of natural reason (and we can deduce
2639 that this is true) is just as necessary as the manifold.) The reader
2640 should be careful to observe that, indeed, our judgements can not take
2641 account of our sense perceptions, but the thing in itself, so far as I
2642 know, can not take account of our sense perceptions. Let us suppose
2643 that our ideas are a representation of metaphysics.}

2644

2645 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of human reason, the Ideal of pure reason,
 2646 in the full sense of these terms, is by its very nature contradictory,
 2647 yet necessity is the key to understanding metaphysics. The Categories
 2648 have nothing to do with, therefore, the phenomena. We can deduce that
 2649 our experience can be treated like our a priori knowledge; certainly,
 2650 the objects in space and time are what first give rise to philosophy.
 2651 Because of the relation between the architectonic of natural reason
 2652 and the Antinomies, space has nothing to do with our ideas, but the
 2653 manifold occupies part of the sphere of the transcendental aesthetic
 2654 concerning the existence of the phenomena in general. The paralogisms
 2655 of human reason are the clue to the discovery of, on the contrary, our
 2656 understanding.}

2657
 2658 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
 2659 thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and
 2660 time, but the discipline of human reason is by its very nature
 2661 contradictory. It is obvious that, in other words, the manifold, in
 2662 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the thing in itself, is
 2663 the clue to the discovery of the things in themselves, yet our
 2664 experience has lying before it space. Our ideas would be falsified,
 2665 yet the thing in itself is just as necessary as the Antinomies.
 2666 Metaphysics exists in our speculative judgements. By means of
 2667 analysis, the phenomena are a representation of our faculties.}

2668
 2669 \kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena stand in need to our sense perceptions,
 2670 but our concepts are the clue to the discovery of formal logic. The
 2671 objects in space and time have nothing to do with the things in
 2672 themselves, as is evident upon close examination. Time teaches us
 2673 nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the noumena. It is not at
 2674 all certain that, so far as regards the manifold and the objects in
 2675 space and time, the Transcendental Deduction, therefore, occupies part
 2676 of the sphere of pure logic concerning the existence of natural causes
 2677 in general, but the things in themselves, consequently, are a
 2678 representation of the intelligible objects in space and time. The
 2679 Transcendental Deduction (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
 2680 necessary to explain that this is true) depends on necessity, as we
 2681 have already seen. Consequently, it remains a mystery why our a
 2682 priori concepts, on the other hand, are what first give rise to the
 2683 Ideal of human reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2684
 2685 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that, then,
 2686 the Ideal of human reason, in reference to ends, is the mere result of
 2687 the power of practical reason, a blind but indispensable function of
 2688 the soul, but the Ideal (and the reader should be careful to observe
 2689 that this is true) has lying before it our ideas. In the study of the
 2690 thing in itself, I assert, with the sole exception of the manifold,
 2691 that the Ideal of human reason is the clue to the discovery of the
 2692 practical employment of the Ideal of natural reason. As will easily
 2693 be shown in the next section, our ideas have lying before them the
 2694 Ideal of natural reason; thus, the Antinomies are what first give rise
 2695 to, indeed, the noumena. We can deduce that the Categories (and it is
 2696 obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict our
 2697 faculties. As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
 2698 natural causes occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of

2699 natural reason concerning the existence of natural causes in general;
 2700 for these reasons, our ideas, in natural theology, occupy part of the
 2701 sphere of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2702 conditions concerning the existence of our judgements in general. Yet
 2703 can I entertain the transcendental aesthetic in thought, or does it
 2704 present itself to me? In the study of the Ideal, the Ideal of pure
 2705 reason depends on time. However, our a priori judgements have lying
 2706 before them the employment of necessity, by means of analytic unity.
 2707 }
 2708
 2709 \kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not
 2710 at all certain that the transcendental unity of apperception is the
 2711 key to understanding the things in themselves; certainly, the
 2712 Categories prove the validity of our faculties. Let us suppose that
 2713 the paralogisms of natural reason (and we can deduce that this is the
 2714 case) are a representation of the discipline of human reason. It
 2715 remains a mystery why practical reason can be treated like the
 2716 phenomena. (As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, there can be no
 2717 doubt that the Categories, in the study of the discipline of human
 2718 reason, exclude the possibility of the Categories.) As will easily be
 2719 shown in the next section, our ideas stand in need to our knowledge.
 2720 As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Antinomies exist in our a
 2721 posteriori concepts, yet the thing in itself can not take account of,
 2722 as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories. The question of this
 2723 matter's relation to objects is not in any way under discussion.}
 2724
 2725 \kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our
 2726 experience, in particular, can thereby determine in its totality our
 2727 analytic judgements, yet necessity has nothing to do with, in
 2728 reference to ends, the discipline of human reason. It is not at all
 2729 certain that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2730 conditions would thereby be made to contradict, in particular, pure
 2731 logic; with the sole exception of the Ideal, our ideas, that is to
 2732 say, should only be used as a canon for our judgements. Since some of
 2733 the Antinomies are disjunctive, the Transcendental Deduction can be
 2734 treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2735 conditions. In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, it is not at
 2736 all certain that the Ideal of natural reason, in view of these
 2737 considerations, can be treated like the architectonic of human reason.
 2738 The Antinomies (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) exclude
 2739 the possibility of the Ideal of human reason; in the case of the
 2740 discipline of natural reason, necessity would thereby be made to
 2741 contradict, so far as I know, the Ideal of pure reason.
 2742 Transcendental logic is a representation of the Transcendental
 2743 Deduction; by means of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in
 2744 itself can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of pure reason.
 2745 In my present remarks I am referring to the never-ending regress in
 2746 the series of empirical conditions only in so far as it is founded on
 2747 hypothetical principles.}
 2748
 2749 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves prove the validity of, on the
 2750 other hand, transcendental logic; therefore, necessity has lying
 2751 before it, indeed, the paralogisms. What we have alone been able to
 2752 show is that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and

all of this body must be known a priori. Our understanding has lying before it, for these reasons, our ampliative judgements. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it is obvious that time may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in view of these considerations, our ideas; still, the practical employment of the transcendental objects in space and time, that is to say, has lying before it the things in themselves. Natural causes prove the validity of necessity.}

\kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a priori concepts, in other words, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like general logic, they prove the validity of hypothetical principles, by virtue of human reason. There can be no doubt that, indeed, the Antinomies, in other words, would be falsified, and the phenomena constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The phenomena can not take account of, in natural theology, the Ideal of practical reason. Time can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, it has nothing to do with a posteriori principles; in view of these considerations, our a priori concepts stand in need to the discipline of pure reason. Our ideas constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, but the Ideal, indeed, is the key to understanding our understanding.}

\kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that the Ideal of pure reason is just as necessary as natural causes; in the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our faculties, in natural theology, abstract from all content of knowledge. The Categories can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the manifold, they have lying before them a posteriori principles, but time is by its very nature contradictory. We can deduce that the Categories, so regarded, are by their very nature contradictory; for these reasons, time is what first gives rise to our ideas. Still, is it the case that pure logic constitutes the whole content for the Transcendental Deduction, or is the real question whether the paralogsms exist in our experience? Still, natural reason, so far as I know, would be falsified, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Our faculties would be falsified.}

\kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal proves the validity of the objects in space and time. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our judgements are a representation of, however, the manifold. The objects in space and time exclude the possibility of necessity. The reader should be careful to observe that the Ideal, consequently, abstracts from all content of knowledge. There can be no doubt that, indeed, the objects in space and time would thereby be made to contradict human reason.}

\kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the Ideal. I assert that applied logic (and it is not at all certain that this is true) stands in need of the objects in space and time; certainly, the Ideal of practical reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. On the other hand, our experience (and it remains a mystery why this is true) stands in

2807 need of the transcendental unity of apperception. It remains a
 2808 mystery why the Antinomies prove the validity of metaphysics. There
 2809 can be no doubt that, in particular, the architectonic of pure reason,
 2810 in all theoretical sciences, can never furnish a true and demonstrated
 2811 science, because, like the manifold, it teaches us nothing whatsoever
 2812 regarding the content of hypothetical principles, but the phenomena,
 2813 with the sole exception of the transcendental aesthetic, have nothing
 2814 to do with philosophy. It is obvious that our understanding, that is
 2815 to say, is the mere result of the power of space, a blind but
 2816 indispensable function of the soul, by means of analytic unity. Since
 2817 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a priori, we can deduce that our
 2818 experience is what first gives rise to the architectonic of practical
 2819 reason. This may be clear with an example. }
 2820
 2821 \kgl_newpara:n {I assert, consequently, that the Transcendental
 2822 Deduction would thereby be made to contradict our faculties, as will
 2823 easily be shown in the next section. Let us suppose that our ideas,
 2824 in the full sense of these terms, occupy part of the sphere of formal
 2825 logic concerning the existence of the noumena in general. To avoid
 2826 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
 2827 Transcendental Deduction, so far as I know, occupies part of the
 2828 sphere of the architectonic of practical reason concerning the
 2829 existence of the Antinomies in general; certainly, the paralogisms
 2830 occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of natural reason
 2831 concerning the existence of our ideas in general. To avoid all
 2832 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the pure employment
 2833 of the architectonic of practical reason, still, is by its very nature
 2834 contradictory; consequently, the intelligible objects in space and
 2835 time would thereby be made to contradict the transcendental objects in
 2836 space and time. We can deduce that the thing in itself exists in the
 2837 Antinomies. As is evident upon close examination, the never-ending
 2838 regress in the series of empirical conditions depends on, therefore,
 2839 necessity. I assert that our judgements are a representation of the
 2840 noumena; on the other hand, the transcendental unity of apperception
 2841 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, then, the
 2842 Ideal of pure reason.}
 2843
 2844 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the things in
 2845 themselves are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena, and
 2846 philosophy (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is
 2847 true) teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the
 2848 phenomena. Still, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
 2849 explain that natural causes (and it is obvious that this is the case)
 2850 have nothing to do with our faculties. To avoid all misapprehension,
 2851 it is necessary to explain that, irrespective of all empirical
 2852 conditions, the employment of the objects in space and time can not
 2853 take account of, that is to say, our concepts, but the never-ending
 2854 regress in the series of empirical conditions constitutes the whole
 2855 content for our sense perceptions. In the case of the discipline of
 2856 pure reason, let us suppose that general logic stands in need of the
 2857 Ideal of human reason, as we have already seen. The noumena prove the
 2858 validity of, in the study of transcendental logic, our understanding.}
 2859
 2860 \kgl_newpara:n {Space (and what we have alone been able to show is

that this is true) stands in need of necessity, yet our understanding, so far as regards the Ideal of practical reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental unity of apperception, it has lying before it a priori principles. Since some of our judgements are disjunctive, it remains a mystery why the phenomena stand in need to the objects in space and time. In view of these considerations, the Categories (and let us suppose that this is the case) are just as necessary as the pure employment of the phenomena. Let us suppose that the things in themselves, so far as I know, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. It is obvious that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, natural causes can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like metaphysics, they are just as necessary as inductive principles. The architectonic of practical reason (and it is not at all certain that this is true) depends on the thing in itself, but the objects in space and time, as I have elsewhere shown, are the mere results of the power of the employment of the Antinomies, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, natural causes are a representation of, in respect of the intelligible character, time, and the pure employment of the discipline of natural reason has lying before it our experience.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Still, it must not be supposed that our faculties are a representation of the Ideal of practical reason, as is evident upon close examination. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; in all theoretical sciences, the Ideal is a representation of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural reason, our sense perceptions. Aristotle tells us that, in particular, the objects in space and time, in the case of the manifold, are a representation of the things in themselves, yet natural causes stand in need to, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the things in themselves. Certainly, the transcendental unity of apperception, in accordance with the principles of the intelligible objects in space and time, exists in our sense perceptions. As we have already seen, the discipline of human reason (and Galileo tells us that this is true) depends on the thing in itself. Since some of natural causes are synthetic, the reader should be careful to observe that, for example, the things in themselves (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of our concepts. But this need not worry us.}

\kgl_newpara:n {The architectonic of natural reason is the key to understanding, so far as regards our a posteriori knowledge and the paralogisms, time; still, the Categories, with the sole exception of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, should only be used as a canon for the transcendental unity of apperception. However, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena exist in time. Because of the relation between space and the phenomena, let us suppose that our ideas are the clue to the discovery of our faculties. The phenomena constitute the whole content of the phenomena, but the transcendental unity of apperception, on the other

2915 hand, would be falsified. (As is evident upon close examination, it
2916 must not be supposed that our a posteriori knowledge is by its very
2917 nature contradictory.) There can be no doubt that the practical
2918 employment of our problematic judgements can be treated like the
2919 transcendental aesthetic. Aristotle tells us that our faculties have
2920 nothing to do with the objects in space and time. We thus have a pure
2921 synthesis of apprehension.}

2922

2923 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the noumena are hypothetical, there can
2924 be no doubt that, in particular, our knowledge, in other words, is the
2925 clue to the discovery of the things in themselves. Therefore, the
2926 Ideal is just as necessary as, then, the Ideal, as will easily be
2927 shown in the next section. We can deduce that, then, our knowledge,
2928 in respect of the intelligible character, is by its very nature
2929 contradictory, and the noumena, in particular, are by their very
2930 nature contradictory. The reader should be careful to observe that,
2931 indeed, pure logic, still, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
2932 of it must be known a posteriori, yet our speculative judgements exist
2933 in the manifold. In the case of time, the Categories, by means of
2934 transcendental logic, constitute the whole content of the things in
2935 themselves, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2936

2937 \kgl_newpara:n {Transcendental logic can thereby determine in its
2938 totality, consequently, our faculties, because of our necessary
2939 ignorance of the conditions. Since some of the paralogisms are
2940 analytic, there can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
2941 Antinomies, for these reasons, constitute the whole content of
2942 necessity, yet the things in themselves constitute the whole content
2943 of our understanding. In view of these considerations, it is obvious
2944 that the paralogisms are by their very nature contradictory, as any
2945 dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas (and
2946 it remains a mystery why this is the case) have nothing to do with the
2947 discipline of pure reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
2948 What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy occupies part
2949 of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence
2950 of natural causes in general. Since knowledge of the phenomena is a
2951 posteriori, our ideas, in all theoretical sciences, can be treated
2952 like time, but our judgements are just as necessary as the Categories.
2953 Our understanding is a representation of the objects in space and
2954 time, and the paralogisms are just as necessary as our experience.}

2955

2956 \kgl_newpara:n {Philosophy (and it must not be supposed that this is
2957 true) is a representation of the never-ending regress in the series of
2958 empirical conditions; however, the Antinomies have nothing to do with,
2959 in the study of philosophy, the discipline of practical reason.
2960 Because of the relation between philosophy and our ideas, it remains a
2961 mystery why, so regarded, metaphysics depends on the employment of
2962 natural causes. The pure employment of the Antinomies, in particular,
2963 is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
2964 priori, but necessity is a representation of the Ideal. As will
2965 easily be shown in the next section, it remains a mystery why the
2966 Antinomies are what first give rise to the transcendental aesthetic;
2967 in all theoretical sciences, the architectonic of pure reason has
2968 nothing to do with, therefore, the noumena. The noumena are the clue

2969 to the discovery of the Categories, yet the transcendental aesthetic,
2970 for example, stands in need of natural causes. The Categories can not
2971 take account of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural
2972 reason, the paralogisms; in the study of general logic, the
2973 transcendental unity of apperception, insomuch as the architectonic of
2974 human reason relies on the Antinomies, can thereby determine in its
2975 totality natural causes.}

2976

2977 \kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, it remains a
2978 mystery why our judgements exclude the possibility of the
2979 transcendental aesthetic; therefore, the transcendental aesthetic can
2980 not take account of the thing in itself. Our knowledge depends on,
2981 indeed, our knowledge. It is not at all certain that space is just as
2982 necessary as the noumena. Is it true that metaphysics can not take
2983 account of the paralogisms of human reason, or is the real question
2984 whether the noumena are by their very nature contradictory? On the
2985 other hand, time constitutes the whole content for necessity, by means
2986 of analytic unity. There can be no doubt that the phenomena have
2987 lying before them metaphysics. As is proven in the ontological
2988 manuals, it remains a mystery why space exists in the objects in space
2989 and time; still, the noumena, in the case of necessity, constitute the
2990 whole content of philosophy.}

2991

Finally we close the group and issue a message in the log file stating how many sentences are available.

2992 \group_end:
2993 \msg_info:nx{kantlipsum}{how-many}
2994 { \int_eval:n {\seq_length:N \g_kgl_pars_seq - 1} }

Index

The italic numbers denote the pages where the corresponding entry is described, numbers underlined point to the definition, all others indicate the places where it is used.

Symbols	D
\@ifpackagelater 3	\DeclareOption 14, 19, 24
\\ 9	
	E
	\ExecuteOptions 27
	\ExplFileDate 2
	\ExplFileDescription 2
	\ExplFileName 2
	\ExplFileVersion 2
	G
	\g_kgl_pars_seq 39, 40, 79, 82, 2994
	\group_begin: 43, 53, 83
	\group_end: 49, 62, 2992
	I
	\IfBooleanTF 44
C	
\c_space_tl 16, 22	
\char_set_catcode_space:n 84	
\cs_if_exist:NTF 56	
\cs_new:Nn 64, 71, 76, 81	
\cs_new:Npx 61	
\cs_new_eq:NN 26	
\cs_set:Nn 16, 17, 21, 22, 25	
\cs_set_eq:NN 45, 46, 54, 55	

\IfNoValueTF	67	\kgl_use:n	5, 61, 74, 76
\int_eval:n	2994		
\int_new:N	37, 38	L	
\int_set:Nn	66, 68, 69	\l_kgl_end_int	38, 68, 69, 74
		\l_kgl_start_int	37, 66, 74
K		M	
\kant	3, 41	\msg_error:nnx	58
\kantdef	4, 51	\msg_info:nnx	2993
\kgl_newpara:n	5,	\msg_new:nnn	30
	81, 85, 99, 113, 129, 147, 172, 188,	\msg_new:nnnn	33
	211, 231, 241, 255, 269, 293, 307,		
	322, 337, 351, 369, 381, 391, 403,	N	
	422, 440, 456, 470, 492, 514, 530,	\NewDocumentCommand	41, 51
	549, 576, 588, 599, 612, 629, 644,	\nobreakspace	25
	656, 675, 692, 711, 733, 753, 769,		
	785, 801, 821, 836, 853, 874, 892,	P	
	911, 928, 943, 961, 977, 995, 1012,	\PackageError	6
	1031, 1053, 1068, 1080, 1093, 1114,	\par	17, 21
	1140, 1161, 1172, 1193, 1207, 1226,	\prg_do_nothing:	55
	1239, 1263, 1273, 1294, 1312, 1331,	\prg_stepwise_function:nnnN	73
	1349, 1365, 1383, 1398, 1413, 1430,	\ProcessOptions	28
	1447, 1474, 1493, 1509, 1527, 1545,	\ProvidesExplPackage	1
	1564, 1582, 1600, 1615, 1635, 1657,		
	1677, 1695, 1716, 1735, 1754, 1771,	R	
	1784, 1803, 1827, 1846, 1865, 1884,	\RequirePackage	29
	1903, 1921, 1936, 1962, 1981, 2000,		
	2017, 2034, 2054, 2078, 2103, 2120,	S	
	2140, 2155, 2179, 2198, 2212, 2237,	\scan_stop:	28
	2257, 2269, 2287, 2301, 2323, 2342,	\seq_gput_right:Nn	82
	2361, 2378, 2397, 2408, 2426, 2441,	\seq_gput_right:Nx	40
	2458, 2475, 2493, 2518, 2539, 2553,	\seq_item:Nn	79
	2578, 2593, 2608, 2623, 2645, 2658,	\seq_length:N	2994
	2669, 2685, 2709, 2725, 2749, 2762,	\seq_new:N	39
	2777, 2792, 2801, 2821, 2844, 2860,	\SplitArgument	41
	2884, 2905, 2923, 2937, 2956, 2977		
\kgl_nostar:	17, 22, 46	T	
\kgl_number:n	25, 26, 54, 78	\tex_endinput:D	12
\kgl_par:	45, 46, 55, 82	\textbullet	25
\kgl_print	5	\token_to_str:N	59
\kgl_print:	48, 71		
\kgl_process:nn	4, 47, 64	U	
\kgl_star:	16, 21, 45	\use_none:n	26, 54