

The `kantlipsum` package

Dummy text in Kantian style*

Enrico Gregorio[†]

Released 2011/11/18

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*.

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 0.1last revised 2011/11/18.

[†]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.

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.

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 need also 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   {\cs_set:Nn \kgl_star: { \c_space_tl }
16    \cs_set:Nn \kgl_nostar: { \par } }
17 \DeclareOption{ nopar }
18   { \cs_set:Nn \kgl_star: { \par }
19     \cs_set:Nn \kgl_nostar: { \c_space_tl } }
20 \DeclareOption{ numbers }
21   { \cs_set:Nn \kgl_number:n {#1-\textbullet\space} }
22 \cs_new_eq:NN \kgl_number:n \use_none:n
23 \ExecuteOptions{par}
24 \ProcessOptions \scan_stop:
   The xparse package is required.
25 \RequirePackage{xparse}

```

3.2 Variables and constants

The `\l_kgl_start_tl` variable will contain the starting number for processing, while `\l_kgl_end_tl` the ending number. The constant `\c_kgl_total_tl` stores the total number of available pseudokantian sentences.

```

26 \tl_new:N \l_kgl_start_tl
27 \tl_new:N \l_kgl_end_tl
28 \tl_new:N \l_kgl_total_tl

```

There are many other constants containing the various sentences, declaring them is just a waste of time; they will be set later.

3.3 Messages

We define two messages.

```

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

```

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.

```

36 \NewDocumentCommand{\kant}{s>\SplitArgument{1}{-}}o{
37   \group_begin:
38   \IfBooleanTF{#1}
39     { \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_par: \kgl_star: }
40     { \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_par: \kgl_nostar: }
41   \IfNoValueTF{#2}
42     { \tl_set:Nn \l_kgl_start_tl {1} \tl_set:Nn \l_kgl_end_tl {7} }
43     { \kgl_process:nn #2 }
44   \kgl_print:
45   \group_end:
46 }

```

\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 having the number given as second argument, which is stored in a constant named `\c_kgl_i_tl` (number 1) or `\c_kgl_ii_tl` (number 2) and so on, by converting the number to a Roman numeral. If the given control sequence is already defined we issue an error and don't perform the definition.

```
47 \NewDocumentCommand{\kantdef}{mm}{  
48   \group_begin:  
49   \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_number:n \use_none:n  
50   \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_par: \prg_do_nothing:  
51   \cs_if_exist:NTF #1  
52     { \msg_error:nnx {kantlipsum}{already-defined}  
53       {\token_to_str:N #1}  
54     }  
55     { \cs_new:Npx #1 { \cs:w c_kgl_\int_to_roman:w #2 _tl \cs_end: } }  
56   \group_end:  
57 }
```

3.5 Internal functions

\kgl_process:nn

The function `\kgl_process:nn` sets the variables `\l_kgl_start_tl` and `\l_kgl_end_tl`. 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.

```
58 \cs_new:Nn \kgl_process:nn {  
59   \tl_set:Nn \l_kgl_start_tl {#1}  
60   \IfNoValueTF{#2}  
61     { \tl_set:Nn \l_kgl_end_tl {#1} }  
62     { \tl_set:Nn \l_kgl_end_tl {#2} }  
63 }
```

\kgl_print

The printing routine is in the function `\kgl_print::`; we start a loop printing `c_kgl_x_tl` for all Roman numerals `x` in the specified range.

```
64 \cs_new_protected:Nn \kgl_print: {  
65   \int_set:Nn \l_tmpa_int {\l_kgl_start_tl}  
66   \int_do_until:nNnn \l_tmpa_int > \l_kgl_end_tl  
67     {  
68       \cs:w c_kgl_\int_to_roman:w \l_tmpa_int _tl \cs_end:  
69       \int_incr:N \l_tmpa_int  
70     }  
71 }
```

`\kgl_newpara:n`

The `\kgl_newpara:n` function defines the constants storing the sentences. It increments the counter `\l_tmpa_int` and defines, say, `\c_kgl_xxxxii_tl` to expand to `\kgl_number:n {42}`*<text of the 42nd sentence>*`\kgl_par:`

```
72 \cs_new:Nn \kgl_newpara:n {  
73   \int_incr:N \l_tmpa_int  
74   \tl_gset:cx {c_kgl_\int_to_roman:w \l_tmpa_int _tl}  
75   {\exp_not:N \kgl_number:n {\int_to_arabic:n \l_tmpa_int}  
76   \exp_not:n {#1\kgl_par:} }  
77 }
```

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.

```
78 \group_begin:  
79 \int_set:Nn \l_tmpa_int {0}  
80 \char_set_catcode_space:n {'\ }
```

Then we provide all of the sentences with the pattern

`\kgl_newpara:n {<text>}`

```
81 \kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Ideal of  
82 practical reason is a representation of, as far as I know, the things  
83 in themselves; as I have shown elsewhere, the phenomena should only be  
84 used as a canon for our understanding. The paralogisms of practical  
85 reason are what first give rise to the architectonic of practical  
86 reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, reason would  
87 thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the  
88 Ideal of practical reason, yet the manifold depends on the phenomena.  
89 Necessity depends on, when thus treated as the practical employment of  
90 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, time.  
91 Human reason depends on our sense perceptions, by means of analytic  
92 unity. There can be no doubt that the objects in space and time are  
93 what first give rise to human reason.}  
94  
95 \kgl_newpara:n {Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do  
96 with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a  
97 posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of  
98 apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason,  
99 by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological manuals,  
100 it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the  
101 validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is  
102 that, our understanding depends on the Categories. It remains a  
103 mystery why the Ideal stands in need of reason. It must not be  
104 supposed that our faculties have lying before them, in the case of the  
105 Ideal, the Antinomies; so, the transcendental aesthetic is just as  
106 necessary as our experience. By means of the Ideal, our sense  
107 perceptions are by their very nature contradictory.}  
108  
109 \kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things  
110 in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a  
111 representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the  
112 paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have
```

113 lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because
 114 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would
 115 thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the
 116 Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions.
 117 (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated
 118 science, because, like time, it depends on analytic principles.) So,
 119 it must not be supposed that our experience depends on, so, our sense
 120 perceptions, by means of analysis. Space constitutes the whole content
 121 for our sense perceptions, and time occupies part of the sphere of the
 122 Ideal concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in
 123 general.}

124
 125 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, what we have alone been able
 126 to show is that the objects in space and time would be falsified; what
 127 we have alone been able to show is that, our judgements are what first
 128 give rise to metaphysics. As I have shown elsewhere, Aristotle tells
 129 us that the objects in space and time, in the full sense of these
 130 terms, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, indeed, our
 131 problematic judgements, indeed, can be treated like our concepts. As
 132 any dedicated reader can clearly see, our knowledge can be treated
 133 like the transcendental unity of apperception, but the phenomena
 134 occupy part of the sphere of the manifold concerning the existence of
 135 natural causes in general. Whence comes the architectonic of natural
 136 reason, the solution of which involves the relation between necessity
 137 and the Categories? Natural causes (and it is not at all certain that
 138 this is the case) constitute the whole content for the paralogisms.
 139 This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental
 140 philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the
 141 fact may suffice.}

142
 143 \kgl_newpara:n {Therefore, we can deduce that the objects in space and
 144 time (and I assert, however, that this is the case) have lying before
 145 them the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance
 146 of the conditions, it must not be supposed that, then, formal logic
 147 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true) is a
 148 representation of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 149 conditions, but the discipline of pure reason, in so far as this
 150 expounds the contradictory rules of metaphysics, depends on the
 151 Antinomies. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, therefore, can
 152 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
 153 like the transcendental unity of apperception, they constitute the
 154 whole content for a priori principles; for these reasons, our
 155 experience is just as necessary as, in accordance with the principles
 156 of our a priori knowledge, philosophy. The objects in space and time
 157 abstract from all content of knowledge. Has it ever been suggested
 158 that it remains a mystery why there is no relation between the
 159 Antinomies and the phenomena? It must not be supposed that the
 160 Antinomies (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are
 161 the clue to the discovery of philosophy, because of our necessary
 162 ignorance of the conditions. As I have shown elsewhere, to avoid all
 163 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our understanding
 164 (and it must not be supposed that this is true) is what first gives
 165 rise to the architectonic of pure reason, as is evident upon close
 166 examination.}

167
168 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are what first give rise to
169 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural
170 reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception
171 abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these
172 considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key
173 to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all
174 empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our
175 disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure
176 logic, in the case of the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from
177 all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in
178 accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms,
179 time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be
180 treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be
181 supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise
182 to the employment of pure reason.}

183
184 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all
185 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the
186 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a
187 representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in
188 themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It
189 remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series
190 of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of
191 the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never
192 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
193 architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic
194 principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time
195 is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would
196 thereby be made to contradict the Ideal of practical reason. On the
197 other hand, natural causes can not take account of, consequently, the
198 Antinomies, as will easily be shown in the next section.
199 Consequently, the Ideal of practical reason (and I assert that this is
200 true) excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our
201 experience would thereby be made to contradict, for example, our
202 ideas, but the transcendental objects in space and time (and let us
203 suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of
204 necessity. But the proof of this is a task from which we can here be
205 absolved.}

206
207 \kgl_newpara:n {Thus, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of, on
208 the other hand, natural causes, as will easily be shown in the next
209 section. Still, the reader should be careful to observe that the
210 phenomena have lying before them the intelligible objects in space and
211 time, because of the relation between the manifold and the noumena.
212 As is evident upon close examination, Aristotle tells us that, in
213 reference to ends, our judgements (and the reader should be careful to
214 observe that this is the case) constitute the whole content of the
215 empirical objects in space and time. Our experience, with the sole
216 exception of necessity, exists in metaphysics; therefore, metaphysics
217 exists in our experience. (It must not be supposed that the thing in
218 itself (and I assert that this is true) may not contradict itself, but
219 it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the
220 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 parallogisms 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 parallogisms 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.}

\kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, certainly, our a priori knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Our faculties abstract from all content of knowledge; for these reasons, the discipline of human reason stands in need of the transcendental aesthetic. There can be no doubt that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on our a posteriori concepts, philosophy, when thus treated as the things in themselves, exists in our hypothetical judgements, yet our a posteriori concepts are what first give rise to the phenomena. Philosophy (and I assert that this is true) excludes the possibility

275 of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, as
276 will easily be shown in the next section. Still, is it true that the
277 transcendental aesthetic can not take account of the objects in space
278 and time, or is the real question whether the phenomena should only be
279 used as a canon for the never-ending regress in the series of
280 empirical conditions? By means of analytic unity, the Transcendental
281 Deduction, still, is the mere result of the power of the
282 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
283 soul, but our faculties abstract from all content of a posteriori
284 knowledge. It remains a mystery why, then, the discipline of human
285 reason, in other words, is what first gives rise to the transcendental
286 aesthetic, yet our faculties have lying before them the architectonic
287 of human reason.}

288
289 \kgl_newpara:n {However, we can deduce that our experience (and it
290 must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our
291 experience, as we have already seen. On the other hand, it is not at
292 all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the
293 practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the
294 noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first
295 give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is
296 necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a
297 true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural
298 reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the
299 writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in
300 respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space
301 and time.}

302
303 \kgl_newpara:n {Our ideas, in the case of the Ideal of pure reason,
304 are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time
305 can not take account of our understanding, and philosophy excludes the
306 possibility of, certainly, space. I assert that our ideas, by means
307 of philosophy, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of
308 this body must be known a posteriori, by means of analysis. It must
309 not be supposed that space is by its very nature contradictory. Space
310 would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of the manifold, the
311 manifold. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us
312 that, in accordance with the principles of the discipline of human
313 reason, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
314 has lying before it our experience. This could not be passed over in
315 a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely
316 critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.}

317
318 \kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of our faculties is a posteriori, pure
319 logic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, indeed,
320 the architectonic of human reason. As we have already seen, we can
321 deduce that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the Ideal of
322 human reason is what first gives rise to, indeed, natural causes, yet
323 the thing in itself can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
324 because, like necessity, it is the clue to the discovery of
325 disjunctive principles. On the other hand, the manifold depends on
326 the paralogisms. Our faculties exclude the possibility of, insomuch
327 as philosophy relies on natural causes, the discipline of natural
328 reason. In all theoretical sciences, what we have alone been able to

329 show is that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of
 330 our judgements, as will easily be shown in the next section. This is
 331 what chiefly concerns us.}
 332
 333 \kgl_newpara:n {Time (and let us suppose that this is true) is the
 334 clue to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen.
 335 Since knowledge of our faculties is a priori, to avoid all
 336 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the empirical objects
 337 in space and time can not take account of, in the case of the Ideal of
 338 natural reason, the manifold. It must not be supposed that pure
 339 reason stands in need of, certainly, our sense perceptions. On the
 340 other hand, our ampliative judgements would thereby be made to
 341 contradict, in the full sense of these terms, our hypothetical
 342 judgements. I assert, still, that philosophy is a representation of,
 343 however, formal logic; in the case of the manifold, the objects in
 344 space and time can be treated like the paralogisms of natural reason.
 345 This is what chiefly concerns us.}
 346
 347 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between pure logic and natural
 348 causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that,
 349 even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes
 350 the whole content for our concepts, but the Ideal of practical reason
 351 may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
 352 contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why
 353 natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by
 354 means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as
 355 our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions,
 356 depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle.
 357 It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is
 358 the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The
 359 Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet
 360 general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing
 361 to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to
 362 the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on
 363 analytic principles.}
 364
 365 \kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of our a priori knowledge, our
 366 faculties have nothing to do with our faculties. Pure reason (and we
 367 can deduce that this is true) would thereby be made to contradict the
 368 phenomena. As we have already seen, let us suppose that the
 369 transcendental aesthetic can thereby determine in its totality the
 370 objects in space and time. We can deduce that, that is to say, our
 371 experience is a representation of the paralogisms, and our
 372 hypothetical judgements constitute the whole content of our concepts.
 373 However, it is obvious that time can be treated like our a priori
 374 knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Philosophy has nothing to do
 375 with natural causes.}
 376
 377 \kgl_newpara:n {By means of analysis, our faculties stand in need to,
 378 indeed, the empirical objects in space and time. The objects in space
 379 and time, for these reasons, have nothing to do with our
 380 understanding. There can be no doubt that the noumena can not take
 381 account of the objects in space and time; consequently, the Ideal of
 382 natural reason has lying before it the noumena. By means of analysis,

383 the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to, therefore,
384 space, yet our sense perceptions exist in the discipline of practical
385 reason.}

386

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

398

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

417

418 \kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, in the case
419 of philosophy, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must
420 be known a posteriori. Thus, the objects in space and time, inasmuch
421 as the discipline of practical reason relies on the Antinomies,
422 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must
423 be known a priori. Applied logic is a representation of, in natural
424 theology, our experience. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
425 Hume tells us that, that is to say, the Categories (and Aristotle
426 tells us that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the
427 transcendental aesthetic. (Because of our necessary ignorance of the
428 conditions, the paralogisms prove the validity of time.) As is shown
429 in the writings of Hume, it must not be supposed that, in reference to
430 ends, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must
431 be known a priori. By means of analysis, it is not at all certain
432 that our a priori knowledge is just as necessary as our ideas. In my
433 present remarks I am referring to time only in so far as it is founded
434 on disjunctive principles.}

435

436 \kgl_newpara:n {The discipline of pure reason is what first gives rise

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

451
 452 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves have lying before them the
 453 Antinomies, by virtue of human reason. By means of the transcendental
 454 aesthetic, let us suppose that the discipline of natural reason
 455 depends on natural causes, because of the relation between the
 456 transcendental aesthetic and the things in themselves. In view of
 457 these considerations, it is obvious that natural causes are the clue
 458 to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception, by means
 459 of analysis. We can deduce that our faculties, in particular, can be
 460 treated like the thing in itself; in the study of metaphysics, the
 461 thing in itself proves the validity of space. And can I entertain the
 462 Transcendental Deduction in thought, or does it present itself to me?
 463 By means of analysis, the phenomena can not take account of natural
 464 causes. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}

465
 466 \kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the things in themselves are a
 467 posteriori, there can be no doubt that, when thus treated as our
 468 understanding, pure reason depends on, still, the Ideal of natural
 469 reason, and our speculative judgements constitute a body of
 470 demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
 471 posteriori. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, it is not at
 472 all certain that, in accordance with the principles of natural causes,
 473 the Transcendental Deduction is a body of demonstrated science, and
 474 all of it must be known a posteriori, yet our concepts are the clue to
 475 the discovery of the objects in space and time. Therefore, it is
 476 obvious that formal logic would be falsified. By means of analytic
 477 unity, it remains a mystery why, in particular, metaphysics teaches us
 478 nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal. The phenomena,
 479 on the other hand, would thereby be made to contradict the
 480 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As is
 481 shown in the writings of Aristotle, philosophy is a representation of,
 482 on the contrary, the employment of the Categories. Because of the
 483 relation between the transcendental unity of apperception and the
 484 paralogisms of natural reason, the paralogisms of human reason, in the
 485 study of the Transcendental Deduction, would be falsified, but
 486 metaphysics abstracts from all content of knowledge.}

487
 488 \kgl_newpara:n {Since some of natural causes are disjunctive, the
 489 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is the key
 490 to understanding, in particular, the noumena. By means of analysis,

the Categories (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) exclude the possibility of our faculties. Let us suppose that the objects in space and time, irrespective of all empirical conditions, exist in the architectonic of natural reason, because of the relation between the architectonic of natural reason and our a posteriori concepts. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that, so regarded, our sense perceptions (and let us suppose that this is the case) are a representation of the practical employment of natural causes. (I assert that time constitutes the whole content for, in all theoretical sciences, our understanding, as will easily be shown in the next section.) With the sole exception of our knowledge, the reader should be careful to observe that natural causes (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) can not take account of our sense perceptions, as will easily be shown in the next section. Certainly, natural causes would thereby be made to contradict, with the sole exception of necessity, the things in themselves, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. But to this matter no answer is possible.}

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

\kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, what we have alone been able to show is that the architectonic of practical reason is the clue to the discovery of, still, the manifold, by means of analysis. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a priori, the things in themselves have lying before them, for example, the paralogisms of human reason. Let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of, by means of philosophy, necessity. Our concepts (and the reader should be careful to observe that this is the case) 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.}

545 \kgl_newpara:n {I assert, however, that our a posteriori concepts (and
 546 it is obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to
 547 contradict the discipline of practical reason; however, the things in
 548 themselves, however, constitute the whole content of philosophy. As
 549 will easily be shown in the next section, the Antinomies would thereby
 550 be made to contradict our understanding; in all theoretical sciences,
 551 metaphysics, irrespective of all empirical conditions, excludes the
 552 possibility of space. It is not at all certain that necessity (and it
 553 is obvious that this is true) constitutes the whole content for the
 554 objects in space and time; consequently, the paralogisms of practical
 555 reason, however, exist in the Antinomies. The reader should be
 556 careful to observe that transcendental logic, in so far as this
 557 expounds the universal rules of formal logic, can never furnish a true
 558 and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it may not
 559 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
 560 contradictions with disjunctive principles. (Because of our necessary
 561 ignorance of the conditions, the thing in itself is what first gives
 562 rise to, insomuch as the transcendental aesthetic relies on the
 563 objects in space and time, the transcendental objects in space and
 564 time; thus, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 565 conditions excludes the possibility of philosophy.) As we have
 566 already seen, time depends on the objects in space and time; in the
 567 study of the architectonic of pure reason, the phenomena are the clue
 568 to the discovery of our understanding. Because of our necessary
 569 ignorance of the conditions, I assert that, indeed, the architectonic
 570 of natural reason, as I have elsewhere shown, would be falsified.}
 571

572 \kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, the transcendental unity of
 573 apperception has nothing to do with the Antinomies. As will easily be
 574 shown in the next section, our sense perceptions are by their very
 575 nature contradictory, but our ideas, with the sole exception of human
 576 reason, have nothing to do with our sense perceptions. Metaphysics is
 577 the key to understanding natural causes, by means of analysis. It is
 578 not at all certain that the paralogisms of human reason prove the
 579 validity of, thus, the noumena, since all of our a posteriori
 580 judgements are a priori. We can deduce that, indeed, the objects in
 581 space and time can not take account of the Transcendental Deduction,
 582 but our knowledge, on the other hand, would be falsified.}
 583

584 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, our understanding is the clue
 585 to the discovery of necessity. On the other hand, the Ideal of pure
 586 reason is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known
 587 a posteriori, as is evident upon close examination. It is obvious
 588 that the transcendental aesthetic, certainly, is a body of
 589 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori; in view
 590 of these considerations, the noumena are the clue to the discovery of,
 591 so far as I know, natural causes. In the case of space, our
 592 experience depends on the Ideal of natural reason, as we have already
 593 seen.}
 594

595 \kgl_newpara:n {For these reasons, space is the key to understanding
 596 the thing in itself. Our sense perceptions abstract from all content
 597 of a priori knowledge, but the phenomena can never, as a whole,
 598 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they are

599 just as necessary as disjunctive principles. Our problematic
 600 judgements constitute the whole content of time. By means of
 601 analysis, our ideas are by their very nature contradictory, and our a
 602 posteriori concepts are a representation of natural causes. I assert
 603 that the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
 604 contradict, so far as regards the thing in itself, the Transcendental
 605 Deduction; in natural theology, the noumena are the clue to the
 606 discovery of, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction.}

607
 608 \kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
 609 explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the
 610 transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet
 611 the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental
 612 Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would
 613 thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our
 614 ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the
 615 validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings
 616 of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that,
 617 insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories,
 618 the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to
 619 contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 620 conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our
 621 faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the
 622 writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands
 623 in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.}

624
 625 \kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the
 626 case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural
 627 theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
 628 content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural
 629 theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the
 630 Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this
 631 relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts
 632 would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in
 633 the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory.
 634 Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a
 635 representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words,
 636 has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us
 637 that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the
 638 Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.}

639
 640 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves can not take account of the
 641 Transcendental Deduction. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious
 642 that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical
 643 sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the
 644 transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these
 645 terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense
 646 perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some
 647 of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the
 648 possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in
 649 themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles
 650 of philosophy, our sense perceptions.}

651
 652 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, philosophy is

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

670
 671 \kgl_newpara:n {By means of the transcendental aesthetic, it remains a
 672 mystery why the phenomena (and it is not at all certain that this is
 673 the case) are the clue to the discovery of the never-ending regress in
 674 the series of empirical conditions. In all theoretical sciences,
 675 metaphysics exists in the objects in space and time, because of the
 676 relation between formal logic and our synthetic judgements. The
 677 Categories would thereby be made to contradict the paralogisms, as any
 678 dedicated reader can clearly see. Therefore, there can be no doubt
 679 that the paralogisms have nothing to do with, so far as regards the
 680 Ideal and our faculties, the paralogisms, because of our necessary
 681 ignorance of the conditions. It must not be supposed that the objects
 682 in space and time occupy part of the sphere of necessity concerning
 683 the existence of the noumena in general. In natural theology, the
 684 things in themselves, therefore, are by their very nature
 685 contradictory, by virtue of natural reason. This is the sense in
 686 which it is to be understood in this work.}

687
 688 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose
 689 that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts
 690 are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to
 691 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in
 692 particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of
 693 natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful
 694 to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in
 695 space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our
 696 understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the
 697 thing in itself abstracts from all content of a posteriori knowledge.
 698 We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can
 699 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal
 700 of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality
 701 speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as
 702 necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, inasmuch as the
 703 Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove
 704 the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to
 705 understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

706

707 \kgl_newpara:n {Natural causes, when thus treated as the things in
 708 themselves, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge, by
 709 means of analytic unity. Our a posteriori knowledge, in other words,
 710 is the key to understanding the Antinomies. As we have already seen,
 711 what we have alone been able to show is that, so far as I know, the
 712 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the
 713 manifold. The things in themselves are the clue to the discovery of,
 714 in the case of the Ideal of natural reason, our concepts. To avoid
 715 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, so far as
 716 regards philosophy, the discipline of human reason, for these reasons,
 717 is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
 718 priori, but our faculties, consequently, would thereby be made to
 719 contradict the Antinomies. It remains a mystery why our understanding
 720 excludes the possibility of, inasmuch as the Ideal relies on the
 721 objects in space and time, our concepts. It is not at all certain
 722 that the pure employment of the objects in space and time (and the
 723 reader should be careful to observe that this is true) is the clue to
 724 the discovery of the architectonic of pure reason. Let us suppose
 725 that natural reason is a representation of, inasmuch as space relies
 726 on the paralogisms, the Transcendental Deduction, by means of
 727 analysis.}
 728
 729 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, the Ideal constitutes the
 730 whole content for the transcendental unity of apperception. By means
 731 of analytic unity, let us suppose that, when thus treated as space,
 732 our synthetic judgements, therefore, would be falsified, and the
 733 objects in space and time are what first give rise to our sense
 734 perceptions. Let us suppose that, in the full sense of these terms,
 735 the discipline of practical reason can not take account of our
 736 experience, and our ideas have lying before them our inductive
 737 judgements. (Since all of the phenomena are speculative, to avoid all
 738 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena
 739 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must
 740 be known a posteriori; as I have elsewhere shown, the noumena are a
 741 representation of the noumena.) Let us suppose that practical reason
 742 can thereby determine in its totality, by means of the Ideal, the pure
 743 employment of the discipline of practical reason. Galileo tells us
 744 that the employment of the phenomena can be treated like our ideas;
 745 still, the Categories, when thus treated as the paralogisms, exist in
 746 the employment of the Antinomies. Let us apply this to our
 747 experience.}
 748
 749 \kgl_newpara:n {I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason
 750 can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the
 751 Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our
 752 ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader
 753 can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account
 754 of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and the
 755 noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should
 756 only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in
 757 natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown
 758 in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these
 759 reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is
 760 that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories,

are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.}

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

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

\kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between space and the noumena, our experience is by its very nature contradictory. It is obvious that natural causes constitute the whole content of the transcendental unity of apperception, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. By virtue of pure reason, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, have lying before them human reason. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that the transcendental objects in space and time, in the study of the architectonic of practical reason, exclude the possibility of the objects in space and time, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. By means of philosophy, is it true that formal logic can not take account of the manifold, or is the real question whether our sense perceptions are the mere results of the power of the transcendental aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the soul? The objects in space and time are just as necessary as the Antinomies, because of the relation between metaphysics and the things in themselves. Human reason is a representation of the transcendental aesthetic. In my present remarks I am referring to the pure employment of our disjunctive judgements

815 only in so far as it is founded on inductive principles.}

816

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

831

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

848

849 \kgl_newpara:n {In the study of time, our concepts prove the validity
850 of, as I have elsewhere shown, our understanding, as any dedicated
851 reader can clearly see. As will easily be shown in the next section,
852 the reader should be careful to observe that, so far as regards our
853 knowledge, natural causes, so far as regards the never-ending regress
854 in the series of empirical conditions and our a priori judgements,
855 should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the
856 Transcendental Deduction, and our understanding can not take account
857 of formal logic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, to avoid
858 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the Antinomies
859 are just as necessary as, on the other hand, our ideas; however, the
860 Ideal, in the full sense of these terms, exists in the architectonic
861 of human reason. As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all
862 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in other words, our
863 faculties have nothing to do with the manifold, but our faculties
864 should only be used as a canon for space. Our faculties prove the
865 validity of the Antinomies, and the things in themselves (and let us
866 suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of our
867 ideas. It remains a mystery why, then, the architectonic of practical
868 reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.}

869
870 \kgl_newpara:n {The paralogisms of practical reason can be treated
871 like the paralogisms. The objects in space and time, therefore, are
872 what first give rise to the discipline of human reason; in all
873 theoretical sciences, the things in themselves (and we can deduce that
874 this is the case) have nothing to do with metaphysics. Therefore,
875 Aristotle tells us that our understanding exists in the Ideal of human
876 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Thus, our sense
877 perceptions (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) would
878 thereby be made to contradict space. I assert, on the other hand,
879 that, in reference to ends, the objects in space and time can not take
880 account of the Categories, yet natural causes are the mere results of
881 the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable
882 function of the soul. By virtue of practical reason, it must not be
883 supposed that, that is to say, our faculties would thereby be made to
884 contradict philosophy, yet our a posteriori concepts, inasmuch as the
885 Ideal of pure reason relies on the intelligible objects in space and
886 time, are by their very nature contradictory.}

887
888 \kgl_newpara:n {Time, on the contrary, can never furnish a true and
889 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it
890 constitutes the whole content for ampliative principles, yet natural
891 reason, even as this relates to philosophy, proves the validity of the
892 thing in itself. As is evident upon close examination, the Ideal of
893 practical reason, when thus treated as the things in themselves, is by
894 its very nature contradictory; as I have elsewhere shown, our
895 understanding may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that
896 it may be in contradictions with the Ideal of practical reason. Since
897 all of the things in themselves are problematic, it remains a mystery
898 why, so regarded, our knowledge is the key to understanding our
899 problematic judgements, but our ideas (and to avoid all
900 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case)
901 have lying before them our disjunctive judgements. In the case of the
902 Ideal, we can deduce that the transcendental unity of apperception
903 excludes the possibility of the manifold, as we have already seen.
904 Consequently, the Ideal of pure reason can be treated like the
905 phenomena. Let us apply this to the Transcendental Deduction.}

906
907 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that our a
908 posteriori concepts (and it is obvious that this is the case) are what
909 first give rise to the transcendental unity of apperception. In the
910 case of necessity, the reader should be careful to observe that
911 metaphysics is a representation of natural causes, by means of
912 analysis. In all theoretical sciences, the phenomena (and the reader
913 should be careful to observe that this is the case) would thereby be
914 made to contradict natural reason. The transcendental aesthetic, in
915 the case of space, is by its very nature contradictory. By virtue of
916 human reason, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
917 that the empirical objects in space and time exist in our judgements;
918 for these reasons, the Antinomies, by means of our experience, can be
919 treated like the architectonic of human reason. It must not be
920 supposed that our ideas have lying before them metaphysics;
921 consequently, the architectonic of pure reason, in all theoretical
922 sciences, would be falsified.}

923
924 \kgl_newpara:n {The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the
925 Ideal of pure reason, and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their
926 very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying
927 before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception,
928 indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic
929 of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon
930 close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume
931 tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated
932 as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of
933 knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand
934 in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity,
935 natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics,
936 and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a
937 priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.}
938

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

957 \kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, in respect of the
958 intelligible character, the Antinomies (and we can deduce that this is
959 the case) constitute the whole content of the phenomena, yet the
960 Categories exist in natural causes. The Ideal of natural reason, when
961 thus treated as metaphysics, can be treated like our faculties;
962 consequently, pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is
963 true) is what first gives rise to our sense perceptions. The
964 paralogisms of practical reason exist in the objects in space and
965 time. As we have already seen, our sense perceptions stand in need to
966 space. Still, our a priori concepts, in the case of metaphysics, have
967 nothing to do with the Categories. Because of the relation between
968 the discipline of practical reason and our a posteriori concepts, we
969 can deduce that, when thus treated as the phenomena, our sense
970 perceptions (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) are what
971 first give rise to the discipline of practical reason.}
972

973 \kgl_newpara:n {Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the
974 noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our
975 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense
976 perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural

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

990
991 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that, for
992 example, pure logic depends on the transcendental unity of
993 apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our a priori
994 concepts are what first give rise to the Categories. Hume tells us
995 that our ideas are just as necessary as, on the other hand, natural
996 causes; however, natural causes should only be used as a canon for our
997 faculties. For these reasons, to avoid all misapprehension, it is
998 necessary to explain that our ideas are the clue to the discovery of
999 our understanding, as is shown in the writings of Hume. (By virtue of
1000 natural reason, the employment of our disjunctive judgements, then, is
1001 by its very nature contradictory.) By virtue of natural reason, the
1002 Categories can not take account of our hypothetical judgements. The
1003 transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
1004 content of, consequently, the transcendental unity of apperception, as
1005 will easily be shown in the next section. We thus have a pure
1006 synthesis of apprehension.}

1007
1008 \kgl_newpara:n {The Antinomies have nothing to do with our faculties.
1009 As is shown in the writings of Hume, we can deduce that, on the
1010 contrary, the empirical objects in space and time prove the validity
1011 of our ideas. The manifold may not contradict itself, but it is still
1012 possible that it may be in contradictions with our a posteriori
1013 concepts. For these reasons, the transcendental objects in space and
1014 time (and it is obvious that this is the case) have nothing to do with
1015 our faculties, as will easily be shown in the next section. What we
1016 have alone been able to show is that the phenomena constitute the
1017 whole content of the Antinomies; with the sole exception of
1018 philosophy, the Categories have lying before them formal logic. Since
1019 knowledge of the Antinomies is a posteriori, it remains a mystery why
1020 the Antinomies (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) prove
1021 the validity of the thing in itself; for these reasons, metaphysics is
1022 the mere result of the power of the employment of our sense
1023 perceptions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. As I
1024 have elsewhere shown, philosophy proves the validity of our sense
1025 perceptions.}

1026
1027 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
1028 phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our
1029 concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo
1030 tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to

contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, insomuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it remains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.}

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

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

\kgl_newpara:n {The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions can be treated like the objects in space and time. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, would thereby be made to contradict the Transcendental Deduction. The architectonic of practical reason has nothing to do with our ideas; however, time can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it depends on hypothetical principles. Space has nothing to do with the Antinomies, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. In all

1085 theoretical sciences, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1086 explain that the things in themselves are a representation of, in
1087 other words, necessity, as is evident upon close examination.}

1088

1089 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a
1090 mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the
1091 discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
1092 soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself
1093 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of
1094 natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no
1095 doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the
1096 Antinomies. I assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the
1097 noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our
1098 a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our
1099 ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the
1100 architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to
1101 observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts
1102 are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic
1103 unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory
1104 rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the
1105 power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and
1106 the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of,
1107 however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to
1108 the thing in itself.}

1109

1110 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, we can deduce
1111 that the transcendental unity of apperception depends on the Ideal of
1112 practical reason. Certainly, it is obvious that the Antinomies, in
1113 accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time,
1114 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must
1115 be known a posteriori. Because of the relation between the discipline
1116 of pure reason and our a posteriori concepts, I assert that, for
1117 example, metaphysics, consequently, is by its very nature
1118 contradictory, yet the transcendental aesthetic is the key to
1119 understanding our understanding. By virtue of natural reason, the
1120 objects in space and time are what first give rise to, when thus
1121 treated as the paralogisms of human reason, the things in themselves,
1122 but the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions can
1123 not take account of the architectonic of human reason. What we have
1124 alone been able to show is that natural causes, irrespective of all
1125 empirical conditions, exist in the objects in space and time, as is
1126 shown in the writings of Hume. By virtue of practical reason, our
1127 sense perceptions are what first give rise to, irrespective of all
1128 empirical conditions, necessity. Our sense perceptions, in the study
1129 of necessity, would thereby be made to contradict transcendental
1130 logic; consequently, natural reason stands in need of the objects in
1131 space and time. There can be no doubt that, in other words, the
1132 paralogisms of natural reason have nothing to do with the thing in
1133 itself, but the paralogisms prove the validity of transcendental
1134 logic.}

1135

1136 \kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as
1137 necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in
1138 space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do

1139 with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the
 1140 noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of
 1141 the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
 1142 Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in
 1143 themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
 1144 transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the
 1145 phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions,
 1146 yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
 1147 demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole
 1148 content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense
 1149 perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with
 1150 the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility
 1151 of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is
 1152 still possible that it may be in contradictions with, thus, our sense
 1153 perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
 1154 that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all
 1155 empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.}

1156
 1157 \kgl_newpara:n {It remains a mystery why our sense perceptions prove
 1158 the validity of our a priori concepts. The objects in space and time,
 1159 then, exist in metaphysics; therefore, the things in themselves can
 1160 not take account of the transcendental aesthetic. The Ideal of pure
 1161 reason can thereby determine in its totality, that is to say, our
 1162 ideas, and space constitutes the whole content for the discipline of
 1163 human reason. The paralogisms of pure reason are just as necessary
 1164 as, in all theoretical sciences, our knowledge. The things in
 1165 themselves constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of
 1166 this body must be known a posteriori.}

1167
 1168 \kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, the
 1169 Transcendental Deduction exists in the Ideal. To avoid all
 1170 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that pure reason (and it
 1171 is obvious that this is true) is the key to understanding the
 1172 transcendental unity of apperception. The reader should be careful to
 1173 observe that our experience depends on necessity. It is obvious that
 1174 space, thus, can be treated like the objects in space and time,
 1175 because of the relation between the transcendental unity of
 1176 apperception and the objects in space and time. It must not be
 1177 supposed that, even as this relates to natural reason, the Antinomies
 1178 (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) exclude the
 1179 possibility of the empirical objects in space and time, yet philosophy
 1180 proves the validity of practical reason. The things in themselves, on
 1181 the contrary, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge; in
 1182 all theoretical sciences, the noumena (and there can be no doubt that
 1183 this is the case) are just as necessary as the Antinomies. As is
 1184 shown in the writings of Galileo, I assert, in natural theology, that
 1185 the transcendental aesthetic, thus, exists in our faculties. Our
 1186 faculties are just as necessary as the Categories, yet the manifold
 1187 has lying before it, certainly, our understanding.}

1188
 1189 \kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the never-ending regress in the
 1190 series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it is
 1191 still possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic
 1192 of practical reason. The objects in space and time, so regarded,

should only be used as a canon for the architectonic of human reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. In all theoretical sciences, the Antinomies can not take account of our concepts, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. By means of analysis, the things in themselves are a representation of our experience; for these reasons, the paralogisms of practical reason have lying before them our inductive judgements. Still, the architectonic of pure reason is just as necessary as the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.}

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

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

\kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the discipline of human reason, it is obvious that the phenomena, still, are the mere results of the power of the practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, by means of analysis. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, Aristotle tells us that natural causes constitute the whole content of, as I have elsewhere shown, the pure employment of the paralogisms. Aristotle tells us that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the thing in itself, indeed, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of practical reason, it has lying before it analytic principles, yet the Categories have nothing to do with the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,

human reason is just as necessary as our concepts, yet the practical employment of the paralogisms is the mere result of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, Hume tells us that natural causes have nothing to do with the transcendental unity of apperception, by means of analytic unity. The Antinomies can not take account of the Antinomies, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. I assert, in all theoretical sciences, that, that is to say, natural causes would thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, the Ideal of natural reason. Hume tells us that our ideas abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge, as is evident upon close examination.}

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

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

\kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, the Antinomies are a representation of the Categories. Necessity stands in need of the Antinomies. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies have lying before them the Ideal of pure reason; on the other hand, the Antinomies have nothing to do with natural causes. As I have elsewhere shown, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves would thereby be made to contradict, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of our faculties, our ideas. I assert that, in so far as this expounds the necessary rules of human reason, our concepts (and we can deduce that this is the case) prove the validity of space, but our sense perceptions, so far as regards

1301 the transcendental unity of apperception, can never, as a whole,
1302 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1303 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they have
1304 nothing to do with disjunctive principles. But we have fallen short
1305 of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of
1306 necessity.}

1307

1308 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
1309 abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently,
1310 the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of
1311 the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories
1312 in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute
1313 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
1314 posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be
1315 treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for
1316 example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but
1317 indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of
1318 Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not
1319 be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in
1320 view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the
1321 objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of
1322 the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our
1323 necessary ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the
1324 manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first
1325 gives rise to space.}

1326

1327 \kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, our experience
1328 occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal concerning the existence of
1329 the objects in space and time in general, as will easily be shown in
1330 the next section. It must not be supposed that our ideas (and it
1331 remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of the
1332 intelligible objects in space and time. Consequently, the
1333 Transcendental Deduction can thereby determine in its totality, in
1334 other words, our ideas, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1335 conditions. (In natural theology, our concepts abstract from all
1336 content of a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological
1337 manuals.) I assert, in the case of the manifold, that human reason is
1338 a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
1339 posteriori, by virtue of human reason. As is proven in the
1340 ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the thing in itself, so
1341 far as I know, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
1342 because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as
1343 necessary as a priori principles.}

1344

1345 \kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1346 explain that philosophy can not take account of our sense perceptions;
1347 in the study of the discipline of natural reason, our experience, in
1348 the study of the architectonic of practical reason, is the mere result
1349 of the power of pure logic, a blind but indispensable function of the
1350 soul. As is evident upon close examination, the noumena are what
1351 first give rise to, on the contrary, the phenomena, but natural
1352 reason, that is to say, excludes the possibility of our hypothetical
1353 judgements. The objects in space and time are the clue to the
1354 discovery of the thing in itself, because of our necessary ignorance

1355 of the conditions. Therefore, there can be no doubt that the
 1356 architectonic of practical reason depends on the Antinomies, because
 1357 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Human reason (and there
 1358 can be no doubt that this is true) depends on our understanding, but
 1359 the Ideal can thereby determine in its totality metaphysics.}
 1360
 1361 \kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
 1362 posteriori, general logic, in respect of the intelligible character,
 1363 is by its very nature contradictory. By means of analytic unity, it
 1364 is not at all certain that space, inasmuch as our understanding relies
 1365 on our sense perceptions, would thereby be made to contradict the
 1366 Ideal. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are just as
 1367 necessary as, indeed, the thing in itself. The manifold, as I have
 1368 elsewhere shown, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it
 1369 must be known a priori. There can be no doubt that, in particular,
 1370 the phenomena are a representation of pure logic, yet our sense
 1371 perceptions have lying before them our sense perceptions. I assert,
 1372 as I have elsewhere shown, that, indeed, our experience (and let us
 1373 suppose that this is true) excludes the possibility of the objects in
 1374 space and time, and the discipline of human reason, in accordance with
 1375 the principles of the transcendental unity of apperception, occupies
 1376 part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of
 1377 the phenomena in general.}
 1378
 1379 \kgl_newpara:n {Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true)
 1380 proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid
 1381 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the employment of
 1382 the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The
 1383 transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the
 1384 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly,
 1385 our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the
 1386 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we
 1387 have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and
 1388 time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance
 1389 with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending
 1390 regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our
 1391 ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the
 1392 phenomena.}
 1393
 1394 \kgl_newpara:n {Necessity, as I have elsewhere shown, is the mere
 1395 result of the power of the architectonic of practical reason, a blind
 1396 but indispensable function of the soul. The paralogisms of pure
 1397 reason are the clue to the discovery of the practical employment of
 1398 the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the never-ending
 1399 regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it the
 1400 paralogisms of human reason; with the sole exception of the
 1401 architectonic of pure reason, transcendental logic is just as
 1402 necessary as, then, our judgements. What we have alone been able to
 1403 show is that our synthetic judgements have lying before them, when
 1404 thus treated as space, our knowledge, by means of analysis. By virtue
 1405 of natural reason, the transcendental aesthetic can be treated like
 1406 general logic, yet the objects in space and time are just as necessary
 1407 as the noumena. }
 1408

1409 \kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, let us suppose that
 1410 the Categories exclude the possibility of the never-ending regress in
 1411 the series of empirical conditions. The manifold occupies part of the
 1412 sphere of the thing in itself concerning the existence of the things
 1413 in themselves in general, and formal logic, indeed, would be
 1414 falsified. It is not at all certain that, in reference to ends, the
 1415 discipline of practical reason, for example, occupies part of the
 1416 sphere of the discipline of practical reason concerning the existence
 1417 of our ampliative judgements in general, yet general logic is by its
 1418 very nature contradictory. Since all of our judgements are a priori,
 1419 there can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these terms, the
 1420 phenomena can not take account of the transcendental objects in space
 1421 and time. The architectonic of pure reason (and it is not at all
 1422 certain that this is true) stands in need of the things in themselves.
 1423 Philosophy is the key to understanding, thus, our sense perceptions.
 1424 This is what chiefly concerns us.}

1425
 1426 \kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding would thereby be made to contradict,
 1427 so far as regards the Ideal, necessity. Our faculties, as I have
 1428 elsewhere shown, are the mere results of the power of time, a blind
 1429 but indispensable function of the soul. Time, with the sole exception
 1430 of formal logic, would be falsified, but the Ideal can not take
 1431 account of our sense perceptions. It is not at all certain that the
 1432 Antinomies are what first give rise to our experience; thus, our a
 1433 posteriori concepts are the clue to the discovery of, so regarded, the
 1434 practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Natural causes
 1435 occupy part of the sphere of practical reason concerning the existence
 1436 of the paralogisms of pure reason in general; in view of these
 1437 considerations, the noumena exclude the possibility of the employment
 1438 of the objects in space and time. The manifold is what first gives
 1439 rise to the paralogisms, but our judgements are the clue to the
 1440 discovery of, in the study of the thing in itself, the discipline of
 1441 practical reason.}

1442
 1443 \kgl_newpara:n {Our a priori concepts, with the sole exception of our
 1444 experience, have lying before them our judgements. It must not be
 1445 supposed that the Antinomies are a representation of the discipline of
 1446 human reason, by means of analytic unity. In the study of the
 1447 transcendental aesthetic, the paralogisms constitute a body of
 1448 demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
 1449 posteriori. The Categories are the mere results of the power of the
 1450 thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
 1451 Because of the relation between pure reason and the paralogisms of
 1452 human reason, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
 1453 that, indeed, the objects in space and time (and to avoid all
 1454 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
 1455 a representation of our concepts, yet the Ideal can be treated like
 1456 our inductive judgements. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
 1457 our understanding would thereby be made to contradict, thus, the
 1458 Transcendental Deduction; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena
 1459 abstract from all content of knowledge. The thing in itself excludes
 1460 the possibility of philosophy; therefore, space, for example, teaches
 1461 us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of metaphysics. We can
 1462 deduce that the noumena (and it must not be supposed that this is the

case) are a representation of the transcendental unity of apperception; with the sole exception of the thing in itself, our sense perceptions, as I have elsewhere shown, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental unity of apperception, they exclude the possibility of hypothetical principles.}

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

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

\kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that the objects in space and time have nothing to do with our judgements. The architectonic of human reason has nothing to do with the noumena. What we have alone been able to show is that natural causes have nothing to do with, still, our a priori concepts, as we have already seen. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it remains a mystery why, for example, our ideas, with the sole exception of the thing in itself, can not take account of the objects in space and time. It remains a mystery why our faculties are a representation of the transcendental aesthetic. Our ideas, in reference to ends, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the discipline of natural reason, they are a representation of synthetic principles.

1517 The transcendental unity of apperception is just as necessary as, in
1518 view of these considerations, our ampliative judgements; with the sole
1519 exception of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in itself (and it
1520 remains a mystery why this is true) is the clue to the discovery of
1521 our speculative judgements.}

1522

1523 \kgl_newpara:n {As I have elsewhere shown, the Ideal is a body of
1524 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori, as is
1525 evident upon close examination. Our ideas abstract from all content
1526 of knowledge, and the phenomena have nothing to do with, then,
1527 necessity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the empirical
1528 objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, in other words,
1529 our sense perceptions. It must not be supposed that, then, the
1530 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions stands in
1531 need of, certainly, the Ideal of natural reason, yet pure reason can
1532 not take account of the objects in space and time. The noumena, in
1533 all theoretical sciences, prove the validity of the practical
1534 employment of the manifold; in natural theology, the phenomena are
1535 just as necessary as the paralogisms. It is not at all certain that
1536 our concepts have lying before them our faculties, by means of
1537 analytic unity. It is not at all certain that the architectonic of
1538 practical reason, then, is what first gives rise to necessity; still,
1539 our concepts stand in need to the objects in space and time.}

1540

1541 \kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are
1542 the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown
1543 in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the
1544 possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason
1545 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like
1546 philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic
1547 principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy,
1548 our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in
1549 natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still
1550 possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The
1551 thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.)
1552 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose
1553 that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the
1554 things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from
1555 all content of a priori knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole
1556 content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the
1557 necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the
1558 transcendental aesthetic. }

1559

1560 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, when
1561 thus treated as the phenomena, the transcendental unity of
1562 apperception can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of human
1563 reason. There can be no doubt that natural causes can not take
1564 account of, certainly, the phenomena, since none of the paralogisms
1565 are hypothetical. We can deduce that the transcendental aesthetic is
1566 a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori.
1567 Hume tells us that, for example, our a posteriori knowledge
1568 constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, yet the
1569 discipline of pure reason, when thus treated as our understanding,
1570 constitutes the whole content for the empirical objects in space and

1571 time. The discipline of pure reason occupies part of the sphere of
1572 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
1573 concerning the existence of the things in themselves in general;
1574 consequently, the architectonic of natural reason (and what we have
1575 alone been able to show is that this is true) is the clue to the
1576 discovery of the objects in space and time.}

1577
1578 \kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas
1579 would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects
1580 in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery
1581 why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the
1582 Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of
1583 empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not
1584 take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would
1585 thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in
1586 natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation
1587 of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our
1588 concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the
1589 Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to
1590 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
1591 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore,
1592 necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere
1593 of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
1594 intelligible objects in space and time in general.}

1595
1596 \kgl_newpara:n {Still, time is by its very nature contradictory. The
1597 paralogisms of practical reason constitute a body of demonstrated
1598 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; for these
1599 reasons, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the
1600 transcendental aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the
1601 soul. On the other hand, Aristotle tells us that our a posteriori
1602 concepts are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the transcendental
1603 unity of apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the
1604 discipline of pure reason can not take account of our faculties. It
1605 must not be supposed that the Ideal, in particular, can never furnish
1606 a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it is the clue to
1607 the discovery of problematic principles, since knowledge of the
1608 objects in space and time is a priori. The Categories are what first
1609 give rise to the Transcendental Deduction.}

1610
1611 \kgl_newpara:n {Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist
1612 in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the
1613 phenomena. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
1614 paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our
1615 understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space
1616 and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when
1617 thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated
1618 science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements
1619 stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to
1620 observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole
1621 content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure
1622 logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere
1623 results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
1624 function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding

1625 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
1626 it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be
1627 in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our
1628 knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the
1629 noumena.}

1630

1631 \kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our a posteriori concepts are synthetic,
1632 applied logic has nothing to do with, for example, the noumena. With
1633 the sole exception of philosophy, the Ideal of practical reason is
1634 what first gives rise to our ideas, as is evident upon close
1635 examination. The reader should be careful to observe that the pure
1636 employment of our understanding is what first gives rise to the
1637 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, by virtue
1638 of natural reason. By virtue of natural reason, there can be no doubt
1639 that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the architectonic of
1640 natural reason (and we can deduce that this is true) has nothing to do
1641 with space, but our judgements (and what we have alone been able to
1642 show is that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of the
1643 paralogisms of human reason. (The things in themselves, however,
1644 exist in the thing in itself, and natural causes can not take account
1645 of the objects in space and time.) We can deduce that the thing in
1646 itself has lying before it the Transcendental Deduction, by virtue of
1647 pure reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, to avoid all
1648 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in other words, the
1649 objects in space and time can not take account of the noumena, but the
1650 empirical objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
1651 metaphysics, exist in the empirical objects in space and time. }

1652

1653 \kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the reader should be careful to
1654 observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and
1655 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby
1656 be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of
1657 the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human
1658 reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for
1659 the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the
1660 universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason.
1661 To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
1662 thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have
1663 already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the
1664 noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of
1665 the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical
1666 reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time.
1667 Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case)
1668 prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense
1669 perceptions is a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete
1670 system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay
1671 the simple mention of the fact may suffice.}

1672

1673 \kgl_newpara:n {Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the
1674 employment of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1675 conditions, but our a priori concepts can never, as a whole, furnish a
1676 true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, they would
1677 thereby be made to contradict problematic principles. What we have
1678 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 paralogsms of pure reason should only be used as a canon for time.}

\kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogsms, 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 paralogsms 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 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.}

\kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the objects in space and time are analytic, it remains a mystery why, in the full sense of these terms,

the objects in space and time have lying before them the Categories, and our ideas (and let us suppose that this is the case) have lying before them our problematic judgements. In the study of our understanding, there can be no doubt that necessity (and it is obvious that this is true) is a representation of the architectonic of natural reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of the Antinomies is a posteriori, our faculties would thereby be made to contradict our sense perceptions. As will easily be shown in the next section, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in the case of our experience, can be treated like the phenomena, and the Categories exclude the possibility of, thus, our knowledge. In which of our cognitive faculties are natural causes and the objects in space and time connected together? Still, the Transcendental Deduction stands in need of natural reason. There can be no doubt that the manifold, when thus treated as the things in themselves, is by its very nature contradictory.}

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

\kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that, so far as regards the manifold and our ideas, the Categories are just as necessary as, in the study of the architectonic of pure reason, the discipline of human reason. It must not be supposed that metaphysics is the mere result of the power of the Ideal of practical reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; in the study of human reason, the phenomena are a representation of metaphysics. Our understanding proves the validity of the transcendental unity of apperception; therefore, human reason depends on natural causes. In the study of 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 Categories. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is not at all certain that, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, with the sole exception of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, natural causes, but the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the objects in space and time. The objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, in the case of metaphysics, can be treated like necessity; for these reasons, the noumena exclude the possibility of the Ideal.}

1841
1842 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a
1843 posteriori knowledge has lying before it the Categories, as is shown
1844 in the writings of Galileo. Thus, the Categories are the mere results
1845 of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1846 In view of these considerations, it is obvious that the Categories are
1847 just as necessary as, however, the never-ending regress in the series
1848 of empirical conditions, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
1849 Because of the relation between the Ideal of human reason and the
1850 objects in space and time, the empirical objects in space and time
1851 have lying before them natural causes; still, our experience (and it
1852 must not be supposed that this is true) depends on the Transcendental
1853 Deduction. Because of the relation between the employment of the
1854 Transcendental Deduction and the Antinomies, pure logic occupies part
1855 of the sphere of necessity concerning the existence of the objects in
1856 space and time in general; however, the things in themselves, still,
1857 stand in need to our judgements. The Transcendental Deduction proves
1858 the validity of the things in themselves, and our sense perceptions
1859 would thereby be made to contradict our understanding.}
1860
1861 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells
1862 us that natural causes, so far as regards necessity, can never, as a
1863 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1864 manifold, they prove the validity of ampliative principles. Let us
1865 suppose that, in particular, the Ideal of human reason is a body of
1866 demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a posteriori. As is
1867 proven in the ontological manuals, our faculties, consequently, are
1868 the mere results of the power of human reason, a blind but
1869 indispensable function of the soul, but the noumena can never, as a
1870 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like space,
1871 they would thereby be made to contradict analytic principles. As is
1872 shown in the writings of Hume, the intelligible objects in space and
1873 time, in the study of the never-ending regress in the series of
1874 empirical conditions, stand in need to our experience. On the other
1875 hand, Galileo tells us that formal logic is by its very nature
1876 contradictory. With the sole exception of the architectonic of
1877 natural reason, there can be no doubt that our understanding would be
1878 falsified. This is what chiefly concerns us.}
1879
1880 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between philosophy and the
1881 objects in space and time, the Categories, in all theoretical
1882 sciences, are by their very nature contradictory. What we have alone
1883 been able to show is that our knowledge is a representation of the
1884 Categories. With the sole exception of the practical employment of
1885 the noumena, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects
1886 in space and time would thereby be made to contradict the discipline
1887 of pure reason, because of the relation between the manifold and our
1888 ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that, then, the
1889 Categories are by their very nature contradictory, but space is the
1890 mere result of the power of the discipline of practical reason, a
1891 blind but indispensable function of the soul. The noumena are by
1892 their very nature contradictory. As any dedicated reader can clearly
1893 see, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
1894 architectonic of human reason, on the contrary, excludes the

possibility of the paralogisms. The thing in itself, in view of these considerations, is by its very nature contradictory. Let us apply this to necessity.}

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

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

\kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a priori, it remains a mystery why, in reference to ends, the phenomena prove the validity of the paralogisms. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the empirical objects in space and time would thereby be made to contradict the empirical objects in space and time; in the study of the transcendental unity of apperception, the Categories exist in our a priori concepts. Because of the relation between space and our analytic judgements, the reader should be careful to observe that the Categories (and I assert that this is the case) can not take account of the discipline of pure reason; in the study of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. In the case of general logic, space (and it is obvious that this is true) is just as necessary as the things in themselves. By means of analytic unity, I assert, in view of these considerations, that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our

1949 speculative judgements (and it is obvious that this is the case) are
 1950 what first give rise to the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
 1951 the next section, it remains a mystery why our ideas would thereby be
 1952 made to contradict our judgements; therefore, our sense perceptions,
 1953 certainly, exclude the possibility of the noumena. As is shown in the
 1954 writings of Galileo, the objects in space and time exclude the
 1955 possibility of our ideas; thus, the objects in space and time, for
 1956 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies.}

1957
 1958 \kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of the never-ending regress in
 1959 the series of empirical conditions, it is not at all certain that the
 1960 noumena, in so far as this expounds the practical rules of the
 1961 paralogisms of pure reason, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
 1962 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, they
 1963 are just as necessary as ampliative principles, as will easily be
 1964 shown in the next section. As is evident upon close examination, the
 1965 objects in space and time constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
 1966 and all of this body must be known a posteriori, but the architectonic
 1967 of practical reason would be falsified. Because of our necessary
 1968 ignorance of the conditions, it is not at all certain that, then, our
 1969 understanding proves the validity of, on the contrary, formal logic.
 1970 With the sole exception of the Ideal of natural reason, the Categories
 1971 exist in the paralogisms, since knowledge of the Antinomies is a
 1972 posteriori. Since knowledge of our ideas is a priori, it must not be
 1973 supposed that the manifold, as I have elsewhere shown, abstracts from
 1974 all content of knowledge; in the study of the Ideal of practical
 1975 reason, our concepts are the clue to the discovery of our experience.}

1976
 1977 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
 1978 Categories would be falsified. Consequently, there can be no doubt
 1979 that the noumena can not take account of, even as this relates to
 1980 philosophy, the Antinomies, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
 1981 Our judgements (and I assert that this is the case) are what first
 1982 give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 1983 conditions. It is not at all certain that, in the full sense of these
 1984 terms, the objects in space and time stand in need to the Ideal of
 1985 pure reason, yet the Transcendental Deduction, in reference to ends,
 1986 is just as necessary as the Ideal. Has it ever been suggested that it
 1987 must not be supposed that there is a causal connection between the
 1988 transcendental objects in space and time and the discipline of natural
 1989 reason? As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not at all
 1990 certain that the noumena can not take account of the Transcendental
 1991 Deduction. By virtue of human reason, I assert, in the study of the
 1992 manifold, that, indeed, the objects in space and time have lying
 1993 before them our faculties, and the architectonic of natural reason
 1994 stands in need of the things in themselves.}

1995
 1996 \kgl_newpara:n {By means of analytic unity, the objects in space and
 1997 time (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the
 1998 whole content of the Antinomies, but our ideas have lying before them
 1999 the noumena. The Ideal is the key to understanding, that is to say,
 2000 the things in themselves. By means of analytic unity, our judgements
 2001 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case)
 2002 have lying before them the Transcendental Deduction. Aristotle tells

us that metaphysics, in the study of the Ideal of practical reason, occupies part of the sphere of applied logic concerning the existence of the paralogisms in general; certainly, metaphysics can not take account of necessity. But can I entertain human reason in thought, or does it present itself to me? The things in themselves stand in need to natural causes, by means of analytic unity. Since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori, the empirical objects in space and time have nothing to do with philosophy. The divisions are thus provided; all that is required is to fill them.}

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

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

\kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is not at all certain that, on the contrary, the objects in space and time, in the case of space, stand in need to the objects in space and time, but the phenomena have lying before them the discipline of human reason. The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in other words, is what first gives rise to general logic. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, our concepts, so far as

2057 regards the Ideal of human reason, exist in the paralogisms; in the
 2058 study of time, the thing in itself is the clue to the discovery of the
 2059 manifold. I assert that our experience, in natural theology,
 2060 abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge; therefore, our ideas
 2061 are what first give rise to the Categories. As is evident upon close
 2062 examination, our ideas, for these reasons, can not take account of
 2063 philosophy. Has it ever been suggested that what we have alone been
 2064 able to show is that there is no relation between the architectonic of
 2065 human reason and our sense perceptions? Since all of the noumena are
 2066 a priori, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the thing
 2067 in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can
 2068 be no doubt that the empirical objects in space and time constitute a
 2069 body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a
 2070 posteriori; thus, time is the mere result of the power of the
 2071 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
 2072 soul. But this need not worry us.}

2073
 2074 \kgl_newpara:n {Aristotle tells us that, insomuch as the pure
 2075 employment of the Categories relies on our ideas, the things in
 2076 themselves are just as necessary as, in all theoretical sciences, the
 2077 noumena. Therefore, let us suppose that the phenomena occupy part of
 2078 the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of our concepts in
 2079 general. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the
 2080 architectonic of pure reason is what first gives rise to the
 2081 employment of our concepts, by means of analysis. The things in
 2082 themselves occupy part of the sphere of the never-ending regress in
 2083 the series of empirical conditions concerning the existence of our
 2084 sense perceptions in general; thus, metaphysics may not contradict
 2085 itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions
 2086 with, in other words, the transcendental unity of apperception. By
 2087 means of the architectonic of practical reason, our sense perceptions,
 2088 irrespective of all empirical conditions, abstract from all content of
 2089 knowledge. As is proven in the ontological manuals, metaphysics, so
 2090 far as regards the transcendental aesthetic and the intelligible
 2091 objects in space and time, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
 2092 of it must be known a priori; by means of philosophy, the Categories
 2093 are a representation of, in the case of time, the phenomena. As any
 2094 dedicated reader can clearly see, the Transcendental Deduction, in
 2095 other words, would thereby be made to contradict our understanding;
 2096 still, the employment of the noumena is a representation of the
 2097 Ideal.}

2098
 2099 \kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that the paralogisms of human reason are
 2100 a representation of, in the full sense of these terms, our experience.
 2101 The thing in itself, in reference to ends, exists in our judgements.
 2102 As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, let us suppose that, in
 2103 respect of the intelligible character, the Categories constitute the
 2104 whole content of our knowledge, yet metaphysics is a representation of
 2105 our judgements. As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
 2106 would thereby be made to contradict the manifold; therefore, pure
 2107 logic is a representation of time. In natural theology, the
 2108 discipline of natural reason abstracts from all content of a priori
 2109 knowledge. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
 2110 that the paralogisms of human reason have lying before them the Ideal

2111 of pure reason, since none of the things in themselves are a priori.
 2112 Consequently, it remains a mystery why our concepts abstract from all
 2113 content of knowledge, since knowledge of the objects in space and time
 2114 is a posteriori.}

2115
 2116 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between practical reason and
 2117 our problematic judgements, what we have alone been able to show is
 2118 that, in respect of the intelligible character, our faculties,
 2119 inasmuch as our knowledge relies on the Categories, can be treated
 2120 like natural reason. In view of these considerations, the reader
 2121 should be careful to observe that the transcendental aesthetic is the
 2122 clue to the discovery of, in view of these considerations, the
 2123 phenomena. As is evident upon close examination, it remains a mystery
 2124 why the objects in space and time occupy part of the sphere of the
 2125 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions concerning
 2126 the existence of the Categories in general; in view of these
 2127 considerations, our experience, indeed, stands in need of the
 2128 phenomena. (However, the phenomena prove the validity of the Ideal,
 2129 by virtue of human reason.) We can deduce that, so regarded, our
 2130 faculties (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are what
 2131 first give rise to the architectonic of pure reason. Our ideas can
 2132 not take account of, by means of space, our knowledge. But we have
 2133 fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind
 2134 when we speak of necessity.}

2135
 2136 \kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that space can not take
 2137 account of natural causes. The Transcendental Deduction can not take
 2138 account of our a priori knowledge; as I have elsewhere shown, the
 2139 objects in space and time (and let us suppose that this is the case)
 2140 can not take account of the objects in space and time. As is shown in
 2141 the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary
 2142 to explain that the Categories have lying before them, as I have
 2143 elsewhere shown, our ideas. The Ideal of human reason excludes the
 2144 possibility of the Ideal of human reason. By virtue of natural
 2145 reason, our ideas stand in need to the Ideal of practical reason. By
 2146 means of analysis, the phenomena, in the study of our understanding,
 2147 can not take account of the noumena, but the paralogisms of natural
 2148 reason, thus, abstract from all content of knowledge. This is not
 2149 something we are in a position to establish.}

2150
 2151 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of our ideas are inductive, our ideas
 2152 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms; consequently, our
 2153 faculties can not take account of metaphysics. As will easily be
 2154 shown in the next section, the Ideal, in reference to ends, may not
 2155 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
 2156 contradictions with the Categories; in all theoretical sciences, the
 2157 architectonic of practical reason, in the case of the practical
 2158 employment of our experience, can be treated like necessity. Because
 2159 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the things in themselves
 2160 are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
 2161 function of the soul, and the Transcendental Deduction exists in the
 2162 Antinomies. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the thing in
 2163 itself (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true)
 2164 constitutes the whole content for time. It remains a mystery why our

2165 understanding (and Aristotle tells us that this is true) may not
2166 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2167 contradictions with our judgements; in all theoretical sciences, the
2168 objects in space and time constitute the whole content of our ideas.
2169 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, we can deduce
2170 that, for example, our concepts, for example, are the mere results of
2171 the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
2172 soul, yet the objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
2173 the manifold, exist in our ideas.}

2174

2175 \kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, it must not be supposed that the
2176 objects in space and time, so far as regards the manifold, should only
2177 be used as a canon for natural reason. The manifold, so far as
2178 regards our a priori knowledge, teaches us nothing whatsoever
2179 regarding the content of the Transcendental Deduction. By means of
2180 analytic unity, we can deduce that, so far as regards our experience
2181 and the objects in space and time, the objects in space and time would
2182 thereby be made to contradict the Categories, but our concepts can
2183 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
2184 like our experience, they stand in need to ampliative principles. The
2185 noumena, so far as I know, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
2186 demonstrated science, because, like the employment of the Categories,
2187 they have lying before them ampliative principles, yet the phenomena
2188 are just as necessary as natural causes. The reader should be careful
2189 to observe that, so far as I know, the Ideal has nothing to do with
2190 the Categories, but the things in themselves, however, constitute a
2191 body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
2192 posteriori. And similarly with all the others.}

2193

2194 \kgl_newpara:n {Our speculative judgements, therefore, prove the
2195 validity of the transcendental unity of apperception. Necessity is
2196 just as necessary as, that is to say, transcendental logic. The
2197 reader should be careful to observe that the noumena (and it must not
2198 be supposed that this is the case) can not take account of our
2199 faculties, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. The Ideal (and
2200 to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is
2201 true) can not take account of the transcendental aesthetic, and the
2202 employment of the manifold has nothing to do with, insomuch as the
2203 architectonic of natural reason relies on the Antinomies, the
2204 discipline of human reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
2205 the paralogisms prove the validity of, as I have elsewhere shown, the
2206 architectonic of pure reason.}

2207

2208 \kgl_newpara:n {Space may not contradict itself, but it is still
2209 possible that it may be in contradictions with, for these reasons, the
2210 phenomena; with the sole exception of metaphysics, our ideas exclude
2211 the possibility of, in natural theology, the thing in itself. What we
2212 have alone been able to show is that, for example, the Ideal excludes
2213 the possibility of time, yet the noumena (and I assert, in view of
2214 these considerations, that this is the case) are just as necessary as
2215 the objects in space and time. Because of the relation between
2216 metaphysics and the paralogisms, the Categories are the mere results
2217 of the power of the discipline of natural reason, a blind but
2218 indispensable function of the soul. The objects in space and time, in

2219 other words, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental
2220 aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since
2221 knowledge of our faculties is a priori, what we have alone been able
2222 to show is that necessity, in reference to ends, constitutes the whole
2223 content for metaphysics; still, our understanding (and we can deduce
2224 that this is true) excludes the possibility of our experience. As
2225 will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed
2226 that, even as this relates to philosophy, the phenomena (and I assert,
2227 with the sole exception of metaphysics, that this is the case) are a
2228 representation of the objects in space and time, but the Antinomies
2229 should only be used as a canon for our knowledge. But we have fallen
2230 short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we
2231 speak of necessity.}

2232
2233 \kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time are the mere results of
2234 the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the
2235 soul; in the study of our a posteriori knowledge, the manifold, so far
2236 as I know, proves the validity of the Ideal. Hume tells us that, so
2237 far as regards time, the phenomena, in view of these considerations,
2238 stand in need to the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the
2239 things in themselves, in respect of the intelligible character, can be
2240 treated like our ideas; as I have elsewhere shown, our concepts have
2241 lying before them the phenomena. As is proven in the ontological
2242 manuals, there can be no doubt that the phenomena, in all theoretical
2243 sciences, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this
2244 body must be known a priori. As is evident upon close examination,
2245 the architectonic of natural reason, so regarded, is by its very
2246 nature contradictory; for these reasons, the phenomena are a
2247 representation of time. In natural theology, the Antinomies (and it
2248 remains a mystery why this is the case) constitute the whole content
2249 of the Categories, because of our necessary ignorance of the
2250 conditions. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection
2251 that we have in mind when we speak of the Categories.}

2252
2253 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
2254 it is not at all certain that, for example, the thing in itself (and
2255 the reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not
2256 take account of our experience, and our concepts, in all theoretical
2257 sciences, are a representation of the phenomena. Since some of the
2258 phenomena are problematic, Hume tells us that metaphysics has lying
2259 before it, however, natural causes. By virtue of natural reason,
2260 Aristotle tells us that the things in themselves, therefore, should
2261 only be used as a canon for our a posteriori judgements. Our
2262 understanding can be treated like the transcendental unity of
2263 apperception. The Categories can be treated like space.}

2264
2265 \kgl_newpara:n {Since some of our sense perceptions are hypothetical,
2266 philosophy proves the validity of natural causes; on the other hand,
2267 our experience, in other words, can never furnish a true and
2268 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it depends on
2269 synthetic principles. Natural causes, in natural theology, constitute
2270 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
2271 priori. What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy is a
2272 representation of our concepts, as will easily be shown in the next

2273 section. The Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still
 2274 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in the study of the
 2275 transcendental aesthetic, our sense perceptions. (As is shown in the
 2276 writings of Galileo, the reader should be careful to observe that the
 2277 objects in space and time, by means of necessity, are by their very
 2278 nature contradictory.) The Antinomies can not take account of our
 2279 experience, by virtue of natural reason. Therefore, the noumena, in
 2280 view of these considerations, are by their very nature contradictory,
 2281 as will easily be shown in the next section.}
 2282
 2283 \kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the never-ending regress in the
 2284 series of empirical conditions stands in need of practical reason. As
 2285 will easily be shown in the next section, there can be no doubt that,
 2286 in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the discipline
 2287 of natural reason, metaphysics can be treated like metaphysics. As is
 2288 shown in the writings of Hume, what we have alone been able to show is
 2289 that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
 2290 would be falsified. Our experience can be treated like the
 2291 architectonic of human reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo.
 2292 The thing in itself proves the validity of the phenomena, as is shown
 2293 in the writings of Hume. Certainly, what we have alone been able to
 2294 show is that natural causes, in reference to ends, would be falsified.
 2295 But this need not worry us.}
 2296
 2297 \kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the objects in space and time are
 2298 speculative, let us suppose that our sense perceptions are the clue to
 2299 the discovery of, in particular, our a posteriori knowledge. Since
 2300 knowledge of the transcendental objects in space and time is a
 2301 posteriori, what we have alone been able to show is that our a
 2302 posteriori concepts exclude the possibility of the never-ending
 2303 regress in the series of empirical conditions; by means of the
 2304 discipline of pure reason, our faculties are the clue to the discovery
 2305 of our a priori knowledge. Because of the relation between the
 2306 transcendental unity of apperception and the things in themselves,
 2307 there can be no doubt that our sense perceptions (and it is obvious
 2308 that this is the case) are what first give rise to the Categories. To
 2309 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
 2310 phenomena can not take account of, with the sole exception of the
 2311 transcendental unity of apperception, the noumena. Certainly, the
 2312 things in themselves are by their very nature contradictory, as is
 2313 shown in the writings of Galileo. Because of our necessary ignorance
 2314 of the conditions, we can deduce that, then, the thing in itself
 2315 constitutes the whole content for, still, the intelligible objects in
 2316 space and time, and space is the clue to the discovery of, in
 2317 particular, our a posteriori concepts. }
 2318
 2319 \kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal of human reason has nothing to do with time.
 2320 As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, so far as regards
 2321 the Transcendental Deduction, the transcendental aesthetic, inasmuch
 2322 as the practical employment of the never-ending regress in the series
 2323 of empirical conditions relies on the things in themselves, can never
 2324 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
 2325 transcendental unity of apperception, it excludes the possibility of
 2326 speculative principles, and the Ideal is a representation of our

2327 experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
 2328 phenomena (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) are the clue
 2329 to the discovery of our speculative judgements; in all theoretical
 2330 sciences, our understanding, when thus treated as the noumena, is a
 2331 body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori.
 2332 We can deduce that our knowledge, for example, exists in the
 2333 transcendental unity of apperception. Consequently, I assert, by
 2334 means of general logic, that the transcendental unity of apperception
 2335 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, consequently,
 2336 the Antinomies, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.}

2337
 2338 \kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our concepts are inductive, there can be
 2339 no doubt that, in respect of the intelligible character, our ideas are
 2340 the clue to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception,
 2341 and the paralogisms of natural reason should only be used as a canon
 2342 for our judgements. Still, I assert that the objects in space and
 2343 time have lying before them, by means of transcendental logic, the
 2344 Transcendental Deduction. Our faculties can be treated like our
 2345 experience; thus, our ideas have lying before them the objects in
 2346 space and time. Our judgements constitute a body of demonstrated
 2347 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a posteriori. Time can
 2348 be treated like the manifold. As any dedicated reader can clearly
 2349 see, the employment of the noumena proves the validity of, certainly,
 2350 human reason, and space excludes the possibility of general logic.
 2351 Let us suppose that, indeed, the Ideal of pure reason, even as this
 2352 relates to our a priori knowledge, is the key to understanding the
 2353 Antinomies, yet the employment of the pure employment of our a
 2354 posteriori concepts is what first gives rise to, in all theoretical
 2355 sciences, the noumena.}

2356
 2357 \kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori, it
 2358 is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception is the mere
 2359 result of the power of the never-ending regress in the series of
 2360 empirical conditions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul;
 2361 in all theoretical sciences, natural causes exclude the possibility of
 2362 the noumena. Let us suppose that the transcendental objects in space
 2363 and time would thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, natural
 2364 causes. There can be no doubt that our understanding is the clue to
 2365 the discovery of the Ideal. Because of the relation between the Ideal
 2366 of pure reason and the Antinomies, the transcendental unity of
 2367 apperception, as I have elsewhere shown, can be treated like the
 2368 paralogisms, yet the phenomena are the clue to the discovery of the
 2369 Ideal. As I have elsewhere shown, I assert, in view of these
 2370 considerations, that our faculties, even as this relates to the thing
 2371 in itself, occupy part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction
 2372 concerning the existence of the Categories in general.}

2373
 2374 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain
 2375 that, that is to say, the Transcendental Deduction is the clue to the
 2376 discovery of, in particular, our knowledge, yet the thing in itself
 2377 would thereby be made to contradict our faculties. As is proven in
 2378 the ontological manuals, it is obvious that, when thus treated as our
 2379 understanding, the Categories have nothing to do with our
 2380 understanding, yet the never-ending regress in the series of empirical

2381 conditions occupies part of the sphere of the architectonic of human
 2382 reason concerning the existence of the paralogisms in general. As
 2383 will easily be shown in the next section, general logic has nothing to
 2384 do with, in the full sense of these terms, the discipline of pure
 2385 reason. As is evident upon close examination, the Ideal of human
 2386 reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may
 2387 be in contradictions with the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
 2388 the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that, even
 2389 as this relates to the transcendental unity of apperception, the
 2390 Categories, certainly, should only be used as a canon for the thing in
 2391 itself. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}

2392
 2393 \kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that space depends on the things in
 2394 themselves. There can be no doubt that, in particular, the Ideal, in
 2395 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the phenomena, is just
 2396 as necessary as the transcendental unity of apperception. There can
 2397 be no doubt that the manifold can not take account of, so far as
 2398 regards the architectonic of human reason, the things in themselves.
 2399 Thus, it remains a mystery why space depends on the manifold. To
 2400 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our
 2401 understanding (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
 2402 explain that this is true) is a representation of the Antinomies.}

2403
 2404 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are a
 2405 representation of metaphysics; in the case of the practical employment
 2406 of the transcendental aesthetic, the Categories are by their very
 2407 nature contradictory. It is not at all certain that the phenomena
 2408 have lying before them the objects in space and time, because of our
 2409 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Because of the relation
 2410 between applied logic and our faculties, it remains a mystery why our
 2411 ideas, consequently, exclude the possibility of philosophy; however,
 2412 the things in themselves prove the validity of, in the case of
 2413 metaphysics, the phenomena. By means of the transcendental aesthetic,
 2414 let us suppose that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated
 2415 doctrine, and all of this body must be known a priori. Since all of
 2416 the objects in space and time are hypothetical, metaphysics is the key
 2417 to understanding the paralogisms, yet the Transcendental Deduction has
 2418 nothing to do with our a posteriori knowledge. There can be no doubt
 2419 that metaphysics is a representation of the transcendental unity of
 2420 apperception, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2421
 2422 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that our concepts, in accordance
 2423 with the principles of the noumena, are by their very nature
 2424 contradictory, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. Space is what
 2425 first gives rise to, in other words, the Antinomies, and space depends
 2426 on the Ideal. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
 2427 our experience, indeed, proves the validity of the noumena. Hume
 2428 tells us that the phenomena can not take account of transcendental
 2429 logic. The objects in space and time, thus, exist in the manifold.
 2430 In which of our cognitive faculties are the manifold and the
 2431 Categories connected together? As will easily be shown in the next
 2432 section, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that
 2433 metaphysics, on the contrary, occupies part of the sphere of the thing
 2434 in itself concerning the existence of our synthetic judgements in

2435 general. }

2436

2437 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, I assert that,
2438 so far as regards metaphysics, our knowledge proves the validity of,
2439 on the contrary, the manifold, yet the objects in space and time are
2440 what first give rise to, in the study of formal logic, the paralogisms
2441 of pure reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, I
2442 assert, in all theoretical sciences, that our understanding (and the
2443 reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not take
2444 account of our sense perceptions. Because of the relation between the
2445 Transcendental Deduction and our a priori concepts, the phenomena are
2446 what first give rise to the intelligible objects in space and time,
2447 and natural causes, indeed, abstract from all content of a priori
2448 knowledge. By means of analysis, Galileo tells us that the Ideal has
2449 lying before it, on the contrary, our sense perceptions. I assert,
2450 for these reasons, that our knowledge stands in need of the things in
2451 themselves, since knowledge of our faculties is a priori. But this is
2452 to be dismissed as random groping.}

2453

2454 \kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding can not take account of our
2455 faculties; certainly, the never-ending regress in the series of
2456 empirical conditions is what first gives rise to, therefore, the
2457 things in themselves. It is not at all certain that, then, time
2458 occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning
2459 the existence of the paralogisms of practical reason in general. We
2460 can deduce that the thing in itself, on the other hand, abstracts from
2461 all content of knowledge. On the other hand, our a priori knowledge
2462 has lying before it the practical employment of the Antinomies. The
2463 employment of our sense perceptions is what first gives rise to the
2464 Antinomies, but the Categories, for these reasons, are by their very
2465 nature contradictory. In natural theology, it is not at all certain
2466 that our sense perceptions can not take account of our knowledge, by
2467 means of analysis. Thus, the Categories would thereby be made to
2468 contradict the things in themselves, as any dedicated reader can
2469 clearly see.}

2470

2471 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are just as necessary as the
2472 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As any
2473 dedicated reader can clearly see, the architectonic of natural reason
2474 (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby determine in
2475 its totality general logic. As will easily be shown in the next
2476 section, natural causes are a representation of, on the contrary, the
2477 Ideal of pure reason; as I have elsewhere shown, the things in
2478 themselves, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
2479 and none of this body must be known a priori. As we have already
2480 seen, our ideas are the clue to the discovery of our faculties.
2481 Whence comes applied logic, the solution of which involves the
2482 relation between the noumena and the Transcendental Deduction?
2483 Therefore, it is obvious that the empirical objects in space and time
2484 can not take account of the noumena, because of our necessary
2485 ignorance of the conditions. It is not at all certain that the
2486 manifold stands in need of, for these reasons, the Antinomies, by
2487 virtue of human reason.}

2488

2489 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of practical reason, there can be no doubt
 2490 that our experience, still, occupies part of the sphere of the
 2491 manifold concerning the existence of our analytic judgements in
 2492 general; as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories can never, as a
 2493 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
 2494 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they are a
 2495 representation of synthetic principles. As is proven in the
 2496 ontological manuals, the Categories are what first give rise to,
 2497 consequently, our faculties. We can deduce that, insomuch as the
 2498 discipline of practical reason relies on our ideas, necessity can be
 2499 treated like the thing in itself, yet the noumena can never, as a
 2500 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
 2501 they are a representation of problematic principles. However, let us
 2502 suppose that the things in themselves are the clue to the discovery
 2503 of, consequently, our judgements, as we have already seen. Whence
 2504 comes time, the solution of which involves the relation between the
 2505 phenomena and the noumena? In the study of our experience, I assert
 2506 that the Ideal can not take account of the discipline of practical
 2507 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The reader should be
 2508 careful to observe that the phenomena are what first give rise to the
 2509 Categories, by virtue of natural reason. As is proven in the
 2510 ontological manuals, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and
 2511 some of it must be known a priori. This may be clear with an
 2512 example.}

2513
 2514 \kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, so far as
 2515 regards the Ideal of practical reason and the noumena, abstracts from
 2516 all content of a posteriori knowledge, by virtue of human reason. To
 2517 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, that is to
 2518 say, our inductive judgements have nothing to do with, in the case of
 2519 the discipline of human reason, the things in themselves, and the
 2520 paralogisms of natural reason are the clue to the discovery of the
 2521 Transcendental Deduction. It remains a mystery why the noumena, in
 2522 natural theology, would be falsified; however, the things in
 2523 themselves can not take account of the thing in itself. As any
 2524 dedicated reader can clearly see, philosophy, in the study of the
 2525 thing in itself, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
 2526 because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it proves the validity of
 2527 inductive principles, but our sense perceptions, with the sole
 2528 exception of necessity, are the clue to the discovery of the
 2529 transcendental unity of apperception. Let us suppose that the
 2530 Categories can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated
 2531 science, because, like the employment of philosophy, they have nothing
 2532 to do with hypothetical principles. Our ideas have nothing to do with
 2533 the transcendental aesthetic.}

2534
 2535 \kgl_newpara:n {In the case of philosophy, the Transcendental
 2536 Deduction proves the validity of necessity, by means of analysis. Our
 2537 sense perceptions have lying before them, certainly, our experience.
 2538 There can be no doubt that space (and it remains a mystery why this is
 2539 true) stands in need of the noumena. As I have elsewhere shown, the
 2540 transcendental unity of apperception has lying before it, irrespective
 2541 of all empirical conditions, the Transcendental Deduction. The
 2542 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of our

2543 faculties, but the thing in itself, in accordance with the principles
2544 of our experience, can be treated like the paralogisms. As is proven
2545 in the ontological manuals, space has nothing to do with, thus, our
2546 ideas, yet the things in themselves, in natural theology, can be
2547 treated like the transcendental aesthetic.}

2548

2549 \kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Galileo, it remains a
2550 mystery why, so far as I know, the phenomena are the mere results of
2551 the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
2552 function of the soul, but the paralogisms (and there can be no doubt
2553 that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the transcendental
2554 aesthetic. Our experience, in accordance with the principles of
2555 transcendental logic, occupies part of the sphere of the manifold
2556 concerning the existence of the Categories in general. Our sense
2557 perceptions can not take account of the Ideal, by virtue of natural
2558 reason. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
2559 objects in space and time (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
2560 necessary to explain that this is the case) would thereby be made to
2561 contradict the pure employment of space; in the case of the discipline
2562 of human reason, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the
2563 transcendental aesthetic. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have
2564 already seen, it remains a mystery why there is a causal connection
2565 between the Ideal of human reason and the Ideal of human reason? What
2566 we have alone been able to show is that the Antinomies, for these
2567 reasons, stand in need to our judgements. Let us suppose that, in
2568 accordance with the principles of the Ideal of practical reason, the
2569 Antinomies prove the validity of space, but natural causes (and I
2570 assert, for these reasons, that this is the case) would thereby be
2571 made to contradict the transcendental unity of apperception. But the
2572 proof of this is a task from which we can here be absolved. }

2573

2574 \kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, the noumena
2575 should only be used as a canon for the Categories. As is proven in
2576 the ontological manuals, our sense perceptions, consequently, are by
2577 their very nature contradictory; therefore, our experience (and it
2578 must not be supposed that this is true) may not contradict itself, but
2579 it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the
2580 architectonic of practical reason. We can deduce that the Categories
2581 would thereby be made to contradict pure logic; for these reasons,
2582 space is by its very nature contradictory. Formal logic is a
2583 representation of our faculties. Metaphysics, insomuch as time relies
2584 on the Antinomies, stands in need of space. Let us suppose that the
2585 Antinomies constitute the whole content of our a priori concepts; on
2586 the other hand, the Ideal of natural reason (and there can be no doubt
2587 that this is true) is a representation of the manifold.}

2588

2589 \kgl_newpara:n {I assert, certainly, that, irrespective of all
2590 empirical conditions, the Categories are just as necessary as, on the
2591 other hand, the thing in itself, yet the manifold proves the validity
2592 of, on the other hand, the employment of the transcendental unity of
2593 apperception. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
2594 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in
2595 the architectonic of practical reason. As is evident upon close
2596 examination, it remains a mystery why the things in themselves have

2597 lying before them, that is to say, the Ideal; however, the
 2598 architectonic of natural reason exists in the Ideal of pure reason.
 2599 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the noumena
 2600 exclude the possibility of, however, general logic; consequently, the
 2601 paralogisms of natural reason, when thus treated as our ideas, can be
 2602 treated like philosophy.}

2603
 2604 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, our faculties
 2605 stand in need to the transcendental objects in space and time;
 2606 certainly, our ideas are a representation of the objects in space and
 2607 time. The reader should be careful to observe that the Categories
 2608 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms of human reason. By
 2609 means of analytic unity, space would be falsified; with the sole
 2610 exception of the manifold, necessity, even as this relates to our
 2611 understanding, has nothing to do with natural causes. Time is just as
 2612 necessary as, indeed, the phenomena. Thus, the noumena, consequently,
 2613 exclude the possibility of the Transcendental Deduction, by means of
 2614 analysis. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have already seen,
 2615 Aristotle tells us that there is a causal connection between the
 2616 noumena and the things in themselves? The employment of the
 2617 Antinomies is the key to understanding our ideas.}

2618
 2619 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
 2620 employment of the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in our sense
 2621 perceptions; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena exist in the
 2622 discipline of practical reason. Necessity (and Aristotle tells us
 2623 that this is true) has lying before it the objects in space and time;
 2624 in natural theology, our understanding, for example, proves the
 2625 validity of the objects in space and time. It is not at all certain
 2626 that our faculties, in the case of the thing in itself, are the clue
 2627 to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen. To avoid
 2628 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in reference to
 2629 ends, the Ideal would be falsified, and the Antinomies are a
 2630 representation of our a priori knowledge. (By means of analysis, to
 2631 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as
 2632 this relates to the Ideal of practical reason, the phenomena
 2633 constitute the whole content of, in view of these considerations, our
 2634 knowledge, and the discipline of natural reason (and we can deduce
 2635 that this is true) is just as necessary as the manifold.) The reader
 2636 should be careful to observe that, indeed, our judgements can not take
 2637 account of our sense perceptions, but the thing in itself, so far as I
 2638 know, can not take account of our sense perceptions. Let us suppose
 2639 that our ideas are a representation of metaphysics.}

2640
 2641 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of human reason, the Ideal of pure reason,
 2642 in the full sense of these terms, is by its very nature contradictory,
 2643 yet necessity is the key to understanding metaphysics. The Categories
 2644 have nothing to do with, therefore, the phenomena. We can deduce that
 2645 our experience can be treated like our a priori knowledge; certainly,
 2646 the objects in space and time are what first give rise to philosophy.
 2647 Because of the relation between the architectonic of natural reason
 2648 and the Antinomies, space has nothing to do with our ideas, but the
 2649 manifold occupies part of the sphere of the transcendental aesthetic
 2650 concerning the existence of the phenomena in general. The paralogisms

2651 of human reason are the clue to the discovery of, on the contrary, our
 2652 understanding.}
 2653
 2654 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
 2655 thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and
 2656 time, but the discipline of human reason is by its very nature
 2657 contradictory. It is obvious that, in other words, the manifold, in
 2658 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the thing in itself, is
 2659 the clue to the discovery of the things in themselves, yet our
 2660 experience has lying before it space. Our ideas would be falsified,
 2661 yet the thing in itself is just as necessary as the Antinomies.
 2662 Metaphysics exists in our speculative judgements. By means of
 2663 analysis, the phenomena are a representation of our faculties.}
 2664
 2665 \kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena stand in need to our sense perceptions,
 2666 but our concepts are the clue to the discovery of formal logic. The
 2667 objects in space and time have nothing to do with the things in
 2668 themselves, as is evident upon close examination. Time teaches us
 2669 nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the noumena. It is not at
 2670 all certain that, so far as regards the manifold and the objects in
 2671 space and time, the Transcendental Deduction, therefore, occupies part
 2672 of the sphere of pure logic concerning the existence of natural causes
 2673 in general, but the things in themselves, consequently, are a
 2674 representation of the intelligible objects in space and time. The
 2675 Transcendental Deduction (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
 2676 necessary to explain that this is true) depends on necessity, as we
 2677 have already seen. Consequently, it remains a mystery why our a
 2678 priori concepts, on the other hand, are what first give rise to the
 2679 Ideal of human reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}
 2680
 2681 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that, then,
 2682 the Ideal of human reason, in reference to ends, is the mere result of
 2683 the power of practical reason, a blind but indispensable function of
 2684 the soul, but the Ideal (and the reader should be careful to observe
 2685 that this is true) has lying before it our ideas. In the study of the
 2686 thing in itself, I assert, with the sole exception of the manifold,
 2687 that the Ideal of human reason is the clue to the discovery of the
 2688 practical employment of the Ideal of natural reason. As will easily
 2689 be shown in the next section, our ideas have lying before them the
 2690 Ideal of natural reason; thus, the Antinomies are what first give rise
 2691 to, indeed, the noumena. We can deduce that the Categories (and it is
 2692 obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict our
 2693 faculties. As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
 2694 natural causes occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of
 2695 natural reason concerning the existence of natural causes in general;
 2696 for these reasons, our ideas, in natural theology, occupy part of the
 2697 sphere of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2698 conditions concerning the existence of our judgements in general. Yet
 2699 can I entertain the transcendental aesthetic in thought, or does it
 2700 present itself to me? In the study of the Ideal, the Ideal of pure
 2701 reason depends on time. However, our a priori judgements have lying
 2702 before them the employment of necessity, by means of analytic unity.
 2703 }
 2704

2705 \kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not
2706 at all certain that the transcendental unity of apperception is the
2707 key to understanding the things in themselves; certainly, the
2708 Categories prove the validity of our faculties. Let us suppose that
2709 the paralogisms of natural reason (and we can deduce that this is the
2710 case) are a representation of the discipline of human reason. It
2711 remains a mystery why practical reason can be treated like the
2712 phenomena. (As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, there can be no
2713 doubt that the Categories, in the study of the discipline of human
2714 reason, exclude the possibility of the Categories.) As will easily be
2715 shown in the next section, our ideas stand in need to our knowledge.
2716 As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Antinomies exist in our a
2717 posteriori concepts, yet the thing in itself can not take account of,
2718 as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories. The question of this
2719 matter's relation to objects is not in any way under discussion.}

2720

2721 \kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our
2722 experience, in particular, can thereby determine in its totality our
2723 analytic judgements, yet necessity has nothing to do with, in
2724 reference to ends, the discipline of human reason. It is not at all
2725 certain that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2726 conditions would thereby be made to contradict, in particular, pure
2727 logic; with the sole exception of the Ideal, our ideas, that is to
2728 say, should only be used as a canon for our judgements. Since some of
2729 the Antinomies are disjunctive, the Transcendental Deduction can be
2730 treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2731 conditions. In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, it is not at
2732 all certain that the Ideal of natural reason, in view of these
2733 considerations, can be treated like the architectonic of human reason.
2734 The Antinomies (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) exclude
2735 the possibility of the Ideal of human reason; in the case of the
2736 discipline of natural reason, necessity would thereby be made to
2737 contradict, so far as I know, the Ideal of pure reason.
2738 Transcendental logic is a representation of the Transcendental
2739 Deduction; by means of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in
2740 itself can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of pure reason.
2741 In my present remarks I am referring to the never-ending regress in
2742 the series of empirical conditions only in so far as it is founded on
2743 hypothetical principles.}

2744

2745 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves prove the validity of, on the
2746 other hand, transcendental logic; therefore, necessity has lying
2747 before it, indeed, the paralogisms. What we have alone been able to
2748 show is that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and
2749 all of this body must be known a priori. Our understanding has lying
2750 before it, for these reasons, our ampliative judgements. Because of
2751 our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it is obvious that time may
2752 not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2753 contradictions with, in view of these considerations, our ideas;
2754 still, the practical employment of the transcendental objects in space
2755 and time, that is to say, has lying before it the things in
2756 themselves. Natural causes prove the validity of necessity.}

2757

2758 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a

2759 priori concepts, in other words, can never, as a whole, furnish a true
2760 and demonstrated science, because, like general logic, they prove the
2761 validity of hypothetical principles, by virtue of human reason. There
2762 can be no doubt that, indeed, the Antinomies, in other words, would be
2763 falsified, and the phenomena constitute the whole content of the
2764 discipline of natural reason. The phenomena can not take account of,
2765 in natural theology, the Ideal of practical reason. Time can never
2766 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, it
2767 has nothing to do with a posteriori principles; in view of these
2768 considerations, our a priori concepts stand in need to the discipline
2769 of pure reason. Our ideas constitute the whole content of the objects
2770 in space and time, but the Ideal, indeed, is the key to understanding
2771 our understanding.}

2772
2773 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
2774 the Ideal of pure reason is just as necessary as natural causes; in
2775 the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our faculties, in natural
2776 theology, abstract from all content of knowledge. The Categories can
2777 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
2778 like the manifold, they have lying before them a posteriori
2779 principles, but time is by its very nature contradictory. We can
2780 deduce that the Categories, so regarded, are by their very nature
2781 contradictory; for these reasons, time is what first gives rise to our
2782 ideas. Still, is it the case that pure logic constitutes the whole
2783 content for the Transcendental Deduction, or is the real question
2784 whether the paralogisms exist in our experience? Still, natural
2785 reason, so far as I know, would be falsified, because of our necessary
2786 ignorance of the conditions. Our faculties would be falsified.}

2787
2788 \kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal proves the validity of the objects in space
2789 and time. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2790 that our judgements are a representation of, however, the manifold.
2791 The objects in space and time exclude the possibility of necessity.
2792 The reader should be careful to observe that the Ideal, consequently,
2793 abstracts from all content of knowledge. There can be no doubt that,
2794 indeed, the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
2795 contradict human reason.}

2796
2797 \kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the transcendental unity of
2798 apperception can be treated like the Ideal. I assert that applied
2799 logic (and it is not at all certain that this is true) stands in need
2800 of the objects in space and time; certainly, the Ideal of practical
2801 reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. On the other hand,
2802 our experience (and it remains a mystery why this is true) stands in
2803 need of the transcendental unity of apperception. It remains a
2804 mystery why the Antinomies prove the validity of metaphysics. There
2805 can be no doubt that, in particular, the architectonic of pure reason,
2806 in all theoretical sciences, can never furnish a true and demonstrated
2807 science, because, like the manifold, it teaches us nothing whatsoever
2808 regarding the content of hypothetical principles, but the phenomena,
2809 with the sole exception of the transcendental aesthetic, have nothing
2810 to do with philosophy. It is obvious that our understanding, that is
2811 to say, is the mere result of the power of space, a blind but
2812 indispensable function of the soul, by means of analytic unity. Since

2813 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a priori, we can deduce that our
2814 experience is what first gives rise to the architectonic of practical
2815 reason. This may be clear with an example. }

2816

2817 \kgl_newpara:n {I assert, consequently, that the Transcendental
2818 Deduction would thereby be made to contradict our faculties, as will
2819 easily be shown in the next section. Let us suppose that our ideas,
2820 in the full sense of these terms, occupy part of the sphere of formal
2821 logic concerning the existence of the noumena in general. To avoid
2822 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
2823 Transcendental Deduction, so far as I know, occupies part of the
2824 sphere of the architectonic of practical reason concerning the
2825 existence of the Antinomies in general; certainly, the paralogisms
2826 occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of natural reason
2827 concerning the existence of our ideas in general. To avoid all
2828 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the pure employment
2829 of the architectonic of practical reason, still, is by its very nature
2830 contradictory; consequently, the intelligible objects in space and
2831 time would thereby be made to contradict the transcendental objects in
2832 space and time. We can deduce that the thing in itself exists in the
2833 Antinomies. As is evident upon close examination, the never-ending
2834 regress in the series of empirical conditions depends on, therefore,
2835 necessity. I assert that our judgements are a representation of the
2836 noumena; on the other hand, the transcendental unity of apperception
2837 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, then, the
2838 Ideal of pure reason.}

2839

2840 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the things in
2841 themselves are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena, and
2842 philosophy (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is
2843 true) teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the
2844 phenomena. Still, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2845 explain that natural causes (and it is obvious that this is the case)
2846 have nothing to do with our faculties. To avoid all misapprehension,
2847 it is necessary to explain that, irrespective of all empirical
2848 conditions, the employment of the objects in space and time can not
2849 take account of, that is to say, our concepts, but the never-ending
2850 regress in the series of empirical conditions constitutes the whole
2851 content for our sense perceptions. In the case of the discipline of
2852 pure reason, let us suppose that general logic stands in need of the
2853 Ideal of human reason, as we have already seen. The noumena prove the
2854 validity of, in the study of transcendental logic, our understanding.}

2855

2856 \kgl_newpara:n {Space (and what we have alone been able to show is
2857 that this is true) stands in need of necessity, yet our understanding,
2858 so far as regards the Ideal of practical reason, can never furnish a
2859 true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental unity
2860 of apperception, it has lying before it a priori principles. Since
2861 some of our judgements are disjunctive, it remains a mystery why the
2862 phenomena stand in need to the objects in space and time. In view of
2863 these considerations, the Categories (and let us suppose that this is
2864 the case) are just as necessary as the pure employment of the
2865 phenomena. Let us suppose that the things in themselves, so far as I
2866 know, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. It is

2867 obvious that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, natural
2868 causes can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science,
2869 because, like metaphysics, they are just as necessary as inductive
2870 principles. The architectonic of practical reason (and it is not at
2871 all certain that this is true) depends on the thing in itself, but the
2872 objects in space and time, as I have elsewhere shown, are the mere
2873 results of the power of the employment of the Antinomies, a blind but
2874 indispensable function of the soul. By means of analysis, there can
2875 be no doubt that, in reference to ends, natural causes are a
2876 representation of, in respect of the intelligible character, time, and
2877 the pure employment of the discipline of natural reason has lying
2878 before it our experience.}

2879
2880 \kgl_newpara:n {Still, it must not be supposed that our faculties are
2881 a representation of the Ideal of practical reason, as is evident upon
2882 close examination. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
2883 reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time
2884 are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
2885 function of the soul; in all theoretical sciences, the Ideal is a
2886 representation of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural
2887 reason, our sense perceptions. Aristotle tells us that, in
2888 particular, the objects in space and time, in the case of the
2889 manifold, are a representation of the things in themselves, yet
2890 natural causes stand in need to, irrespective of all empirical
2891 conditions, the things in themselves. Certainly, the transcendental
2892 unity of apperception, in accordance with the principles of the
2893 intelligible objects in space and time, exists in our sense
2894 perceptions. As we have already seen, the discipline of human reason
2895 (and Galileo tells us that this is true) depends on the thing in
2896 itself. Since some of natural causes are synthetic, the reader should
2897 be careful to observe that, for example, the things in themselves (and
2898 it is not at all certain that this is the case) are the clue to the
2899 discovery of our concepts. But this need not worry us.}

2900
2901 \kgl_newpara:n {The architectonic of natural reason is the key to
2902 understanding, so far as regards our a posteriori knowledge and the
2903 paralogsms, time; still, the Categories, with the sole exception of
2904 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, should
2905 only be used as a canon for the transcendental unity of apperception.
2906 However, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena
2907 exist in time. Because of the relation between space and the
2908 phenomena, let us suppose that our ideas are the clue to the discovery
2909 of our faculties. The phenomena constitute the whole content of the
2910 phenomena, but the transcendental unity of apperception, on the other
2911 hand, would be falsified. (As is evident upon close examination, it
2912 must not be supposed that our a posteriori knowledge is by its very
2913 nature contradictory.) There can be no doubt that the practical
2914 employment of our problematic judgements can be treated like the
2915 transcendental aesthetic. Aristotle tells us that our faculties have
2916 nothing to do with the objects in space and time. We thus have a pure
2917 synthesis of apprehension.}

2918
2919 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the noumena are hypothetical, there can
2920 be no doubt that, in particular, our knowledge, in other words, is the

2921 clue to the discovery of the things in themselves. Therefore, the
 2922 Ideal is just as necessary as, then, the Ideal, as will easily be
 2923 shown in the next section. We can deduce that, then, our knowledge,
 2924 in respect of the intelligible character, is by its very nature
 2925 contradictory, and the noumena, in particular, are by their very
 2926 nature contradictory. The reader should be careful to observe that,
 2927 indeed, pure logic, still, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
 2928 of it must be known a posteriori, yet our speculative judgements exist
 2929 in the manifold. In the case of time, the Categories, by means of
 2930 transcendental logic, constitute the whole content of the things in
 2931 themselves, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2932
 2933 \kgl_newpara:n {Transcendental logic can thereby determine in its
 2934 totality, consequently, our faculties, because of our necessary
 2935 ignorance of the conditions. Since some of the paralogisms are
 2936 analytic, there can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
 2937 Antinomies, for these reasons, constitute the whole content of
 2938 necessity, yet the things in themselves constitute the whole content
 2939 of our understanding. In view of these considerations, it is obvious
 2940 that the paralogisms are by their very nature contradictory, as any
 2941 dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas (and
 2942 it remains a mystery why this is the case) have nothing to do with the
 2943 discipline of pure reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
 2944 What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy occupies part
 2945 of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence
 2946 of natural causes in general. Since knowledge of the phenomena is a
 2947 posteriori, our ideas, in all theoretical sciences, can be treated
 2948 like time, but our judgements are just as necessary as the Categories.
 2949 Our understanding is a representation of the objects in space and
 2950 time, and the paralogisms are just as necessary as our experience.}

2951
 2952 \kgl_newpara:n {Philosophy (and it must not be supposed that this is
 2953 true) is a representation of the never-ending regress in the series of
 2954 empirical conditions; however, the Antinomies have nothing to do with,
 2955 in the study of philosophy, the discipline of practical reason.
 2956 Because of the relation between philosophy and our ideas, it remains a
 2957 mystery why, so regarded, metaphysics depends on the employment of
 2958 natural causes. The pure employment of the Antinomies, in particular,
 2959 is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
 2960 priori, but necessity is a representation of the Ideal. As will
 2961 easily be shown in the next section, it remains a mystery why the
 2962 Antinomies are what first give rise to the transcendental aesthetic;
 2963 in all theoretical sciences, the architectonic of pure reason has
 2964 nothing to do with, therefore, the noumena. The noumena are the clue
 2965 to the discovery of the Categories, yet the transcendental aesthetic,
 2966 for example, stands in need of natural causes. The Categories can not
 2967 take account of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural
 2968 reason, the paralogisms; in the study of general logic, the
 2969 transcendental unity of apperception, inasmuch as the architectonic of
 2970 human reason relies on the Antinomies, can thereby determine in its
 2971 totality natural causes.}

2972
 2973 \kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, it remains a
 2974 mystery why our judgements exclude the possibility of the

2975 transcendental aesthetic; therefore, the transcendental aesthetic can
2976 not take account of the thing in itself. Our knowledge depends on,
2977 indeed, our knowledge. It is not at all certain that space is just as
2978 necessary as the noumena. Is it true that metaphysics can not take
2979 account of the paralogisms of human reason, or is the real question
2980 whether the noumena are by their very nature contradictory? On the
2981 other hand, time constitutes the whole content for necessity, by means
2982 of analytic unity. There can be no doubt that the phenomena have
2983 lying before them metaphysics. As is proven in the ontological
2984 manuals, it remains a mystery why space exists in the objects in space
2985 and time; still, the noumena, in the case of necessity, constitute the
2986 whole content of philosophy.}

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

2988 \group_end:
2989
2990 \msg_info:nx{kantlipsum}{how-many}{ \int_to_arabic:n \l_tmpa_int }

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		\ExplFileDescription	2
\@ifpackagelater	3	\ExplFileName	2
\\	9, 30, 34	\ExplFileVersion	2
G			
_	80	\group_begin:	37, 48, 78
C		\group_end:	45, 56, 2988
\c_space_tl	15, 19	I	
\char_set_catcode_space:n	80	\IfBooleanTF	38
\cs:w	55, 68	\IfNoValueTF	41, 60
\cs_end:	55, 68	\int_do_until:nNnn	66
\cs_if_exist:NTF	51	\int_incr:N	69, 73
\cs_new:Nn	58, 72	\int_set:Nn	65, 79
\cs_new:Npx	55	\int_to_arabic:n	75, 2990
\cs_new_eq:NN	22	\int_to_roman:w	55, 68, 74
\cs_new_protected:Nn	64	K	
\cs_set:Nn	15, 16, 18, 19, 21	\kant	3, 36
\cs_set_eq:NN	39, 40, 49, 50	\kantdef	4, 47
D		\kgl_newpara:n	5,
\DeclareOption	14, 17, 20	72, 81, 95, 109, 125, 143, 168, 184,	
E		207, 227, 237, 251, 265, 289, 303,	
\ExecuteOptions	23	318, 333, 347, 365, 377, 387, 399,	
\exp_not:N	75	418, 436, 452, 466, 488, 510, 526,	
\exp_not:n	76	545, 572, 584, 595, 608, 625, 640,	
\ExplFileDate	2	652, 671, 688, 707, 729, 749, 765,	

781, 797, 817, 832, 849, 870, 888, 907, 924, 939, 957, 973, 991, 1008, 1027, 1049, 1064, 1076, 1089, 1110, 1136, 1157, 1168, 1189, 1203, 1222, 1235, 1259, 1269, 1290, 1308, 1327, 1345, 1361, 1379, 1394, 1409, 1426, 1443, 1470, 1489, 1505, 1523, 1541, 1560, 1578, 1596, 1611, 1631, 1653, 1673, 1691, 1712, 1731, 1750, 1767, 1780, 1799, 1823, 1842, 1861, 1880, 1899, 1917, 1932, 1958, 1977, 1996, 2013, 2030, 2050, 2074, 2099, 2116, 2136, 2151, 2175, 2194, 2208, 2233, 2253, 2265, 2283, 2297, 2319, 2338, 2357, 2374, 2393, 2404, 2422, 2437, 2454, 2471, 2489, 2514, 2535, 2549, 2574, 2589, 2604, 2619, 2641, 2654, 2665, 2681, 2705, 2721, 2745, 2758, 2773, 2788, 2797, 2817, 2840, 2856, 2880, 2901, 2919, 2933, 2952, 2973	
\kgl_nostar:	16, 19, 40
\kgl_number:n	21, 22, 49, 75
\kgl_par:	39, 40, 50, 76
\kgl_print	4
\kgl_print:	44, 64
\kgl_process:nn	4, 43, 58
\kgl_star:	15, 18, 39
L	
\l_kgl_end_tl	27, 42, 61, 62, 66
\l_kgl_start_tl	26, 42, 59, 65
\l_kgl_total_tl	28
\l_tmpa_int	65, 66, 68, 69, 73–75, 79, 2990
M	
\msg_error:nnx	52
\msg_info:nnx	2990
\msg_new:nnn	29
\msg_new:nnnn	32
N	
\NewDocumentCommand	36, 47
P	
\PackageError	6
\par	16, 18
\prg_do_nothing:	50
\ProcessOptions	24
\ProvidesExplPackage	1
R	
\RequirePackage	25
S	
\scan_stop:	24
\space	21
\SplitArgument	36
T	
\tex_endinput:D	12
\textbullet	21
\tl_gset:cx	74
\tl_new:N	26–28
\tl_set:Nn	42, 59, 61, 62
\token_to_str:N	53
U	
\use_none:n	22, 49