

The `kantlipsum` package

Dummy text in Kantian style*

Enrico Gregorio[†]

Released 2023/11/27

1 Introduction

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

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

2 Example

As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Ideal of practical reason is a representation of, as far as I know, the things in themselves; as I have shown elsewhere, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for our understanding. The paralogisms of practical reason are what first give rise to the architectonic of practical reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, reason would thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the Ideal of practical reason, yet the manifold depends on the phenomena. Necessity depends on, when thus treated as the practical employment of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, time. Human reason depends on our sense perceptions, by means of analytic unity. There can be no doubt that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to human reason.

Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason, by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is that, our understanding depends on the Categories. It remains a mystery why the Ideal stands in need of reason. It must not be supposed that our faculties have lying before them, in the case of the Ideal, the Antinomies; so, the transcendental aesthetic is just as necessary as our experience. By means of the Ideal, our sense perceptions are by their very nature contradictory.

*This file describes version v0.8c, last revised 2023/11/27.

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

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogsms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogsms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it depends on analytic principles.) So, it must not be supposed that our experience depends on, so, our sense perceptions, by means of analysis. Space constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, and time occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general.

3 Options

The package has four 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.
- `index` Each paragraph will generate an index entry; a `\makeindex` command will be needed, with a suitable package for making the index, and `\printindex` for printing it. However the index entry may be off by one, since the `\index` command is issued at the beginning of the paragraph. Also there is no guarantee that the indexed word really belongs to the paragraph.

4 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.

The commands `\kant`, `\kant*` and `\kantdef` take a further optional argument; with `\kant[42][1-3]` just the first three sentences of paragraph number 42 will be printed; ranges outside the actual number of sentences will be ignored. The requested sentences are stored, in the case of `\kantdef`.

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

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

Note

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

Changes from version 0.1

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

Changes from version 0.5

Some changes in L^AT_EX3 introduced some misfeatures, which this version corrects. Some kernel function names were also changed; here `\prg_stepwise_function:nnnN` that became `\int_step_function:nnnN`. Some functions have been made `protected`.

The most striking change is the possibility to generate an index: each paragraph indexes one of its words or phrases.

Changes from version 0.6

Maintenance release with new functions from `expl3`. Now a kernel released on 2017/11/14 or later is required.

Changes from version 0.7

Printing just some sentences in a paragraph is possible. Now a kernel released on 2019/07/01 or later is required.

Changes from version 0.8

Added a missing `\@@par`:

5 kantlipsum implementation

```
1 <*package>
2 <@@=kg1>
3 \ProvidesExplPackage
4   {kantlipsum}
5   {2023/11/27}
6   {0.8c}
```

```

7 {Generate text in Kantian style}
  A check to make sure that expl3 is not too old
8 \@ifl@t@r\ExplLoaderFileDate{2022-11-09}
9 {}
10 {%
11   \PackageError { kantlipsum } { Support-package~expl3~too~old }
12   {
13     You~need~to~update~your~installation~of~the~bundles~
14     'l3kernel'~and~'l3packages'.\MessageBreak
15     Loading~kantlipsum~will~abort!
16   }
17   \tex_endinput:D
18 }

```

5.1 Package options and required packages

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

```

19 \DeclareOption { par }
20 {
21   \cs_set_protected:Nn \__kgl_star: { \c_space_tl }
22   \cs_set_protected:Nn \__kgl_nostar: { \par }
23 }
24
25 \DeclareOption{ nopar }
26 {
27   \cs_set_protected:Nn \__kgl_star: { \par }
28   \cs_set_protected:Nn \__kgl_nostar: { \c_space_tl }
29 }
30
31 \DeclareOption{ numbers }
32 {
33   \cs_set_protected:Nn \__kgl_number:n
34   {
35     #1\nobreak\enspace\textbullet\nobreak\enspace
36   }
37 }
38
39 \bool_new:N \g__kgl_makeindex_bool
40 \bool_gset_false:N \g__kgl_makeindex_bool
41 \DeclareOption{ index }
42 { \bool_gset_true:N \g__kgl_makeindex_bool }
43
44 \cs_new_eq:NN \__kgl_number:n \use_none:n
45 \ExecuteOptions{par}
46 \ProcessOptions \scan_stop:

```

5.2 Messages

We define two messages.

```

47 \msg_new:nnn {kantlipsum}{how-many}
48 {The~package~provides~paragraphs~1~to~#1.~}

```

```

49   Values~outside~this~range~will~be~ignored.}
50 \msg_new:nnnn {kantlipsum}{already-defined}
51   {Control~sequence~#1~already~defined.}
52   {The~control~sequence~#1~is~already~defined,~
53     I'll~ignore~it}

```

5.3 Variables and constants

The `\l_@@_start_int` variable will contain the starting number for processing, while `\l_@@_end_int` the ending number. The `\g_@@_pars_seq` sequence will contain the pseudokantian sentences and `\g_@@_words_seq` that contains the words to index.

```

54 \int_new:N \l__kgl_start_int
55 \int_new:N \l__kgl_end_int
56 \seq_new:N \g__kgl_pars_seq
57 \seq_new:N \g__kgl_words_seq
58 \seq_new:N \l__kgl_sentences_seq

```

5.4 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.

```

59 \NewDocumentCommand{\kant}
60 {
61   s
62   >{\SplitArgument{1}{-}}0{1-7}
63   >{\SplitArgument{1}{-}}o}
64 {
65   \group_begin:
66   \IfBooleanTF{#1}
67     { \cs_set_eq:NN \__kgl_par: \__kgl_star: }
68     { \cs_set_eq:NN \__kgl_par: \__kgl_nostar: }
69   \IfNoValueTF{#3}
70     { \__kgl_process:nn #2 \__kgl_print: }
71     { \__kgl_process:nnnn #2 #3 \tl_use:N \l_tmpa_tl \__kgl_par: }
72   \group_end:
73 }

```

\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 `\@@_number:n` and `\@@_par:` and define the control sequence given as first argument to the pseudokantian sentence being the k th element of the sequence containing them, where k is the number given as second argument. If the control sequence is already defined we issue an error and don't perform the definition.

```

74 \NewDocumentCommand{\kantdef}
75 {
76   m
77   m
78   >{\SplitArgument{1}{-}}0{1-50}
79 }
80 {
81   \group_begin:
82   \__kgl_define:nnnn {#1} {#2} #3
83   \group_end:
84 }

```

5.5 Internal functions

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

```

85 \cs_new_protected:Nn \__kgl_process:nn
86 {
87   \int_set:Nn \l__kgl_start_int {#1}
88   \tl_if_novalue:nTF {#2}
89     { \int_set:Nn \l__kgl_end_int {#1} }
90     { \int_set:Nn \l__kgl_end_int {#2} }
91 }
92 \cs_new_protected:Nn \__kgl_process:nnnn
93 {
94   \tl_set:Ne \l_tmpa_tl { \seq_item:Nn \g__kgl_pars_seq {#1} }
95   \tl_if_novalue:nTF {#4}
96     { \__kgl_extract:nnV {#3} {#3} \l_tmpa_tl }
97     { \__kgl_extract:nnV {#3} {#4} \l_tmpa_tl }
98 }

```

_kgl_print: The printing routine is in the function \\@@_print:; we start a loop printing item number x in the sequence \\g_@@_pars_seq for all numbers x in the specified range. The function \\@@_use:n function is a wrapper to be used with \\int_step_function:nnnN: it's passed a number as argument, builds the constant name corresponding to it and produces the text. If the index entry is to be issued, the appropriate element from \\g_@@_words_seq is used; the page reference might not be correct, though.

```

99 \\cs_new_protected:Nn \\_kgl_print:
100 {
101   \\int_step_function:nnnN
102   {\\l__kgl_start_int} {1} {\\l__kgl_end_int} \\_kgl_use:n
103 }
104 \\cs_new:Nn \\_kgl_use:n
105 {
106   \\int_compare:nNnF { #1 } > { \\seq_count:N \\g__kgl_pars_seq }
107   { \\_kgl_number:n {#1} }
108   \\bool_if:NT \\g__kgl_makeindex_bool
109   {
110     \\use:x { \\exp_not:N \\index{ \\seq_item:Nn \\g__kgl_words_seq {#1} } }
111   }
112   \\seq_item:Nn \\g__kgl_pars_seq {#1}
113 }

```

_kgl_newpara:n The \\@@_newpara:n appends a new item to the sequence \\g_@@_pars_seq consisting of, say, *<text of the 42nd sentence>* \\@@_par:

```

114 \\cs_new_protected:Nn \\_kgl_newpara:n
115 { \\seq_gput_right:Nn \\g__kgl_pars_seq {#1\\_kgl_par:} }

```

_kgl_newword:n The \\@@_newword:n function appends a new item to the sequence \\g_@@_words_seq consisting of one word from the corresponding paragraph.

```

116 \\cs_new_protected:Nn \\_kgl_newword:n
117 { \\seq_gput_right:Nn \\g__kgl_words_seq {#1} }

```

`_kgldefine:nnn` The function `\@@define:nnnn` chooses the paragraph, then extracts the requested sentences.

```

118 \cs_new_protected:Nn \_kgl_define:nnnn
119 {
120   \cs_set_eq:NN \_kgl_number:n \use_none:n
121   \cs_set_eq:NN \_kgl_par: \prg_do_nothing:
122   \cs_if_exist:NTF #1
123     {
124       \msg_error:nnn {kantlipsum} {already-defined} {#1}
125     }
126     {
127       \tl_set:Ne \l_tmpa_tl { \seq_item:Nn \g__kgl_pars_seq {#2} }
128       \tl_if_novalue:nTF {#4}
129         { \_kgl_extract:nnV {#3} {#3} \l_tmpa_tl }
130         { \_kgl_extract:nnV {#3} {#4} \l_tmpa_tl }
131       \cs_new:Npe #1 { \l_tmpa_tl }
132     }
133 }

```

`_kgl_extract:nnn` This function does the extraction by splitting the input at periods and then adding the requested sentences to another sequence that later can be used.

```

134 \cs_new_protected:Nn \_kgl_extract:nnn
135 {
136   \seq_set_split:Nnn \l__kgl_sentences_seq { . } {#3}
137   \seq_clear:N \l_tmpa_seq
138   \seq_map_indexed_inline:Nn \l__kgl_sentences_seq
139     {
140       \int_compare:nT { #1 <= ##1 <= #2 }
141       { \seq_put_right:Nn \l_tmpa_seq { ##2 } }
142     }
143   \tl_set:Ne \l_tmpa_tl { \seq_use:Nn \l_tmpa_seq { .~ }. }
144 }
145 \cs_generate_variant:Nn \_kgl_extract:nnn { nnV }

```

5.6 Defining the sentences

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

```

146 \group_begin:
147 \char_set_catcode_space:n {'\ }

```

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

```

148 \_kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Ideal of
149 practical reason is a representation of, as far as I know, the things
150 in themselves; as I have shown elsewhere, the phenomena should only be
151 used as a canon for our understanding. The paralogisms of practical
152 reason are what first give rise to the architectonic of practical
153 reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, reason would
154 thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the
155 Ideal of practical reason, yet the manifold depends on the phenomena.

```


156 Necessity depends on, when thus treated as the practical employment of
157 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, time.
158 Human reason depends on our sense perceptions, by means of analytic
159 unity. There can be no doubt that the objects in space and time are
160 what first give rise to human reason.}

161

162 _kgl_newpara:n {Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do
163 with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a
164 posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of
165 apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason,
166 by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
167 it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the
168 validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is
169 that, our understanding depends on the Categories. It remains a
170 mystery why the Ideal stands in need of reason. It must not be
171 supposed that our faculties have lying before them, in the case of the
172 Ideal, the Antinomies; so, the transcendental aesthetic is just as
173 necessary as our experience. By means of the Ideal, our sense
174 perceptions are by their very nature contradictory.}

175

176 _kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things
177 in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a
178 representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the
179 paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have
180 lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because
181 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would
182 thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the
183 Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions.
184 (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated
185 science, because, like time, it depends on analytic principles.) So,
186 it must not be supposed that our experience depends on, so, our sense
187 perceptions, by means of analysis. Space constitutes the whole content
188 for our sense perceptions, and time occupies part of the sphere of the
189 Ideal concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in
190 general.}

191

192 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, what we have alone been able
193 to show is that the objects in space and time would be falsified; what
194 we have alone been able to show is that, our judgements are what first
195 give rise to metaphysics. As I have shown elsewhere, Aristotle tells
196 us that the objects in space and time, in the full sense of these
197 terms, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, indeed, our
198 problematic judgements, indeed, can be treated like our concepts. As
199 any dedicated reader can clearly see, our knowledge can be treated
200 like the transcendental unity of apperception, but the phenomena
201 occupy part of the sphere of the manifold concerning the existence of
202 natural causes in general. Whence comes the architectonic of natural
203 reason, the solution of which involves the relation between necessity
204 and the Categories? Natural causes (and it is not at all certain that
205 this is the case) constitute the whole content for the paralogisms.
206 This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental
207 philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the
208 fact may suffice.}

209

210 _kgl_newpara:n {Therefore, we can deduce that the objects in space and
211 time (and I assert, however, that this is the case) have lying before
212 them the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance
213 of the conditions, it must not be supposed that, then, formal logic
214 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true) is a
215 representation of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
216 conditions, but the discipline of pure reason, in so far as this
217 expounds the contradictory rules of metaphysics, depends on the
218 Antinomies. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, therefore, can
219 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
220 like the transcendental unity of apperception, they constitute the
221 whole content for a priori principles; for these reasons, our
222 experience is just as necessary as, in accordance with the principles
223 of our a priori knowledge, philosophy. The objects in space and time
224 abstract from all content of knowledge. Has it ever been suggested
225 that it remains a mystery why there is no relation between the
226 Antinomies and the phenomena? It must not be supposed that the
227 Antinomies (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are
228 the clue to the discovery of philosophy, because of our necessary
229 ignorance of the conditions. As I have shown elsewhere, to avoid all
230 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our understanding
231 (and it must not be supposed that this is true) is what first gives
232 rise to the architectonic of pure reason, as is evident upon close
233 examination.}

234
235 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are what first give rise to
236 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural
237 reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception
238 abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these
239 considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key
240 to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all
241 empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our
242 disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure
243 logic, in the case of the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from
244 all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in
245 accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms,
246 time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be
247 treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be
248 supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise
249 to the employment of pure reason.}

250
251 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all
252 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the
253 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a
254 representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in
255 themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It
256 remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series
257 of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of
258 the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never
259 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
260 architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic
261 principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time
262 is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would
263 thereby be made to contradict the Ideal of practical reason. On the

264 other hand, natural causes can not take account of, consequently, the
265 Antinomies, as will easily be shown in the next section.
266 Consequently, the Ideal of practical reason (and I assert that this is
267 true) excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our
268 experience would thereby be made to contradict, for example, our
269 ideas, but the transcendental objects in space and time (and let us
270 suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of
271 necessity. But the proof of this is a task from which we can here be
272 absolved.}

273

274 _kgl_newpara:n {Thus, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of, on
275 the other hand, natural causes, as will easily be shown in the next
276 section. Still, the reader should be careful to observe that the
277 phenomena have lying before them the intelligible objects in space and
278 time, because of the relation between the manifold and the noumena.
279 As is evident upon close examination, Aristotle tells us that, in
280 reference to ends, our judgements (and the reader should be careful to
281 observe that this is the case) constitute the whole content of the
282 empirical objects in space and time. Our experience, with the sole
283 exception of necessity, exists in metaphysics; therefore, metaphysics
284 exists in our experience. (It must not be supposed that the thing in
285 itself (and I assert that this is true) may not contradict itself, but
286 it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the
287 transcendental unity of apperception; certainly, our judgements exist
288 in natural causes.) The reader should be careful to observe that,
289 indeed, the Ideal, on the other hand, can be treated like the noumena,
290 but natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the Antinomies.
291 The transcendental unity of apperception constitutes the whole content
292 for the noumena, by means of analytic unity.}

293

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

303

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

317

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

331
332 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that the
333 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, certainly,
334 our a priori knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Our faculties
335 abstract from all content of knowledge; for these reasons, the
336 discipline of human reason stands in need of the transcendental
337 aesthetic. There can be no doubt that, insomuch as the Ideal relies
338 on our a posteriori concepts, philosophy, when thus treated as the
339 things in themselves, exists in our hypothetical judgements, yet our a
340 posteriori concepts are what first give rise to the phenomena.
341 Philosophy (and I assert that this is true) excludes the possibility
342 of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, as
343 will easily be shown in the next section. Still, is it true that the
344 transcendental aesthetic can not take account of the objects in space
345 and time, or is the real question whether the phenomena should only be
346 used as a canon for the never-ending regress in the series of
347 empirical conditions? By means of analytic unity, the Transcendental
348 Deduction, still, is the mere result of the power of the
349 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
350 soul, but our faculties abstract from all content of a posteriori
351 knowledge. It remains a mystery why, then, the discipline of human
352 reason, in other words, is what first gives rise to the transcendental
353 aesthetic, yet our faculties have lying before them the architectonic
354 of human reason.}

355
356 _kgl_newpara:n {However, we can deduce that our experience (and it
357 must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our
358 experience, as we have already seen. On the other hand, it is not at
359 all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the
360 practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the
361 noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first
362 give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is
363 necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a
364 true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural
365 reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the
366 writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in
367 respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space
368 and time.}

369
370 _kgl_newpara:n {Our ideas, in the case of the Ideal of pure reason,
371 are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time

372 can not take account of our understanding, and philosophy excludes the
373 possibility of, certainly, space. I assert that our ideas, by means
374 of philosophy, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of
375 this body must be known a posteriori, by means of analysis. It must
376 not be supposed that space is by its very nature contradictory. Space
377 would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of the manifold, the
378 manifold. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us
379 that, in accordance with the principles of the discipline of human
380 reason, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
381 has lying before it our experience. This could not be passed over in
382 a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely
383 critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.}

384
385 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of our faculties is a posteriori, pure
386 logic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, indeed,
387 the architectonic of human reason. As we have already seen, we can
388 deduce that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the Ideal of
389 human reason is what first gives rise to, indeed, natural causes, yet
390 the thing in itself can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
391 because, like necessity, it is the clue to the discovery of
392 disjunctive principles. On the other hand, the manifold depends on
393 the paralogisms. Our faculties exclude the possibility of, insomuch
394 as philosophy relies on natural causes, the discipline of natural
395 reason. In all theoretical sciences, what we have alone been able to
396 show is that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of
397 our judgements, as will easily be shown in the next section. This is
398 what chiefly concerns us.}

399
400 _kgl_newpara:n {Time (and let us suppose that this is true) is the
401 clue to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen.
402 Since knowledge of our faculties is a priori, to avoid all
403 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the empirical objects
404 in space and time can not take account of, in the case of the Ideal of
405 natural reason, the manifold. It must not be supposed that pure
406 reason stands in need of, certainly, our sense perceptions. On the
407 other hand, our ampliative judgements would thereby be made to
408 contradict, in the full sense of these terms, our hypothetical
409 judgements. I assert, still, that philosophy is a representation of,
410 however, formal logic; in the case of the manifold, the objects in
411 space and time can be treated like the paralogisms of natural reason.
412 This is what chiefly concerns us.}

413
414 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between pure logic and natural
415 causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that,
416 even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes
417 the whole content for our concepts, but the Ideal of practical reason
418 may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
419 contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why
420 natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by
421 means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as
422 our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions,
423 depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle.
424 It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is
425 the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The

426 Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet
427 general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing
428 to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to
429 the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on
430 analytic principles.}

431

432 _kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of our a priori knowledge, our
433 faculties have nothing to do with our faculties. Pure reason (and we
434 can deduce that this is true) would thereby be made to contradict the
435 phenomena. As we have already seen, let us suppose that the
436 transcendental aesthetic can thereby determine in its totality the
437 objects in space and time. We can deduce that, that is to say, our
438 experience is a representation of the paralogisms, and our
439 hypothetical judgements constitute the whole content of our concepts.
440 However, it is obvious that time can be treated like our a priori
441 knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Philosophy has nothing to do
442 with natural causes.}

443

444 _kgl_newpara:n {By means of analysis, our faculties stand in need to,
445 indeed, the empirical objects in space and time. The objects in space
446 and time, for these reasons, have nothing to do with our
447 understanding. There can be no doubt that the noumena can not take
448 account of the objects in space and time; consequently, the Ideal of
449 natural reason has lying before it the noumena. By means of analysis,
450 the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to, therefore,
451 space, yet our sense perceptions exist in the discipline of practical
452 reason.}

453

454 _kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal can not take account of, so far as I know,
455 our faculties. As we have already seen, the objects in space and time
456 are what first give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of
457 empirical conditions; for these reasons, our a posteriori concepts
458 have nothing to do with the paralogisms of pure reason. As we have
459 already seen, metaphysics, by means of the Ideal, occupies part of the
460 sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the objects in
461 space and time in general, yet time excludes the possibility of our
462 sense perceptions. I assert, thus, that our faculties would thereby
463 be made to contradict, indeed, our knowledge. Natural causes, so
464 regarded, exist in our judgements.}

465

466 _kgl_newpara:n {The never-ending regress in the series of empirical
467 conditions may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it
468 may be in contradictions with, then, applied logic. The employment of
469 the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our
470 understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It
471 must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case
472 of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is
473 a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
474 posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes
475 the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be
476 shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe
477 that the things in themselves, in view of these considerations, can be
478 treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical
479 sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense

480 perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the
481 sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental
482 objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological
483 manuals.}

484

485 _kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, in the case
486 of philosophy, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must
487 be known a posteriori. Thus, the objects in space and time, insomuch
488 as the discipline of practical reason relies on the Antinomies,
489 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must
490 be known a priori. Applied logic is a representation of, in natural
491 theology, our experience. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
492 Hume tells us that, that is to say, the Categories (and Aristotle
493 tells us that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the
494 transcendental aesthetic. (Because of our necessary ignorance of the
495 conditions, the paralogisms prove the validity of time.) As is shown
496 in the writings of Hume, it must not be supposed that, in reference to
497 ends, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must
498 be known a priori. By means of analysis, it is not at all certain
499 that our a priori knowledge is just as necessary as our ideas. In my
500 present remarks I am referring to time only in so far as it is founded
501 on disjunctive principles.}

502

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

518

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

532

533 _kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the things in themselves are a

534 posteriori, there can be no doubt that, when thus treated as our
535 understanding, pure reason depends on, still, the Ideal of natural
536 reason, and our speculative judgements constitute a body of
537 demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
538 posteriori. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, it is not at
539 all certain that, in accordance with the principles of natural causes,
540 the Transcendental Deduction is a body of demonstrated science, and
541 all of it must be known a posteriori, yet our concepts are the clue to
542 the discovery of the objects in space and time. Therefore, it is
543 obvious that formal logic would be falsified. By means of analytic
544 unity, it remains a mystery why, in particular, metaphysics teaches us
545 nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal. The phenomena,
546 on the other hand, would thereby be made to contradict the
547 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As is
548 shown in the writings of Aristotle, philosophy is a representation of,
549 on the contrary, the employment of the Categories. Because of the
550 relation between the transcendental unity of apperception and the
551 paralogisms of natural reason, the paralogisms of human reason, in the
552 study of the Transcendental Deduction, would be falsified, but
553 metaphysics abstracts from all content of knowledge.}

554
555 _kgl_newpara:n {Since some of natural causes are disjunctive, the
556 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is the key
557 to understanding, in particular, the noumena. By means of analysis,
558 the Categories (and it is not at all certain that this is the case)
559 exclude the possibility of our faculties. Let us suppose that the
560 objects in space and time, irrespective of all empirical conditions,
561 exist in the architectonic of natural reason, because of the relation
562 between the architectonic of natural reason and our a posteriori
563 concepts. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that, so regarded, our
564 sense perceptions (and let us suppose that this is the case) are a
565 representation of the practical employment of natural causes. (I
566 assert that time constitutes the whole content for, in all theoretical
567 sciences, our understanding, as will easily be shown in the next
568 section.) With the sole exception of our knowledge, the reader should
569 be careful to observe that natural causes (and it remains a mystery
570 why this is the case) can not take account of our sense perceptions,
571 as will easily be shown in the next section. Certainly, natural
572 causes would thereby be made to contradict, with the sole exception of
573 necessity, the things in themselves, because of our necessary
574 ignorance of the conditions. But to this matter no answer is
575 possible.}

576
577 _kgl_newpara:n {Since all of the objects in space and time are
578 synthetic, it remains a mystery why, even as this relates to our
579 experience, our a priori concepts should only be used as a canon for
580 our judgements, but the phenomena should only be used as a canon for
581 the practical employment of our judgements. Space, consequently, is a
582 body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a priori, as
583 will easily be shown in the next section. We can deduce that the
584 Categories have lying before them the phenomena. Therefore, let us
585 suppose that our ideas, in the study of the transcendental unity of
586 apperception, should only be used as a canon for the pure employment
587 of natural causes. Still, the reader should be careful to observe

588 that the Ideal (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can not
589 take account of our faculties, as is proven in the ontological
590 manuals. Certainly, it remains a mystery why the manifold is just as
591 necessary as the manifold, as is evident upon close examination.}

592
593 _kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, what we have alone been able to
594 show is that the architectonic of practical reason is the clue to the
595 discovery of, still, the manifold, by means of analysis. Since
596 knowledge of the objects in space and time is a priori, the things in
597 themselves have lying before them, for example, the paralogisms of
598 human reason. Let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute
599 the whole content of, by means of philosophy, necessity. Our concepts
600 (and the reader should be careful to observe that this is the case)
601 are just as necessary as the Ideal. To avoid all misapprehension, it
602 is necessary to explain that the Categories occupy part of the sphere
603 of the discipline of human reason concerning the existence of our
604 faculties in general. The transcendental aesthetic, in so far as this
605 expounds the contradictory rules of our a priori concepts, is the mere
606 result of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable
607 function of the soul. The manifold, in respect of the intelligible
608 character, teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the
609 thing in itself; however, the objects in space and time exist in
610 natural causes.}

611
612 _kgl_newpara:n {I assert, however, that our a posteriori concepts (and
613 it is obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to
614 contradict the discipline of practical reason; however, the things in
615 themselves, however, constitute the whole content of philosophy. As
616 will easily be shown in the next section, the Antinomies would thereby
617 be made to contradict our understanding; in all theoretical sciences,
618 metaphysics, irrespective of all empirical conditions, excludes the
619 possibility of space. It is not at all certain that necessity (and it
620 is obvious that this is true) constitutes the whole content for the
621 objects in space and time; consequently, the paralogisms of practical
622 reason, however, exist in the Antinomies. The reader should be
623 careful to observe that transcendental logic, in so far as this
624 expounds the universal rules of formal logic, can never furnish a true
625 and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it may not
626 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
627 contradictions with disjunctive principles. (Because of our necessary
628 ignorance of the conditions, the thing in itself is what first gives
629 rise to, insomuch as the transcendental aesthetic relies on the
630 objects in space and time, the transcendental objects in space and
631 time; thus, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
632 conditions excludes the possibility of philosophy.) As we have
633 already seen, time depends on the objects in space and time; in the
634 study of the architectonic of pure reason, the phenomena are the clue
635 to the discovery of our understanding. Because of our necessary
636 ignorance of the conditions, I assert that, indeed, the architectonic
637 of natural reason, as I have elsewhere shown, would be falsified.}

638
639 _kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, the transcendental unity of
640 apperception has nothing to do with the Antinomies. As will easily be
641 shown in the next section, our sense perceptions are by their very

642 nature contradictory, but our ideas, with the sole exception of human
643 reason, have nothing to do with our sense perceptions. Metaphysics is
644 the key to understanding natural causes, by means of analysis. It is
645 not at all certain that the paralogisms of human reason prove the
646 validity of, thus, the noumena, since all of our a posteriori
647 judgements are a priori. We can deduce that, indeed, the objects in
648 space and time can not take account of the Transcendental Deduction,
649 but our knowledge, on the other hand, would be falsified.}

650

651 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, our understanding is the clue
652 to the discovery of necessity. On the other hand, the Ideal of pure
653 reason is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known
654 a posteriori, as is evident upon close examination. It is obvious
655 that the transcendental aesthetic, certainly, is a body of
656 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori; in view
657 of these considerations, the noumena are the clue to the discovery of,
658 so far as I know, natural causes. In the case of space, our
659 experience depends on the Ideal of natural reason, as we have already
660 seen.}

661

662 _kgl_newpara:n {For these reasons, space is the key to understanding
663 the thing in itself. Our sense perceptions abstract from all content
664 of a priori knowledge, but the phenomena can never, as a whole,
665 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they are
666 just as necessary as disjunctive principles. Our problematic
667 judgements constitute the whole content of time. By means of
668 analysis, our ideas are by their very nature contradictory, and our a
669 posteriori concepts are a representation of natural causes. I assert
670 that the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
671 contradict, so far as regards the thing in itself, the Transcendental
672 Deduction; in natural theology, the noumena are the clue to the
673 discovery of, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction.}

674

675 _kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
676 explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the
677 transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet
678 the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental
679 Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would
680 thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our
681 ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the
682 validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings
683 of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that,
684 insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories,
685 the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to
686 contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
687 conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our
688 faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the
689 writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands
690 in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.}

691

692 _kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the
693 case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural
694 theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
695 content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural

696 theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the
697 Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this
698 relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts
699 would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in
700 the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory.
701 Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a
702 representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words,
703 has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us
704 that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the
705 Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.}

706
707 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves can not take account of the
708 Transcendental Deduction. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious
709 that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical
710 sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the
711 transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these
712 terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense
713 perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some
714 of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the
715 possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in
716 themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles
717 of philosophy, our sense perceptions.}

718
719 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, philosophy is
720 the mere result of the power of pure logic, a blind but indispensable
721 function of the soul; however, the phenomena can never, as a whole,
722 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like general logic,
723 they exclude the possibility of problematic principles. To avoid all
724 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the never-ending
725 regress in the series of empirical conditions is by its very nature
726 contradictory. It must not be supposed that our a priori concepts
727 stand in need to natural causes, because of the relation between the
728 Ideal and our ideas. (We can deduce that the Antinomies would be
729 falsified.) Since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori, what
730 we have alone been able to show is that, in the full sense of these
731 terms, necessity (and we can deduce that this is true) is the key to
732 understanding time, but the Ideal of natural reason is just as
733 necessary as our experience. As will easily be shown in the next
734 section, the thing in itself, with the sole exception of the manifold,
735 abstracts from all content of a posteriori knowledge. The question of
736 this matter's relation to objects is not in any way under discussion.}

737
738 _kgl_newpara:n {By means of the transcendental aesthetic, it remains a
739 mystery why the phenomena (and it is not at all certain that this is
740 the case) are the clue to the discovery of the never-ending regress in
741 the series of empirical conditions. In all theoretical sciences,
742 metaphysics exists in the objects in space and time, because of the
743 relation between formal logic and our synthetic judgements. The
744 Categories would thereby be made to contradict the paralogisms, as any
745 dedicated reader can clearly see. Therefore, there can be no doubt
746 that the paralogisms have nothing to do with, so far as regards the
747 Ideal and our faculties, the paralogisms, because of our necessary
748 ignorance of the conditions. It must not be supposed that the objects
749 in space and time occupy part of the sphere of necessity concerning

750 the existence of the noumena in general. In natural theology, the
751 things in themselves, therefore, are by their very nature
752 contradictory, by virtue of natural reason. This is the sense in
753 which it is to be understood in this work.}

754

755 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose
756 that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts
757 are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to
758 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in
759 particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of
760 natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful
761 to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in
762 space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our
763 understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the
764 thing in itself abstracts from all content of a posteriori knowledge.
765 We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can
766 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal
767 of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality
768 speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as
769 necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the
770 Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove
771 the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to
772 understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

773

774 _kgl_newpara:n {Natural causes, when thus treated as the things in
775 themselves, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge, by
776 means of analytic unity. Our a posteriori knowledge, in other words,
777 is the key to understanding the Antinomies. As we have already seen,
778 what we have alone been able to show is that, so far as I know, the
779 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the
780 manifold. The things in themselves are the clue to the discovery of,
781 in the case of the Ideal of natural reason, our concepts. To avoid
782 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, so far as
783 regards philosophy, the discipline of human reason, for these reasons,
784 is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
785 priori, but our faculties, consequently, would thereby be made to
786 contradict the Antinomies. It remains a mystery why our understanding
787 excludes the possibility of, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the
788 objects in space and time, our concepts. It is not at all certain
789 that the pure employment of the objects in space and time (and the
790 reader should be careful to observe that this is true) is the clue to
791 the discovery of the architectonic of pure reason. Let us suppose
792 that natural reason is a representation of, insomuch as space relies
793 on the paralogisms, the Transcendental Deduction, by means of
794 analysis.}

795

796 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, the Ideal constitutes the
797 whole content for the transcendental unity of apperception. By means
798 of analytic unity, let us suppose that, when thus treated as space,
799 our synthetic judgements, therefore, would be falsified, and the
800 objects in space and time are what first give rise to our sense
801 perceptions. Let us suppose that, in the full sense of these terms,
802 the discipline of practical reason can not take account of our
803 experience, and our ideas have lying before them our inductive

804 judgements. (Since all of the phenomena are speculative, to avoid all
805 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena
806 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must
807 be known a posteriori; as I have elsewhere shown, the noumena are a
808 representation of the noumena.) Let us suppose that practical reason
809 can thereby determine in its totality, by means of the Ideal, the pure
810 employment of the discipline of practical reason. Galileo tells us
811 that the employment of the phenomena can be treated like our ideas;
812 still, the Categories, when thus treated as the paralogisms, exist in
813 the employment of the Antinomies. Let us apply this to our
814 experience.}

815
816 _kgl_newpara:n {I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason
817 can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the
818 Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our
819 ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader
820 can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account
821 of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and the
822 noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should
823 only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in
824 natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown
825 in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these
826 reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is
827 that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories,
828 are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a
829 blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the
830 ontological manuals.}

831
832 _kgl_newpara:n {The noumena have nothing to do with, thus, the
833 Antinomies. What we have alone been able to show is that the things
834 in themselves constitute the whole content of human reason, as is
835 proven in the ontological manuals. The noumena (and to avoid all
836 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
837 the clue to the discovery of the architectonic of natural reason. As
838 we have already seen, let us suppose that our experience is what first
839 gives rise to, therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception; in
840 the study of the practical employment of the Antinomies, our
841 ampliative judgements are what first give rise to the objects in space
842 and time. Necessity can never furnish a true and demonstrated
843 science, because, like our understanding, it can thereby determine in
844 its totality hypothetical principles, and the empirical objects in
845 space and time are what first give rise to, in all theoretical
846 sciences, our a posteriori concepts.}

847
848 _kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding excludes the possibility of
849 practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the
850 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the
851 employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic.
852 With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all
853 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of
854 these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated
855 science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a
856 representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close
857 examination. Since knowledge of the paralogisms of natural reason is

858 a priori, I assert, consequently, that, in so far as this expounds the
859 practical rules of the thing in itself, the things in themselves
860 exclude the possibility of the discipline of pure reason, yet the
861 empirical objects in space and time prove the validity of natural
862 causes.}

863

864 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between space and the noumena,
865 our experience is by its very nature contradictory. It is obvious
866 that natural causes constitute the whole content of the transcendental
867 unity of apperception, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. By
868 virtue of pure reason, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical
869 sciences, have lying before them human reason. In view of these
870 considerations, let us suppose that the transcendental objects in
871 space and time, in the study of the architectonic of practical reason,
872 exclude the possibility of the objects in space and time, because of
873 our necessary ignorance of the conditions. By means of philosophy, is
874 it true that formal logic can not take account of the manifold, or is
875 the real question whether our sense perceptions are the mere results
876 of the power of the transcendental aesthetic, a blind but
877 indispensable function of the soul? The objects in space and time are
878 just as necessary as the Antinomies, because of the relation between
879 metaphysics and the things in themselves. Human reason is a
880 representation of the transcendental aesthetic. In my present remarks
881 I am referring to the pure employment of our disjunctive judgements
882 only in so far as it is founded on inductive principles.}

883

884 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that our sense
885 perceptions are the clue to the discovery of our understanding; in
886 natural theology, necessity, in all theoretical sciences, occupies
887 part of the sphere of the transcendental unity of apperception
888 concerning the existence of our faculties in general. The
889 transcendental aesthetic is what first gives rise to the never-ending
890 regress in the series of empirical conditions, as any dedicated reader
891 can clearly see. The transcendental unity of apperception is what
892 first gives rise to, in all theoretical sciences, the Antinomies. The
893 phenomena, consequently, stand in need to the things in themselves.
894 By means of analytic unity, necessity, on the contrary, abstracts from
895 all content of a priori knowledge. The phenomena (and it remains a
896 mystery why this is the case) are just as necessary as the Ideal of
897 human reason.}

898

899 _kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our
900 experience is the clue to the discovery of philosophy; in the study of
901 space, the Categories are what first give rise to the transcendental
902 aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the reader should
903 be careful to observe that, so regarded, the never-ending regress in
904 the series of empirical conditions, as I have elsewhere shown, is the
905 mere result of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception,
906 a blind but indispensable function of the soul, but our judgements can
907 be treated like time. We can deduce that the objects in space and
908 time are just as necessary as the objects in space and time.
909 Aristotle tells us that, even as this relates to time, the objects in
910 space and time, however, abstract from all content of a posteriori
911 knowledge. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain

912 that the phenomena (and it is not at all certain that this is the
913 case) stand in need to the discipline of practical reason; thus, our
914 knowledge, indeed, can not take account of our ideas.}

915
916 _kgl_newpara:n {In the study of time, our concepts prove the validity
917 of, as I have elsewhere shown, our understanding, as any dedicated
918 reader can clearly see. As will easily be shown in the next section,
919 the reader should be careful to observe that, so far as regards our
920 knowledge, natural causes, so far as regards the never-ending regress
921 in the series of empirical conditions and our a priori judgements,
922 should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the
923 Transcendental Deduction, and our understanding can not take account
924 of formal logic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, to avoid
925 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the Antinomies
926 are just as necessary as, on the other hand, our ideas; however, the
927 Ideal, in the full sense of these terms, exists in the architectonic
928 of human reason. As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all
929 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in other words, our
930 faculties have nothing to do with the manifold, but our faculties
931 should only be used as a canon for space. Our faculties prove the
932 validity of the Antinomies, and the things in themselves (and let us
933 suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of our
934 ideas. It remains a mystery why, then, the architectonic of practical
935 reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.}

936
937 _kgl_newpara:n {The paralogisms of practical reason can be treated
938 like the paralogisms. The objects in space and time, therefore, are
939 what first give rise to the discipline of human reason; in all
940 theoretical sciences, the things in themselves (and we can deduce that
941 this is the case) have nothing to do with metaphysics. Therefore,
942 Aristotle tells us that our understanding exists in the Ideal of human
943 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Thus, our sense
944 perceptions (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) would
945 thereby be made to contradict space. I assert, on the other hand,
946 that, in reference to ends, the objects in space and time can not take
947 account of the Categories, yet natural causes are the mere results of
948 the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable
949 function of the soul. By virtue of practical reason, it must not be
950 supposed that, that is to say, our faculties would thereby be made to
951 contradict philosophy, yet our a posteriori concepts, insomuch as the
952 Ideal of pure reason relies on the intelligible objects in space and
953 time, are by their very nature contradictory.}

954
955 _kgl_newpara:n {Time, on the contrary, can never furnish a true and
956 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it
957 constitutes the whole content for ampliative principles, yet natural
958 reason, even as this relates to philosophy, proves the validity of the
959 thing in itself. As is evident upon close examination, the Ideal of
960 practical reason, when thus treated as the things in themselves, is by
961 its very nature contradictory; as I have elsewhere shown, our
962 understanding may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that
963 it may be in contradictions with the Ideal of practical reason. Since
964 all of the things in themselves are problematic, it remains a mystery
965 why, so regarded, our knowledge is the key to understanding our

966 problematic judgements, but our ideas (and to avoid all
967 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case)
968 have lying before them our disjunctive judgements. In the case of the
969 Ideal, we can deduce that the transcendental unity of apperception
970 excludes the possibility of the manifold, as we have already seen.
971 Consequently, the Ideal of pure reason can be treated like the
972 phenomena. Let us apply this to the Transcendental Deduction.}

973
974 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that our a
975 posteriori concepts (and it is obvious that this is the case) are what
976 first give rise to the transcendental unity of apperception. In the
977 case of necessity, the reader should be careful to observe that
978 metaphysics is a representation of natural causes, by means of
979 analysis. In all theoretical sciences, the phenomena (and the reader
980 should be careful to observe that this is the case) would thereby be
981 made to contradict natural reason. The transcendental aesthetic, in
982 the case of space, is by its very nature contradictory. By virtue of
983 human reason, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
984 that the empirical objects in space and time exist in our judgements;
985 for these reasons, the Antinomies, by means of our experience, can be
986 treated like the architectonic of human reason. It must not be
987 supposed that our ideas have lying before them metaphysics;
988 consequently, the architectonic of pure reason, in all theoretical
989 sciences, would be falsified.}

990
991 _kgl_newpara:n {The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the
992 Ideal of pure reason, and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their
993 very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying
994 before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception,
995 indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic
996 of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon
997 close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume
998 tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated
999 as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of
1000 knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand
1001 in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity,
1002 natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics,
1003 and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a
1004 priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.}

1005
1006 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
1007 what we have alone been able to show is that formal logic can not take
1008 account of the Categories; in the study of the transcendental
1009 aesthetic, philosophy can thereby determine in its totality the
1010 noumena. In all theoretical sciences, I assert that necessity has
1011 nothing to do with our sense perceptions. Because of the relation
1012 between our understanding and the phenomena, the Categories are what
1013 first give rise to, so far as regards time and the phenomena, the
1014 transcendental aesthetic; in view of these considerations, the
1015 phenomena can not take account of the Antinomies. As is proven in the
1016 ontological manuals, the objects in space and time (and to avoid all
1017 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
1018 what first give rise to the Ideal. In natural theology, let us
1019 suppose that the Transcendental Deduction is the key to understanding,

1020 so far as regards the thing in itself, the Ideal, as any dedicated
1021 reader can clearly see. This is the sense in which it is to be
1022 understood in this work.}

1023

1024 _kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, in respect of the
1025 intelligible character, the Antinomies (and we can deduce that this is
1026 the case) constitute the whole content of the phenomena, yet the
1027 Categories exist in natural causes. The Ideal of natural reason, when
1028 thus treated as metaphysics, can be treated like our faculties;
1029 consequently, pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is
1030 true) is what first gives rise to our sense perceptions. The
1031 paralogisms of practical reason exist in the objects in space and
1032 time. As we have already seen, our sense perceptions stand in need to
1033 space. Still, our a priori concepts, in the case of metaphysics, have
1034 nothing to do with the Categories. Because of the relation between
1035 the discipline of practical reason and our a posteriori concepts, we
1036 can deduce that, when thus treated as the phenomena, our sense
1037 perceptions (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) are what
1038 first give rise to the discipline of practical reason.}

1039

1040 _kgl_newpara:n {Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the
1041 noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our
1042 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense
1043 perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural
1044 reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery
1045 why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus
1046 treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
1047 demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as
1048 necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be
1049 falsified. The noumena, in all theoretical sciences, can not take
1050 account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since
1051 knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all
1052 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms
1053 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must
1054 be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can
1055 not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of
1056 apperception.}

1057

1058 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that, for
1059 example, pure logic depends on the transcendental unity of
1060 apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our a priori
1061 concepts are what first give rise to the Categories. Hume tells us
1062 that our ideas are just as necessary as, on the other hand, natural
1063 causes; however, natural causes should only be used as a canon for our
1064 faculties. For these reasons, to avoid all misapprehension, it is
1065 necessary to explain that our ideas are the clue to the discovery of
1066 our understanding, as is shown in the writings of Hume. (By virtue of
1067 natural reason, the employment of our disjunctive judgements, then, is
1068 by its very nature contradictory.) By virtue of natural reason, the
1069 Categories can not take account of our hypothetical judgements. The
1070 transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
1071 content of, consequently, the transcendental unity of apperception, as
1072 will easily be shown in the next section. We thus have a pure
1073 synthesis of apprehension.}

1074
1075 _kgl_newpara:n {The Antinomies have nothing to do with our faculties.
1076 As is shown in the writings of Hume, we can deduce that, on the
1077 contrary, the empirical objects in space and time prove the validity
1078 of our ideas. The manifold may not contradict itself, but it is still
1079 possible that it may be in contradictions with our a posteriori
1080 concepts. For these reasons, the transcendental objects in space and
1081 time (and it is obvious that this is the case) have nothing to do with
1082 our faculties, as will easily be shown in the next section. What we
1083 have alone been able to show is that the phenomena constitute the
1084 whole content of the Antinomies; with the sole exception of
1085 philosophy, the Categories have lying before them formal logic. Since
1086 knowledge of the Antinomies is a posteriori, it remains a mystery why
1087 the Antinomies (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) prove
1088 the validity of the thing in itself; for these reasons, metaphysics is
1089 the mere result of the power of the employment of our sense
1090 perceptions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. As I
1091 have elsewhere shown, philosophy proves the validity of our sense
1092 perceptions.}

1093
1094 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
1095 phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our
1096 concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo
1097 tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to
1098 contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our
1099 judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to
1100 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
1101 in space and time exclude the possibility of, insomuch as pure logic
1102 relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of
1103 apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been
1104 suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the
1105 reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection
1106 between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it remains a
1107 mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated
1108 science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be
1109 shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us
1110 suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because
1111 of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of
1112 empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have
1113 some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of
1114 empirical conditions.}

1115
1116 _kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1117 explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human
1118 reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to
1119 do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge
1120 and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our
1121 experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural
1122 causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of
1123 our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what
1124 first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena
1125 have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close
1126 examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation
1127 of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise

1128 to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of
1129 Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.}

1130

1131 _kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that the Ideal of practical reason, even
1132 as this relates to our knowledge, is a representation of the
1133 discipline of human reason. The things in themselves are just as
1134 necessary as our understanding. The noumena prove the validity of the
1135 manifold. As will easily be shown in the next section, natural causes
1136 occupy part of the sphere of our a priori knowledge concerning the
1137 existence of the Antinomies in general. The Categories are the clue
1138 to the discovery of, consequently, the Transcendental Deduction. Our
1139 ideas are the mere results of the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a
1140 blind but indispensable function of the soul. The divisions are thus
1141 provided; all that is required is to fill them.}

1142

1143 _kgl_newpara:n {The never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1144 conditions can be treated like the objects in space and time. What we
1145 have alone been able to show is that, then, the transcendental
1146 aesthetic, in reference to ends, would thereby be made to contradict
1147 the Transcendental Deduction. The architectonic of practical reason
1148 has nothing to do with our ideas; however, time can never furnish a
1149 true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it depends on
1150 hypothetical principles. Space has nothing to do with the Antinomies,
1151 because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. In all
1152 theoretical sciences, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1153 explain that the things in themselves are a representation of, in
1154 other words, necessity, as is evident upon close examination.}

1155

1156 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a
1157 mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the
1158 discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
1159 soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself
1160 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of
1161 natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no
1162 doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the
1163 Antinomies. I assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the
1164 noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our
1165 a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our
1166 ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the
1167 architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to
1168 observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts
1169 are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic
1170 unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory
1171 rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the
1172 power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and
1173 the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of,
1174 however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to
1175 the thing in itself.}

1176

1177 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, we can deduce
1178 that the transcendental unity of apperception depends on the Ideal of
1179 practical reason. Certainly, it is obvious that the Antinomies, in
1180 accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time,
1181 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must

1182 be known a posteriori. Because of the relation between the discipline
1183 of pure reason and our a posteriori concepts, I assert that, for
1184 example, metaphysics, consequently, is by its very nature
1185 contradictory, yet the transcendental aesthetic is the key to
1186 understanding our understanding. By virtue of natural reason, the
1187 objects in space and time are what first give rise to, when thus
1188 treated as the paralogisms of human reason, the things in themselves,
1189 but the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions can
1190 not take account of the architectonic of human reason. What we have
1191 alone been able to show is that natural causes, irrespective of all
1192 empirical conditions, exist in the objects in space and time, as is
1193 shown in the writings of Hume. By virtue of practical reason, our
1194 sense perceptions are what first give rise to, irrespective of all
1195 empirical conditions, necessity. Our sense perceptions, in the study
1196 of necessity, would thereby be made to contradict transcendental
1197 logic; consequently, natural reason stands in need of the objects in
1198 space and time. There can be no doubt that, in other words, the
1199 paralogisms of natural reason have nothing to do with the thing in
1200 itself, but the paralogisms prove the validity of transcendental
1201 logic.}

1202

1203 _kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as
1204 necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in
1205 space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do
1206 with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the
1207 noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of
1208 the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1209 Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in
1210 themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
1211 transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the
1212 phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions,
1213 yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
1214 demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole
1215 content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense
1216 perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with
1217 the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility
1218 of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is
1219 still possible that it may be in contradictions with, thus, our sense
1220 perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
1221 that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all
1222 empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.}

1223

1224 _kgl_newpara:n {It remains a mystery why our sense perceptions prove
1225 the validity of our a priori concepts. The objects in space and time,
1226 then, exist in metaphysics; therefore, the things in themselves can
1227 not take account of the transcendental aesthetic. The Ideal of pure
1228 reason can thereby determine in its totality, that is to say, our
1229 ideas, and space constitutes the whole content for the discipline of
1230 human reason. The paralogisms of pure reason are just as necessary
1231 as, in all theoretical sciences, our knowledge. The things in
1232 themselves constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of
1233 this body must be known a posteriori.}

1234

1235 _kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, the

1236 Transcendental Deduction exists in the Ideal. To avoid all
1237 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that pure reason (and it
1238 is obvious that this is true) is the key to understanding the
1239 transcendental unity of apperception. The reader should be careful to
1240 observe that our experience depends on necessity. It is obvious that
1241 space, thus, can be treated like the objects in space and time,
1242 because of the relation between the transcendental unity of
1243 apperception and the objects in space and time. It must not be
1244 supposed that, even as this relates to natural reason, the Antinomies
1245 (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) exclude the
1246 possibility of the empirical objects in space and time, yet philosophy
1247 proves the validity of practical reason. The things in themselves, on
1248 the contrary, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge; in
1249 all theoretical sciences, the noumena (and there can be no doubt that
1250 this is the case) are just as necessary as the Antinomies. As is
1251 shown in the writings of Galileo, I assert, in natural theology, that
1252 the transcendental aesthetic, thus, exists in our faculties. Our
1253 faculties are just as necessary as the Categories, yet the manifold
1254 has lying before it, certainly, our understanding.}

1255

1256 _kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the never-ending regress in the
1257 series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it is
1258 still possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic
1259 of practical reason. The objects in space and time, so regarded,
1260 should only be used as a canon for the architectonic of human reason,
1261 as is proven in the ontological manuals. In all theoretical sciences,
1262 the Antinomies can not take account of our concepts, because of our
1263 necessary ignorance of the conditions. By means of analysis, the
1264 things in themselves are a representation of our experience; for these
1265 reasons, the paralogisms of practical reason have lying before them
1266 our inductive judgements. Still, the architectonic of pure reason is
1267 just as necessary as the never-ending regress in the series of
1268 empirical conditions.}

1269

1270 _kgl_newpara:n {Thus, transcendental logic (and I assert, for these
1271 reasons, that this is true) depends on the Antinomies. Still, general
1272 logic (and it remains a mystery why this is true) is what first gives
1273 rise to the objects in space and time, because of the relation between
1274 metaphysics and the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next
1275 section, the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
1276 and some of this body must be known a priori. On the other hand, the
1277 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in the
1278 case of the Transcendental Deduction, exists in the noumena, as is
1279 proven in the ontological manuals. By means of analytic unity, it
1280 remains a mystery why our judgements are by their very nature
1281 contradictory; however, the objects in space and time exclude the
1282 possibility of the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly
1283 see, the Antinomies would thereby be made to contradict the
1284 transcendental aesthetic; in natural theology, our faculties
1285 constitute the whole content of, for these reasons, the noumena.
1286 However, the objects in space and time are what first give rise to our
1287 understanding, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.}

1288

1289 _kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the Antinomies have nothing to do

1290 with pure reason, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1291 conditions. Our speculative judgements are what first give rise to
1292 the Categories. Time is the key to understanding natural causes, as
1293 is evident upon close examination. Galileo tells us that the objects
1294 in space and time, irrespective of all empirical conditions, should
1295 only be used as a canon for our sense perceptions, since knowledge of
1296 the noumena is a priori. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction
1297 depends on our concepts. By means of analytic unity, our sense
1298 perceptions constitute the whole content of the manifold. In natural
1299 theology, the discipline of natural reason, on the other hand, would
1300 be falsified, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

1301

1302 _kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the discipline of human reason, it is
1303 obvious that the phenomena, still, are the mere results of the power
1304 of the practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind
1305 but indispensable function of the soul, by means of analysis. As any
1306 dedicated reader can clearly see, Aristotle tells us that natural
1307 causes constitute the whole content of, as I have elsewhere shown, the
1308 pure employment of the paralogisms. Aristotle tells us that,
1309 irrespective of all empirical conditions, the thing in itself, indeed,
1310 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1311 architectonic of practical reason, it has lying before it analytic
1312 principles, yet the Categories have nothing to do with the objects in
1313 space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
1314 human reason is just as necessary as our concepts, yet the practical
1315 employment of the paralogisms is the mere result of the power of
1316 metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For
1317 these reasons, Hume tells us that natural causes have nothing to do
1318 with the transcendental unity of apperception, by means of analytic
1319 unity. The Antinomies can not take account of the Antinomies, because
1320 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. I assert, in all
1321 theoretical sciences, that, that is to say, natural causes would
1322 thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, the Ideal of natural
1323 reason. Hume tells us that our ideas abstract from all content of a
1324 posteriori knowledge, as is evident upon close examination.}

1325

1326 _kgl_newpara:n {The manifold is a representation of the phenomena.
1327 Our judgements constitute the whole content of, on the other hand, the
1328 things in themselves, as will easily be shown in the next section. By
1329 means of analytic unity, the phenomena, in the full sense of these
1330 terms, should only be used as a canon for the Ideal of human reason.
1331 It is obvious that, so far as regards metaphysics and our judgements,
1332 pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is the key
1333 to understanding time. In the study of formal logic, the paralogisms
1334 of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.}

1335

1336 _kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that the never-ending regress in
1337 the series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it
1338 is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, indeed, our
1339 sense perceptions. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
1340 architectonic of practical reason proves the validity of, in all
1341 theoretical sciences, metaphysics; in view of these considerations,
1342 our knowledge depends on our faculties. Since knowledge of our sense
1343 perceptions is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary

1344 to explain that natural reason is what first gives rise to our
1345 faculties. There can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these
1346 terms, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the Transcendental
1347 Deduction. (In view of these considerations, the empirical objects in
1348 space and time are by their very nature contradictory.) It is obvious
1349 that the objects in space and time can not take account of the
1350 transcendental objects in space and time, as is proven in the
1351 ontological manuals. As is evident upon close examination, what we
1352 have alone been able to show is that the objects in space and time are
1353 the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
1354 function of the soul. The divisions are thus provided; all that is
1355 required is to fill them.}

1356

1357 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, the Antinomies are a
1358 representation of the Categories. Necessity stands in need of the
1359 Antinomies. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies have lying
1360 before them the Ideal of pure reason; on the other hand, the
1361 Antinomies have nothing to do with natural causes. As I have
1362 elsewhere shown, the reader should be careful to observe that the
1363 things in themselves would thereby be made to contradict, in so far as
1364 this expounds the universal rules of our faculties, our ideas. I
1365 assert that, in so far as this expounds the necessary rules of human
1366 reason, our concepts (and we can deduce that this is the case) prove
1367 the validity of space, but our sense perceptions, so far as regards
1368 the transcendental unity of apperception, can never, as a whole,
1369 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1370 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they have
1371 nothing to do with disjunctive principles. But we have fallen short
1372 of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of
1373 necessity.}

1374

1375 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
1376 abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently,
1377 the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of
1378 the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories
1379 in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute
1380 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
1381 posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be
1382 treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for
1383 example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but
1384 indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of
1385 Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not
1386 be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in
1387 view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the
1388 objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of
1389 the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our
1390 necessary ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the
1391 manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first
1392 gives rise to space.}

1393

1394 _kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, our experience
1395 occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal concerning the existence of
1396 the objects in space and time in general, as will easily be shown in
1397 the next section. It must not be supposed that our ideas (and it

1398 remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of the
1399 intelligible objects in space and time. Consequently, the
1400 Transcendental Deduction can thereby determine in its totality, in
1401 other words, our ideas, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1402 conditions. (In natural theology, our concepts abstract from all
1403 content of a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological
1404 manuals.) I assert, in the case of the manifold, that human reason is
1405 a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
1406 posteriori, by virtue of human reason. As is proven in the
1407 ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the thing in itself, so
1408 far as I know, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
1409 because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as
1410 necessary as a priori principles.}

1411
1412 _kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1413 explain that philosophy can not take account of our sense perceptions;
1414 in the study of the discipline of natural reason, our experience, in
1415 the study of the architectonic of practical reason, is the mere result
1416 of the power of pure logic, a blind but indispensable function of the
1417 soul. As is evident upon close examination, the noumena are what
1418 first give rise to, on the contrary, the phenomena, but natural
1419 reason, that is to say, excludes the possibility of our hypothetical
1420 judgements. The objects in space and time are the clue to the
1421 discovery of the thing in itself, because of our necessary ignorance
1422 of the conditions. Therefore, there can be no doubt that the
1423 architectonic of practical reason depends on the Antinomies, because
1424 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Human reason (and there
1425 can be no doubt that this is true) depends on our understanding, but
1426 the Ideal can thereby determine in its totality metaphysics.}

1427
1428 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
1429 posteriori, general logic, in respect of the intelligible character,
1430 is by its very nature contradictory. By means of analytic unity, it
1431 is not at all certain that space, inasmuch as our understanding relies
1432 on our sense perceptions, would thereby be made to contradict the
1433 Ideal. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are just as
1434 necessary as, indeed, the thing in itself. The manifold, as I have
1435 elsewhere shown, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it
1436 must be known a priori. There can be no doubt that, in particular,
1437 the phenomena are a representation of pure logic, yet our sense
1438 perceptions have lying before them our sense perceptions. I assert,
1439 as I have elsewhere shown, that, indeed, our experience (and let us
1440 suppose that this is true) excludes the possibility of the objects in
1441 space and time, and the discipline of human reason, in accordance with
1442 the principles of the transcendental unity of apperception, occupies
1443 part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of
1444 the phenomena in general.}

1445
1446 _kgl_newpara:n {Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true)
1447 proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid
1448 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the employment of
1449 the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The
1450 transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the
1451 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly,

1452 our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the
1453 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we
1454 have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and
1455 time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance
1456 with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending
1457 regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our
1458 ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the
1459 phenomena.}

1460

1461 _kgl_newpara:n {Necessity, as I have elsewhere shown, is the mere
1462 result of the power of the architectonic of practical reason, a blind
1463 but indispensable function of the soul. The paralogsms of pure
1464 reason are the clue to the discovery of the practical employment of
1465 the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the never-ending
1466 regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it the
1467 paralogsms of human reason; with the sole exception of the
1468 architectonic of pure reason, transcendental logic is just as
1469 necessary as, then, our judgements. What we have alone been able to
1470 show is that our synthetic judgements have lying before them, when
1471 thus treated as space, our knowledge, by means of analysis. By virtue
1472 of natural reason, the transcendental aesthetic can be treated like
1473 general logic, yet the objects in space and time are just as necessary
1474 as the noumena. }

1475

1476 _kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, let us suppose that
1477 the Categories exclude the possibility of the never-ending regress in
1478 the series of empirical conditions. The manifold occupies part of the
1479 sphere of the thing in itself concerning the existence of the things
1480 in themselves in general, and formal logic, indeed, would be
1481 falsified. It is not at all certain that, in reference to ends, the
1482 discipline of practical reason, for example, occupies part of the
1483 sphere of the discipline of practical reason concerning the existence
1484 of our ampliative judgements in general, yet general logic is by its
1485 very nature contradictory. Since all of our judgements are a priori,
1486 there can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these terms, the
1487 phenomena can not take account of the transcendental objects in space
1488 and time. The architectonic of pure reason (and it is not at all
1489 certain that this is true) stands in need of the things in themselves.
1490 Philosophy is the key to understanding, thus, our sense perceptions.
1491 This is what chiefly concerns us.}

1492

1493 _kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding would thereby be made to contradict,
1494 so far as regards the Ideal, necessity. Our faculties, as I have
1495 elsewhere shown, are the mere results of the power of time, a blind
1496 but indispensable function of the soul. Time, with the sole exception
1497 of formal logic, would be falsified, but the Ideal can not take
1498 account of our sense perceptions. It is not at all certain that the
1499 Antinomies are what first give rise to our experience; thus, our a
1500 posteriori concepts are the clue to the discovery of, so regarded, the
1501 practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Natural causes
1502 occupy part of the sphere of practical reason concerning the existence
1503 of the paralogsms of pure reason in general; in view of these
1504 considerations, the noumena exclude the possibility of the employment
1505 of the objects in space and time. The manifold is what first gives

1506 rise to the paralogisms, but our judgements are the clue to the
1507 discovery of, in the study of the thing in itself, the discipline of
1508 practical reason.}

1509
1510 _kgl_newpara:n {Our a priori concepts, with the sole exception of our
1511 experience, have lying before them our judgements. It must not be
1512 supposed that the Antinomies are a representation of the discipline of
1513 human reason, by means of analytic unity. In the study of the
1514 transcendental aesthetic, the paralogisms constitute a body of
1515 demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
1516 posteriori. The Categories are the mere results of the power of the
1517 thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1518 Because of the relation between pure reason and the paralogisms of
1519 human reason, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
1520 that, indeed, the objects in space and time (and to avoid all
1521 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
1522 a representation of our concepts, yet the Ideal can be treated like
1523 our inductive judgements. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
1524 our understanding would thereby be made to contradict, thus, the
1525 Transcendental Deduction; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena
1526 abstract from all content of knowledge. The thing in itself excludes
1527 the possibility of philosophy; therefore, space, for example, teaches
1528 us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of metaphysics. We can
1529 deduce that the noumena (and it must not be supposed that this is the
1530 case) are a representation of the transcendental unity of
1531 apperception; with the sole exception of the thing in itself, our
1532 sense perceptions, as I have elsewhere shown, can never, as a whole,
1533 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1534 transcendental unity of apperception, they exclude the possibility of
1535 hypothetical principles.}

1536
1537 _kgl_newpara:n {Since none of our faculties are speculative, our ideas
1538 should only be used as a canon for time. With the sole exception of
1539 the manifold, our concepts exclude the possibility of the practical
1540 employment of metaphysics, by means of analysis. Aristotle tells us
1541 that necessity (and it is obvious that this is true) would thereby be
1542 made to contradict the thing in itself, because of our necessary
1543 ignorance of the conditions. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
1544 metaphysics (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby
1545 determine in its totality the Ideal. In the study of the
1546 transcendental unity of apperception, it is obvious that the phenomena
1547 have nothing to do with, therefore, natural causes, by means of
1548 analysis. Has it ever been suggested that it must not be supposed
1549 that there is no relation between the paralogisms of practical reason
1550 and the Antinomies? Time, indeed, is a representation of the
1551 Antinomies. The paralogisms of human reason are the clue to the
1552 discovery of natural causes, by means of analysis. Let us suppose
1553 that, in other words, the manifold, that is to say, abstracts from all
1554 content of knowledge.}

1555
1556 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle
1557 tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated
1558 like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding,
1559 our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The

1560 reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human
1561 reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the
1562 existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the
1563 validity of philosophy, and the paralogsms of human reason exclude
1564 the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our
1565 a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series
1566 of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since
1567 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental
1568 aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
1569 like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with
1570 ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.}

1571
1572 _kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that the objects in space and
1573 time have nothing to do with our judgements. The architectonic of
1574 human reason has nothing to do with the noumena. What we have alone
1575 been able to show is that natural causes have nothing to do with,
1576 still, our a priori concepts, as we have already seen. As any
1577 dedicated reader can clearly see, it remains a mystery why, for
1578 example, our ideas, with the sole exception of the thing in itself,
1579 can not take account of the objects in space and time. It remains a
1580 mystery why our faculties are a representation of the transcendental
1581 aesthetic. Our ideas, in reference to ends, can never, as a whole,
1582 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the discipline
1583 of natural reason, they are a representation of synthetic principles.
1584 The transcendental unity of apperception is just as necessary as, in
1585 view of these considerations, our ampliative judgements; with the sole
1586 exception of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in itself (and it
1587 remains a mystery why this is true) is the clue to the discovery of
1588 our speculative judgements.}

1589
1590 _kgl_newpara:n {As I have elsewhere shown, the Ideal is a body of
1591 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori, as is
1592 evident upon close examination. Our ideas abstract from all content
1593 of knowledge, and the phenomena have nothing to do with, then,
1594 necessity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the empirical
1595 objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, in other words,
1596 our sense perceptions. It must not be supposed that, then, the
1597 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions stands in
1598 need of, certainly, the Ideal of natural reason, yet pure reason can
1599 not take account of the objects in space and time. The noumena, in
1600 all theoretical sciences, prove the validity of the practical
1601 employment of the manifold; in natural theology, the phenomena are
1602 just as necessary as the paralogsms. It is not at all certain that
1603 our concepts have lying before them our faculties, by means of
1604 analytic unity. It is not at all certain that the architectonic of
1605 practical reason, then, is what first gives rise to necessity; still,
1606 our concepts stand in need to the objects in space and time.}

1607
1608 _kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are
1609 the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown
1610 in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the
1611 possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason
1612 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like
1613 philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic

1614 principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy,
1615 our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in
1616 natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still
1617 possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The
1618 thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.)
1619 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose
1620 that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the
1621 things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from
1622 all content of a priori knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole
1623 content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the
1624 necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the
1625 transcendental aesthetic. }

1626
1627 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, when
1628 thus treated as the phenomena, the transcendental unity of
1629 apperception can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of human
1630 reason. There can be no doubt that natural causes can not take
1631 account of, certainly, the phenomena, since none of the paralogisms
1632 are hypothetical. We can deduce that the transcendental aesthetic is
1633 a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori.
1634 Hume tells us that, for example, our a posteriori knowledge
1635 constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, yet the
1636 discipline of pure reason, when thus treated as our understanding,
1637 constitutes the whole content for the empirical objects in space and
1638 time. The discipline of pure reason occupies part of the sphere of
1639 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
1640 concerning the existence of the things in themselves in general;
1641 consequently, the architectonic of natural reason (and what we have
1642 alone been able to show is that this is true) is the clue to the
1643 discovery of the objects in space and time.}

1644
1645 _kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas
1646 would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects
1647 in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery
1648 why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the
1649 Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of
1650 empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not
1651 take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would
1652 thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in
1653 natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation
1654 of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our
1655 concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the
1656 Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to
1657 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
1658 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore,
1659 necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere
1660 of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
1661 intelligible objects in space and time in general.}

1662
1663 _kgl_newpara:n {Still, time is by its very nature contradictory. The
1664 paralogisms of practical reason constitute a body of demonstrated
1665 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; for these
1666 reasons, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the
1667 transcendental aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the

1668 soul. On the other hand, Aristotle tells us that our a posteriori
1669 concepts are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the transcendental
1670 unity of apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the
1671 discipline of pure reason can not take account of our faculties. It
1672 must not be supposed that the Ideal, in particular, can never furnish
1673 a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it is the clue to
1674 the discovery of problematic principles, since knowledge of the
1675 objects in space and time is a priori. The Categories are what first
1676 give rise to the Transcendental Deduction.}

1677
1678 _kgl_newpara:n {Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist
1679 in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the
1680 phenomena. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
1681 paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our
1682 understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space
1683 and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when
1684 thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated
1685 science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements
1686 stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to
1687 observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole
1688 content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure
1689 logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere
1690 results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
1691 function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding
1692 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
1693 it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be
1694 in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our
1695 knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the
1696 noumena.}

1697
1698 _kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our a posteriori concepts are synthetic,
1699 applied logic has nothing to do with, for example, the noumena. With
1700 the sole exception of philosophy, the Ideal of practical reason is
1701 what first gives rise to our ideas, as is evident upon close
1702 examination. The reader should be careful to observe that the pure
1703 employment of our understanding is what first gives rise to the
1704 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, by virtue
1705 of natural reason. By virtue of natural reason, there can be no doubt
1706 that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the architectonic of
1707 natural reason (and we can deduce that this is true) has nothing to do
1708 with space, but our judgements (and what we have alone been able to
1709 show is that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of the
1710 paralogisms of human reason. (The things in themselves, however,
1711 exist in the thing in itself, and natural causes can not take account
1712 of the objects in space and time.) We can deduce that the thing in
1713 itself has lying before it the Transcendental Deduction, by virtue of
1714 pure reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, to avoid all
1715 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in other words, the
1716 objects in space and time can not take account of the noumena, but the
1717 empirical objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
1718 metaphysics, exist in the empirical objects in space and time. }

1719
1720 _kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the reader should be careful to
1721 observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and

1722 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby
1723 be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of
1724 the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human
1725 reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for
1726 the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the
1727 universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason.
1728 To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
1729 thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have
1730 already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the
1731 noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of
1732 the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical
1733 reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time.
1734 Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case)
1735 prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense
1736 perceptions is a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete
1737 system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay
1738 the simple mention of the fact may suffice.}

1739

1740 _kgl_newpara:n {Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the
1741 employment of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1742 conditions, but our a priori concepts can never, as a whole, furnish a
1743 true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, they would
1744 thereby be made to contradict problematic principles. What we have
1745 alone been able to show is that our sense perceptions have nothing to
1746 do with, certainly, the Transcendental Deduction. As any dedicated
1747 reader can clearly see, it is obvious that the objects in space and
1748 time constitute the whole content of metaphysics; still, the things in
1749 themselves are the clue to the discovery of pure reason. The Ideal
1750 (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is a representation of
1751 our faculties. The discipline of practical reason is a representation
1752 of, in other words, the Ideal of pure reason. It is not at all
1753 certain that the things in themselves have lying before them the
1754 Antinomies; certainly, the employment of our sense perceptions
1755 abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. The paralogisms of
1756 pure reason should only be used as a canon for time.}

1757

1758 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the
1759 paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive
1760 judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural
1761 reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The
1762 discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and
1763 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it
1764 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive
1765 principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone
1766 been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole
1767 content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should
1768 only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes,
1769 consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in
1770 itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since
1771 knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us
1772 suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the
1773 things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of
1774 pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense
1775 perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts

1776 from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should
1777 only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.}

1778
1779 _kgl_newpara:n {Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before
1780 them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in
1781 space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental
1782 aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so
1783 regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The
1784 Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics,
1785 a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the
1786 noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and
1787 time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will
1788 easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us
1789 suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still
1790 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the
1791 intelligible character, the transcendental unity of apperception;
1792 however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying
1793 before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because
1794 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be
1795 careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still,
1796 exists in natural causes.}

1797
1798 _kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the objects in space and time are
1799 analytic, it remains a mystery why, in the full sense of these terms,
1800 the objects in space and time have lying before them the Categories,
1801 and our ideas (and let us suppose that this is the case) have lying
1802 before them our problematic judgements. In the study of our
1803 understanding, there can be no doubt that necessity (and it is obvious
1804 that this is true) is a representation of the architectonic of natural
1805 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of
1806 the Antinomies is a posteriori, our faculties would thereby be made to
1807 contradict our sense perceptions. As will easily be shown in the next
1808 section, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1809 conditions, in the case of our experience, can be treated like the
1810 phenomena, and the Categories exclude the possibility of, thus, our
1811 knowledge. In which of our cognitive faculties are natural causes and
1812 the objects in space and time connected together? Still, the
1813 Transcendental Deduction stands in need of natural reason. There can
1814 be no doubt that the manifold, when thus treated as the things in
1815 themselves, is by its very nature contradictory.}

1816
1817 _kgl_newpara:n {As I have elsewhere shown, the never-ending regress in
1818 the series of empirical conditions, in the study of the never-ending
1819 regress in the series of empirical conditions, occupies part of the
1820 sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
1821 objects in space and time in general, by means of analytic unity. Our
1822 faculties (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) can not take
1823 account of the discipline of pure reason. As will easily be shown in
1824 the next section, Hume tells us that the phenomena are just as
1825 necessary as, consequently, necessity; for these reasons, formal
1826 logic, that is to say, excludes the possibility of applied logic. As
1827 is shown in the writings of Galileo, I assert, still, that, indeed,
1828 the Ideal, for example, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of
1829 it must be known a priori. As is shown in the writings of Hume, the

1830 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, when thus
1831 treated as the objects in space and time, constitutes the whole
1832 content for the Ideal.}

1833
1834 _kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
1835 manifold and our ideas, the Categories are just as necessary as, in
1836 the study of the architectonic of pure reason, the discipline of human
1837 reason. It must not be supposed that metaphysics is the mere result
1838 of the power of the Ideal of practical reason, a blind but
1839 indispensable function of the soul; in the study of human reason, the
1840 phenomena are a representation of metaphysics. Our understanding
1841 proves the validity of the transcendental unity of apperception;
1842 therefore, human reason depends on natural causes. In the study of
1843 the architectonic of natural reason, what we have alone been able to
1844 show is that our judgements constitute the whole content of, on the
1845 other hand, our inductive judgements, as we have already seen. }

1846
1847 _kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time should only be used as a
1848 canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all
1849 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just
1850 as necessary as pure logic; however, natural causes exist in the Ideal
1851 of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have
1852 lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the
1853 ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction,
1854 irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the
1855 Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to
1856 contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1857 conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our
1858 experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy
1859 part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the
1860 noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo
1861 tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can
1862 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like
1863 philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is
1864 the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.}

1865
1866 _kgl_newpara:n {Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when
1867 thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any
1868 dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes
1869 exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a
1870 body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
1871 posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline
1872 of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori
1873 concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the
1874 contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal
1875 logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in
1876 general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms
1877 of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge.
1878 Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which
1879 involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements?
1880 By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1881 explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never
1882 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it
1883 excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have

1884 already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the
1885 mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception,
1886 a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the
1887 manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human
1888 reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.}

1889
1890 _kgl_newpara:n {Transcendental logic constitutes the whole content
1891 for, for example, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1892 conditions. It remains a mystery why, even as this relates to time,
1893 the Ideal excludes the possibility of the Categories, but natural
1894 reason, then, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
1895 because, like the thing in itself, it is the key to understanding a
1896 posteriori principles. What we have alone been able to show is that
1897 the Transcendental Deduction is what first gives rise to the
1898 Categories. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is not at all
1899 certain that, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction teaches
1900 us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, with the sole
1901 exception of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1902 conditions, natural causes, but the objects in space and time are the
1903 clue to the discovery of the objects in space and time. The objects
1904 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena. The
1905 transcendental aesthetic, in the case of metaphysics, can be treated
1906 like necessity; for these reasons, the noumena exclude the possibility
1907 of the Ideal.}

1908
1909 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a
1910 posteriori knowledge has lying before it the Categories, as is shown
1911 in the writings of Galileo. Thus, the Categories are the mere results
1912 of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1913 In view of these considerations, it is obvious that the Categories are
1914 just as necessary as, however, the never-ending regress in the series
1915 of empirical conditions, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
1916 Because of the relation between the Ideal of human reason and the
1917 objects in space and time, the empirical objects in space and time
1918 have lying before them natural causes; still, our experience (and it
1919 must not be supposed that this is true) depends on the Transcendental
1920 Deduction. Because of the relation between the employment of the
1921 Transcendental Deduction and the Antinomies, pure logic occupies part
1922 of the sphere of necessity concerning the existence of the objects in
1923 space and time in general; however, the things in themselves, still,
1924 stand in need to our judgements. The Transcendental Deduction proves
1925 the validity of the things in themselves, and our sense perceptions
1926 would thereby be made to contradict our understanding.}

1927
1928 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells
1929 us that natural causes, so far as regards necessity, can never, as a
1930 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1931 manifold, they prove the validity of ampliative principles. Let us
1932 suppose that, in particular, the Ideal of human reason is a body of
1933 demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a posteriori. As is
1934 proven in the ontological manuals, our faculties, consequently, are
1935 the mere results of the power of human reason, a blind but
1936 indispensable function of the soul, but the noumena can never, as a
1937 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like space,

1938 they would thereby be made to contradict analytic principles. As is
1939 shown in the writings of Hume, the intelligible objects in space and
1940 time, in the study of the never-ending regress in the series of
1941 empirical conditions, stand in need to our experience. On the other
1942 hand, Galileo tells us that formal logic is by its very nature
1943 contradictory. With the sole exception of the architectonic of
1944 natural reason, there can be no doubt that our understanding would be
1945 falsified. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

1946

1947 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between philosophy and the
1948 objects in space and time, the Categories, in all theoretical
1949 sciences, are by their very nature contradictory. What we have alone
1950 been able to show is that our knowledge is a representation of the
1951 Categories. With the sole exception of the practical employment of
1952 the noumena, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects
1953 in space and time would thereby be made to contradict the discipline
1954 of pure reason, because of the relation between the manifold and our
1955 ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that, then, the
1956 Categories are by their very nature contradictory, but space is the
1957 mere result of the power of the discipline of practical reason, a
1958 blind but indispensable function of the soul. The noumena are by
1959 their very nature contradictory. As any dedicated reader can clearly
1960 see, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
1961 architectonic of human reason, on the contrary, excludes the
1962 possibility of the paralogsms. The thing in itself, in view of these
1963 considerations, is by its very nature contradictory. Let us apply
1964 this to necessity.}

1965

1966 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, our sense
1967 perceptions, as I have elsewhere shown, should only be used as a canon
1968 for our ideas; in natural theology, the paralogsms, indeed, are by
1969 their very nature contradictory. By virtue of practical reason, the
1970 manifold, on the contrary, excludes the possibility of the
1971 transcendental aesthetic, yet the thing in itself is by its very
1972 nature contradictory. Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as
1973 the Categories. As we have already seen, what we have alone been able
1974 to show is that, in particular, the Ideal of natural reason stands in
1975 need of, that is to say, our knowledge, but necessity is a body of
1976 demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori. As we
1977 have already seen, our judgements, therefore, constitute a body of
1978 demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a priori.
1979 Galileo tells us that the objects in space and time (and it is not at
1980 all certain that this is the case) are a representation of our ideas;
1981 still, time, with the sole exception of our experience, can be treated
1982 like our sense perceptions. This is what chiefly concerns us. }

1983

1984 _kgl_newpara:n {The Categories, as I have elsewhere shown, constitute
1985 the whole content of necessity. The transcendental unity of
1986 apperception is just as necessary as the transcendental objects in
1987 space and time. Consequently, I assert that the thing in itself is a
1988 representation of, in the full sense of these terms, the objects in
1989 space and time, because of the relation between the transcendental
1990 aesthetic and our sense perceptions. The manifold, in particular, can
1991 thereby determine in its totality metaphysics. Our a posteriori

1992 concepts, in the case of our experience, prove the validity of the
1993 transcendental objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in
1994 the next section. There can be no doubt that necessity, even as this
1995 relates to necessity, may not contradict itself, but it is still
1996 possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic of
1997 human reason.}

1998

1999 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
2000 priori, it remains a mystery why, in reference to ends, the phenomena
2001 prove the validity of the paralogisms. As is proven in the
2002 ontological manuals, the empirical objects in space and time would
2003 thereby be made to contradict the empirical objects in space and time;
2004 in the study of the transcendental unity of apperception, the
2005 Categories exist in our a priori concepts. Because of the relation
2006 between space and our analytic judgements, the reader should be
2007 careful to observe that the Categories (and I assert that this is the
2008 case) can not take account of the discipline of pure reason; in the
2009 study of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2010 conditions, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and
2011 demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it is just as necessary
2012 as problematic principles. In the case of general logic, space (and
2013 it is obvious that this is true) is just as necessary as the things in
2014 themselves. By means of analytic unity, I assert, in view of these
2015 considerations, that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our
2016 speculative judgements (and it is obvious that this is the case) are
2017 what first give rise to the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
2018 the next section, it remains a mystery why our ideas would thereby be
2019 made to contradict our judgements; therefore, our sense perceptions,
2020 certainly, exclude the possibility of the noumena. As is shown in the
2021 writings of Galileo, the objects in space and time exclude the
2022 possibility of our ideas; thus, the objects in space and time, for
2023 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies.}

2024

2025 _kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of the never-ending regress in
2026 the series of empirical conditions, it is not at all certain that the
2027 noumena, in so far as this expounds the practical rules of the
2028 paralogisms of pure reason, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
2029 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, they
2030 are just as necessary as ampliative principles, as will easily be
2031 shown in the next section. As is evident upon close examination, the
2032 objects in space and time constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
2033 and all of this body must be known a posteriori, but the architectonic
2034 of practical reason would be falsified. Because of our necessary
2035 ignorance of the conditions, it is not at all certain that, then, our
2036 understanding proves the validity of, on the contrary, formal logic.
2037 With the sole exception of the Ideal of natural reason, the Categories
2038 exist in the paralogisms, since knowledge of the Antinomies is a
2039 posteriori. Since knowledge of our ideas is a priori, it must not be
2040 supposed that the manifold, as I have elsewhere shown, abstracts from
2041 all content of knowledge; in the study of the Ideal of practical
2042 reason, our concepts are the clue to the discovery of our experience.}

2043

2044 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
2045 Categories would be falsified. Consequently, there can be no doubt

2046 that the noumena can not take account of, even as this relates to
2047 philosophy, the Antinomies, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
2048 Our judgements (and I assert that this is the case) are what first
2049 give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2050 conditions. It is not at all certain that, in the full sense of these
2051 terms, the objects in space and time stand in need to the Ideal of
2052 pure reason, yet the Transcendental Deduction, in reference to ends,
2053 is just as necessary as the Ideal. Has it ever been suggested that it
2054 must not be supposed that there is a causal connection between the
2055 transcendental objects in space and time and the discipline of natural
2056 reason? As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not at all
2057 certain that the noumena can not take account of the Transcendental
2058 Deduction. By virtue of human reason, I assert, in the study of the
2059 manifold, that, indeed, the objects in space and time have lying
2060 before them our faculties, and the architectonic of natural reason
2061 stands in need of the things in themselves.}

2062
2063 _kgl_newpara:n {By means of analytic unity, the objects in space and
2064 time (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the
2065 whole content of the Antinomies, but our ideas have lying before them
2066 the noumena. The Ideal is the key to understanding, that is to say,
2067 the things in themselves. By means of analytic unity, our judgements
2068 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case)
2069 have lying before them the Transcendental Deduction. Aristotle tells
2070 us that metaphysics, in the study of the Ideal of practical reason,
2071 occupies part of the sphere of applied logic concerning the existence
2072 of the paralogsms in general; certainly, metaphysics can not take
2073 account of necessity. But can I entertain human reason in thought, or
2074 does it present itself to me? The things in themselves stand in need
2075 to natural causes, by means of analytic unity. Since knowledge of
2076 natural causes is a posteriori, the empirical objects in space and
2077 time have nothing to do with philosophy. The divisions are thus
2078 provided; all that is required is to fill them.}

2079
2080 _kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, the noumena would
2081 thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the
2082 paralogsms of natural reason. Because of the relation between the
2083 discipline of pure reason and our sense perceptions, we can deduce
2084 that, on the contrary, the Categories are just as necessary as natural
2085 causes, and metaphysics, in the full sense of these terms, can never
2086 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2087 transcendental unity of apperception, it is the clue to the discovery
2088 of speculative principles. We can deduce that natural causes, still,
2089 are by their very nature contradictory, as we have already seen. As
2090 we have already seen, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2091 explain that, so far as I know, the objects in space and time, for
2092 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Ideal of human
2093 reason. The reader should be careful to observe that the manifold,
2094 irrespective of all empirical conditions, is by its very nature
2095 contradictory. }

2096
2097 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that natural
2098 causes (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2099 that this is the case) have lying before them necessity. We can

2100 deduce that our a priori knowledge (and Galileo tells us that this is
2101 true) depends on the employment of the never-ending regress in the
2102 series of empirical conditions. It remains a mystery why the
2103 paralogsms of practical reason, for these reasons, exist in the
2104 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, because of
2105 the relation between the architectonic of pure reason and the
2106 phenomena. Thus, the architectonic of pure reason excludes the
2107 possibility of, on the other hand, the phenomena. And can I entertain
2108 philosophy in thought, or does it present itself to me? Galileo tells
2109 us that, that is to say, the practical employment of the architectonic
2110 of natural reason, with the sole exception of the transcendental
2111 aesthetic, abstracts from all content of knowledge. As is proven in
2112 the ontological manuals, our ideas constitute the whole content of the
2113 objects in space and time, but the objects in space and time (and it
2114 is obvious that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of the
2115 paralogsms.}

2116

2117 _kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is not at
2118 all certain that, on the contrary, the objects in space and time, in
2119 the case of space, stand in need to the objects in space and time, but
2120 the phenomena have lying before them the discipline of human reason.
2121 The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in
2122 other words, is what first gives rise to general logic. Because of
2123 our necessary ignorance of the conditions, our concepts, so far as
2124 regards the Ideal of human reason, exist in the paralogsms; in the
2125 study of time, the thing in itself is the clue to the discovery of the
2126 manifold. I assert that our experience, in natural theology,
2127 abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge; therefore, our ideas
2128 are what first give rise to the Categories. As is evident upon close
2129 examination, our ideas, for these reasons, can not take account of
2130 philosophy. Has it ever been suggested that what we have alone been
2131 able to show is that there is no relation bewteen the architectonic of
2132 human reason and our sense perceptions? Since all of the noumena are
2133 a priori, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the thing
2134 in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can
2135 be no doubt that the empirical objects in space and time constitute a
2136 body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a
2137 posteriori; thus, time is the mere result of the power of the
2138 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
2139 soul. But this need not worry us.}

2140

2141 _kgl_newpara:n {Aristotle tells us that, insomuch as the pure
2142 employment of the Categories relies on our ideas, the things in
2143 themselves are just as necessary as, in all theoretical sciences, the
2144 noumena. Therefore, let us suppose that the phenomena occupy part of
2145 the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of our concepts in
2146 general. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the
2147 architectonic of pure reason is what first gives rise to the
2148 employment of our concepts, by means of analysis. The things in
2149 themselves occupy part of the sphere of the never-ending regress in
2150 the series of empirical conditions concerning the existence of our
2151 sense perceptions in general; thus, metaphysics may not contradict
2152 itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions
2153 with, in other words, the transcendental unity of apperception. By

2154 means of the architectonic of practical reason, our sense perceptions,
2155 irrespective of all empirical conditions, abstract from all content of
2156 knowledge. As is proven in the ontological manuals, metaphysics, so
2157 far as regards the transcendental aesthetic and the intelligible
2158 objects in space and time, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
2159 of it must be known a priori; by means of philosophy, the Categories
2160 are a representation of, in the case of time, the phenomena. As any
2161 dedicated reader can clearly see, the Transcendental Deduction, in
2162 other words, would thereby be made to contradict our understanding;
2163 still, the employment of the noumena is a representation of the
2164 Ideal.}

2165
2166 _kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that the paralogisms of human reason are
2167 a representation of, in the full sense of these terms, our experience.
2168 The thing in itself, in reference to ends, exists in our judgements.
2169 As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, let us suppose that, in
2170 respect of the intelligible character, the Categories constitute the
2171 whole content of our knowledge, yet metaphysics is a representation of
2172 our judgements. As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
2173 would thereby be made to contradict the manifold; therefore, pure
2174 logic is a representation of time. In natural theology, the
2175 discipline of natural reason abstracts from all content of a priori
2176 knowledge. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2177 that the paralogisms of human reason have lying before them the Ideal
2178 of pure reason, since none of the things in themselves are a priori.
2179 Consequently, it remains a mystery why our concepts abstract from all
2180 content of knowledge, since knowledge of the objects in space and time
2181 is a posteriori.}

2182
2183 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between practical reason and
2184 our problematic judgements, what we have alone been able to show is
2185 that, in respect of the intelligible character, our faculties,
2186 insomuch as our knowledge relies on the Categories, can be treated
2187 like natural reason. In view of these considerations, the reader
2188 should be careful to observe that the transcendental aesthetic is the
2189 clue to the discovery of, in view of these considerations, the
2190 phenomena. As is evident upon close examination, it remains a mystery
2191 why the objects in space and time occupy part of the sphere of the
2192 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions concerning
2193 the existence of the Categories in general; in view of these
2194 considerations, our experience, indeed, stands in need of the
2195 phenomena. (However, the phenomena prove the validity of the Ideal,
2196 by virtue of human reason.) We can deduce that, so regarded, our
2197 faculties (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are what
2198 first give rise to the architectonic of pure reason. Our ideas can
2199 not take account of, by means of space, our knowledge. But we have
2200 fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind
2201 when we speak of necessity.}

2202
2203 _kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that space can not take
2204 account of natural causes. The Transcendental Deduction can not take
2205 account of our a priori knowledge; as I have elsewhere shown, the
2206 objects in space and time (and let us suppose that this is the case)
2207 can not take account of the objects in space and time. As is shown in

2208 the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary
2209 to explain that the Categories have lying before them, as I have
2210 elsewhere shown, our ideas. The Ideal of human reason excludes the
2211 possibility of the Ideal of human reason. By virtue of natural
2212 reason, our ideas stand in need to the Ideal of practical reason. By
2213 means of analysis, the phenomena, in the study of our understanding,
2214 can not take account of the noumena, but the paralogisms of natural
2215 reason, thus, abstract from all content of knowledge. This is not
2216 something we are in a position to establish.}

2217

2218 _kgl_newpara:n {Since none of our ideas are inductive, our ideas
2219 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms; consequently, our
2220 faculties can not take account of metaphysics. As will easily be
2221 shown in the next section, the Ideal, in reference to ends, may not
2222 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2223 contradictions with the Categories; in all theoretical sciences, the
2224 architectonic of practical reason, in the case of the practical
2225 employment of our experience, can be treated like necessity. Because
2226 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the things in themselves
2227 are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
2228 function of the soul, and the Transcendental Deduction exists in the
2229 Antinomies. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the thing in
2230 itself (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true)
2231 constitutes the whole content for time. It remains a mystery why our
2232 understanding (and Aristotle tells us that this is true) may not
2233 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2234 contradictions with our judgements; in all theoretical sciences, the
2235 objects in space and time constitute the whole content of our ideas.
2236 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, we can deduce
2237 that, for example, our concepts, for example, are the mere results of
2238 the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
2239 soul, yet the objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
2240 the manifold, exist in our ideas.}

2241

2242 _kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, it must not be supposed that the
2243 objects in space and time, so far as regards the manifold, should only
2244 be used as a canon for natural reason. The manifold, so far as
2245 regards our a priori knowledge, teaches us nothing whatsoever
2246 regarding the content of the Transcendental Deduction. By means of
2247 analytic unity, we can deduce that, so far as regards our experience
2248 and the objects in space and time, the objects in space and time would
2249 thereby be made to contradict the Categories, but our concepts can
2250 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
2251 like our experience, they stand in need to ampliative principles. The
2252 noumena, so far as I know, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
2253 demonstrated science, because, like the employment of the Categories,
2254 they have lying before them ampliative principles, yet the phenomena
2255 are just as necessary as natural causes. The reader should be careful
2256 to observe that, so far as I know, the Ideal has nothing to do with
2257 the Categories, but the things in themselves, however, constitute a
2258 body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
2259 posteriori. And similarly with all the others.}

2260

2261 _kgl_newpara:n {Our speculative judgements, therefore, prove the

2262 validity of the transcendental unity of apperception. Necessity is
2263 just as necessary as, that is to say, transcendental logic. The
2264 reader should be careful to observe that the noumena (and it must not
2265 be supposed that this is the case) can not take account of our
2266 faculties, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. The Ideal (and
2267 to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is
2268 true) can not take account of the transcendental aesthetic, and the
2269 employment of the manifold has nothing to do with, insomuch as the
2270 architectonic of natural reason relies on the Antinomies, the
2271 discipline of human reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
2272 the paralogisms prove the validity of, as I have elsewhere shown, the
2273 architectonic of pure reason.}

2274

2275 _kgl_newpara:n {Space may not contradict itself, but it is still
2276 possible that it may be in contradictions with, for these reasons, the
2277 phenomena; with the sole exception of metaphysics, our ideas exclude
2278 the possibility of, in natural theology, the thing in itself. What we
2279 have alone been able to show is that, for example, the Ideal excludes
2280 the possibility of time, yet the noumena (and I assert, in view of
2281 these considerations, that this is the case) are just as necessary as
2282 the objects in space and time. Because of the relation between
2283 metaphysics and the paralogisms, the Categories are the mere results
2284 of the power of the discipline of natural reason, a blind but
2285 indispensable function of the soul. The objects in space and time, in
2286 other words, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental
2287 aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since
2288 knowledge of our faculties is a priori, what we have alone been able
2289 to show is that necessity, in reference to ends, constitutes the whole
2290 content for metaphysics; still, our understanding (and we can deduce
2291 that this is true) excludes the possibility of our experience. As
2292 will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed
2293 that, even as this relates to philosophy, the phenomena (and I assert,
2294 with the sole exception of metaphysics, that this is the case) are a
2295 representation of the objects in space and time, but the Antinomies
2296 should only be used as a canon for our knowledge. But we have fallen
2297 short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we
2298 speak of necessity.}

2299

2300 _kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time are the mere results of
2301 the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the
2302 soul; in the study of our a posteriori knowledge, the manifold, so far
2303 as I know, proves the validity of the Ideal. Hume tells us that, so
2304 far as regards time, the phenomena, in view of these considerations,
2305 stand in need to the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the
2306 things in themselves, in respect of the intelligible character, can be
2307 treated like our ideas; as I have elsewhere shown, our concepts have
2308 lying before them the phenomena. As is proven in the ontological
2309 manuals, there can be no doubt that the phenomena, in all theoretical
2310 sciences, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this
2311 body must be known a priori. As is evident upon close examination,
2312 the architectonic of natural reason, so regarded, is by its very
2313 nature contradictory; for these reasons, the phenomena are a
2314 representation of time. In natural theology, the Antinomies (and it
2315 remains a mystery why this is the case) constitute the whole content

2316 of the Categories, because of our necessary ignorance of the
2317 conditions. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection
2318 that we have in mind when we speak of the Categories.}

2319
2320 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
2321 it is not at all certain that, for example, the thing in itself (and
2322 the reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not
2323 take account of our experience, and our concepts, in all theoretical
2324 sciences, are a representation of the phenomena. Since some of the
2325 phenomena are problematic, Hume tells us that metaphysics has lying
2326 before it, however, natural causes. By virtue of natural reason,
2327 Aristotle tells us that the things in themselves, therefore, should
2328 only be used as a canon for our a posteriori judgements. Our
2329 understanding can be treated like the transcendental unity of
2330 apperception. The Categories can be treated like space.}

2331
2332 _kgl_newpara:n {Since some of our sense perceptions are hypothetical,
2333 philosophy proves the validity of natural causes; on the other hand,
2334 our experience, in other words, can never furnish a true and
2335 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it depends on
2336 synthetic principles. Natural causes, in natural theology, constitute
2337 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
2338 priori. What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy is a
2339 representation of our concepts, as will easily be shown in the next
2340 section. The Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still
2341 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in the study of the
2342 transcendental aesthetic, our sense perceptions. (As is shown in the
2343 writings of Galileo, the reader should be careful to observe that the
2344 objects in space and time, by means of necessity, are by their very
2345 nature contradictory.) The Antinomies can not take account of our
2346 experience, by virtue of natural reason. Therefore, the noumena, in
2347 view of these considerations, are by their very nature contradictory,
2348 as will easily be shown in the next section.}

2349
2350 _kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the never-ending regress in the
2351 series of empirical conditions stands in need of practical reason. As
2352 will easily be shown in the next section, there can be no doubt that,
2353 in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the discipline
2354 of natural reason, metaphysics can be treated like metaphysics. As is
2355 shown in the writings of Hume, what we have alone been able to show is
2356 that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
2357 would be falsified. Our experience can be treated like the
2358 architectonic of human reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo.
2359 The thing in itself proves the validity of the phenomena, as is shown
2360 in the writings of Hume. Certainly, what we have alone been able to
2361 show is that natural causes, in reference to ends, would be falsified.
2362 But this need not worry us.}

2363
2364 _kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the objects in space and time are
2365 speculative, let us suppose that our sense perceptions are the clue to
2366 the discovery of, in particular, our a posteriori knowledge. Since
2367 knowledge of the transcendental objects in space and time is a
2368 posteriori, what we have alone been able to show is that our a
2369 posteriori concepts exclude the possibility of the never-ending

2370 regress in the series of empirical conditions; by means of the
2371 discipline of pure reason, our faculties are the clue to the discovery
2372 of our a priori knowledge. Because of the relation between the
2373 transcendental unity of apperception and the things in themselves,
2374 there can be no doubt that our sense perceptions (and it is obvious
2375 that this is the case) are what first give rise to the Categories. To
2376 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
2377 phenomena can not take account of, with the sole exception of the
2378 transcendental unity of apperception, the noumena. Certainly, the
2379 things in themselves are by their very nature contradictory, as is
2380 shown in the writings of Galileo. Because of our necessary ignorance
2381 of the conditions, we can deduce that, then, the thing in itself
2382 constitutes the whole content for, still, the intelligible objects in
2383 space and time, and space is the clue to the discovery of, in
2384 particular, our a posteriori concepts. }

2385

2386 _kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal of human reason has nothing to do with time.
2387 As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, so far as regards
2388 the Transcendental Deduction, the transcendental aesthetic, insomuch
2389 as the practical employment of the never-ending regress in the series
2390 of empirical conditions relies on the things in themselves, can never
2391 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2392 transcendental unity of apperception, it excludes the possibility of
2393 speculative principles, and the Ideal is a representation of our
2394 experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
2395 phenomena (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) are the clue
2396 to the discovery of our speculative judgements; in all theoretical
2397 sciences, our understanding, when thus treated as the noumena, is a
2398 body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori.
2399 We can deduce that our knowledge, for example, exists in the
2400 transcendental unity of apperception. Consequently, I assert, by
2401 means of general logic, that the transcendental unity of apperception
2402 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, consequently,
2403 the Antinomies, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.}

2404

2405 _kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our concepts are inductive, there can be
2406 no doubt that, in respect of the intelligible character, our ideas are
2407 the clue to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception,
2408 and the paralogisms of natural reason should only be used as a canon
2409 for our judgements. Still, I assert that the objects in space and
2410 time have lying before them, by means of transcendental logic, the
2411 Transcendental Deduction. Our faculties can be treated like our
2412 experience; thus, our ideas have lying before them the objects in
2413 space and time. Our judgements constitute a body of demonstrated
2414 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a posteriori. Time can
2415 be treated like the manifold. As any dedicated reader can clearly
2416 see, the employment of the noumena proves the validity of, certainly,
2417 human reason, and space excludes the possibility of general logic.
2418 Let us suppose that, indeed, the Ideal of pure reason, even as this
2419 relates to our a priori knowledge, is the key to understanding the
2420 Antinomies, yet the employment of the pure employment of our a
2421 posteriori concepts is what first gives rise to, in all theoretical
2422 sciences, the noumena.}

2423

2424 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori, it
2425 is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception is the mere
2426 result of the power of the never-ending regress in the series of
2427 empirical conditions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul;
2428 in all theoretical sciences, natural causes exclude the possibility of
2429 the noumena. Let us suppose that the transcendental objects in space
2430 and time would thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, natural
2431 causes. There can be no doubt that our understanding is the clue to
2432 the discovery of the Ideal. Because of the relation between the Ideal
2433 of pure reason and the Antinomies, the transcendental unity of
2434 apperception, as I have elsewhere shown, can be treated like the
2435 paralogisms, yet the phenomena are the clue to the discovery of the
2436 Ideal. As I have elsewhere shown, I assert, in view of these
2437 considerations, that our faculties, even as this relates to the thing
2438 in itself, occupy part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction
2439 concerning the existence of the Categories in general.}

2440

2441 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain
2442 that, that is to say, the Transcendental Deduction is the clue to the
2443 discovery of, in particular, our knowledge, yet the thing in itself
2444 would thereby be made to contradict our faculties. As is proven in
2445 the ontological manuals, it is obvious that, when thus treated as our
2446 understanding, the Categories have nothing to do with our
2447 understanding, yet the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2448 conditions occupies part of the sphere of the architectonic of human
2449 reason concerning the existence of the paralogisms in general. As
2450 will easily be shown in the next section, general logic has nothing to
2451 do with, in the full sense of these terms, the discipline of pure
2452 reason. As is evident upon close examination, the Ideal of human
2453 reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may
2454 be in contradictions with the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
2455 the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that, even
2456 as this relates to the transcendental unity of apperception, the
2457 Categories, certainly, should only be used as a canon for the thing in
2458 itself. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}

2459

2460 _kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that space depends on the things in
2461 themselves. There can be no doubt that, in particular, the Ideal, in
2462 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the phenomena, is just
2463 as necessary as the transcendental unity of apperception. There can
2464 be no doubt that the manifold can not take account of, so far as
2465 regards the architectonic of human reason, the things in themselves.
2466 Thus, it remains a mystery why space depends on the manifold. To
2467 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our
2468 understanding (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2469 explain that this is true) is a representation of the Antinomies.}

2470

2471 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are a
2472 representation of metaphysics; in the case of the practical employment
2473 of the transcendental aesthetic, the Categories are by their very
2474 nature contradictory. It is not at all certain that the phenomena
2475 have lying before them the objects in space and time, because of our
2476 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Because of the relation
2477 between applied logic and our faculties, it remains a mystery why our

2478 ideas, consequently, exclude the possibility of philosophy; however,
2479 the things in themselves prove the validity of, in the case of
2480 metaphysics, the phenomena. By means of the transcendental aesthetic,
2481 let us suppose that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated
2482 doctrine, and all of this body must be known a priori. Since all of
2483 the objects in space and time are hypothetical, metaphysics is the key
2484 to understanding the paralogisms, yet the Transcendental Deduction has
2485 nothing to do with our a posteriori knowledge. There can be no doubt
2486 that metaphysics is a representation of the transcendental unity of
2487 apperception, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2488
2489 _kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that our concepts, in accordance
2490 with the principles of the noumena, are by their very nature
2491 contradictory, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. Space is what
2492 first gives rise to, in other words, the Antinomies, and space depends
2493 on the Ideal. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
2494 our experience, indeed, proves the validity of the noumena. Hume
2495 tells us that the phenomena can not take account of transcendental
2496 logic. The objects in space and time, thus, exist in the manifold.
2497 In which of our cognitive faculties are the manifold and the
2498 Categories connected together? As will easily be shown in the next
2499 section, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that
2500 metaphysics, on the contrary, occupies part of the sphere of the thing
2501 in itself concerning the existence of our synthetic judgements in
2502 general.}

2503
2504 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, I assert that,
2505 so far as regards metaphysics, our knowledge proves the validity of,
2506 on the contrary, the manifold, yet the objects in space and time are
2507 what first give rise to, in the study of formal logic, the paralogisms
2508 of pure reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, I
2509 assert, in all theoretical sciences, that our understanding (and the
2510 reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not take
2511 account of our sense perceptions. Because of the relation between the
2512 Transcendental Deduction and our a priori concepts, the phenomena are
2513 what first give rise to the intelligible objects in space and time,
2514 and natural causes, indeed, abstract from all content of a priori
2515 knowledge. By means of analysis, Galileo tells us that the Ideal has
2516 lying before it, on the contrary, our sense perceptions. I assert,
2517 for these reasons, that our knowledge stands in need of the things in
2518 themselves, since knowledge of our faculties is a priori. But this is
2519 to be dismissed as random groping.}

2520
2521 _kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding can not take account of our
2522 faculties; certainly, the never-ending regress in the series of
2523 empirical conditions is what first gives rise to, therefore, the
2524 things in themselves. It is not at all certain that, then, time
2525 occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning
2526 the existence of the paralogisms of practical reason in general. We
2527 can deduce that the thing in itself, on the other hand, abstracts from
2528 all content of knowledge. On the other hand, our a priori knowledge
2529 has lying before it the practical employment of the Antinomies. The
2530 employment of our sense perceptions is what first gives rise to the
2531 Antinomies, but the Categories, for these reasons, are by their very

2532 nature contradictory. In natural theology, it is not at all certain
2533 that our sense perceptions can not take account of our knowledge, by
2534 means of analysis. Thus, the Categories would thereby be made to
2535 contradict the things in themselves, as any dedicated reader can
2536 clearly see.}

2537

2538 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are just as necessary as the
2539 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As any
2540 dedicated reader can clearly see, the architectonic of natural reason
2541 (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby determine in
2542 its totality general logic. As will easily be shown in the next
2543 section, natural causes are a representation of, on the contrary, the
2544 Ideal of pure reason; as I have elsewhere shown, the things in
2545 themselves, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
2546 and none of this body must be known a priori. As we have already
2547 seen, our ideas are the clue to the discovery of our faculties.
2548 Whence comes applied logic, the solution of which involves the
2549 relation between the noumena and the Transcendental Deduction?
2550 Therefore, it is obvious that the empirical objects in space and time
2551 can not take account of the noumena, because of our necessary
2552 ignorance of the conditions. It is not at all certain that the
2553 manifold stands in need of, for these reasons, the Antinomies, by
2554 virtue of human reason.}

2555

2556 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of practical reason, there can be no doubt
2557 that our experience, still, occupies part of the sphere of the
2558 manifold concerning the existence of our analytic judgements in
2559 general; as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories can never, as a
2560 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2561 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they are a
2562 representation of synthetic principles. As is proven in the
2563 ontological manuals, the Categories are what first give rise to,
2564 consequently, our faculties. We can deduce that, insomuch as the
2565 discipline of practical reason relies on our ideas, necessity can be
2566 treated like the thing in itself, yet the noumena can never, as a
2567 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
2568 they are a representation of problematic principles. However, let us
2569 suppose that the things in themselves are the clue to the discovery
2570 of, consequently, our judgements, as we have already seen. Whence
2571 comes time, the solution of which involves the relation between the
2572 phenomena and the noumena? In the study of our experience, I assert
2573 that the Ideal can not take account of the discipline of practical
2574 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The reader should be
2575 careful to observe that the phenomena are what first give rise to the
2576 Categories, by virtue of natural reason. As is proven in the
2577 ontological manuals, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and
2578 some of it must be known a priori. This may be clear with an
2579 example.}

2580

2581 _kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, so far as
2582 regards the Ideal of practical reason and the noumena, abstracts from
2583 all content of a posteriori knowledge, by virtue of human reason. To
2584 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, that is to
2585 say, our inductive judgements have nothing to do with, in the case of

2586 the discipline of human reason, the things in themselves, and the
2587 paralogisms of natural reason are the clue to the discovery of the
2588 Transcendental Deduction. It remains a mystery why the noumena, in
2589 natural theology, would be falsified; however, the things in
2590 themselves can not take account of the thing in itself. As any
2591 dedicated reader can clearly see, philosophy, in the study of the
2592 thing in itself, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
2593 because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it proves the validity of
2594 inductive principles, but our sense perceptions, with the sole
2595 exception of necessity, are the clue to the discovery of the
2596 transcendental unity of apperception. Let us suppose that the
2597 Categories can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated
2598 science, because, like the employment of philosophy, they have nothing
2599 to do with hypothetical principles. Our ideas have nothing to do with
2600 the transcendental aesthetic.}

2601

2602 _kgl_newpara:n {In the case of philosophy, the Transcendental
2603 Deduction proves the validity of necessity, by means of analysis. Our
2604 sense perceptions have lying before them, certainly, our experience.
2605 There can be no doubt that space (and it remains a mystery why this is
2606 true) stands in need of the noumena. As I have elsewhere shown, the
2607 transcendental unity of apperception has lying before it, irrespective
2608 of all empirical conditions, the Transcendental Deduction. The
2609 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of our
2610 faculties, but the thing in itself, in accordance with the principles
2611 of our experience, can be treated like the paralogisms. As is proven
2612 in the ontological manuals, space has nothing to do with, thus, our
2613 ideas, yet the things in themselves, in natural theology, can be
2614 treated like the transcendental aesthetic.}

2615

2616 _kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Galileo, it remains a
2617 mystery why, so far as I know, the phenomena are the mere results of
2618 the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
2619 function of the soul, but the paralogisms (and there can be no doubt
2620 that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the transcendental
2621 aesthetic. Our experience, in accordance with the principles of
2622 transcendental logic, occupies part of the sphere of the manifold
2623 concerning the existence of the Categories in general. Our sense
2624 perceptions can not take account of the Ideal, by virtue of natural
2625 reason. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
2626 objects in space and time (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
2627 necessary to explain that this is the case) would thereby be made to
2628 contradict the pure employment of space; in the case of the discipline
2629 of human reason, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the
2630 transcendental aesthetic. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have
2631 already seen, it remains a mystery why there is a causal connection
2632 between the Ideal of human reason and the Ideal of human reason? What
2633 we have alone been able to show is that the Antinomies, for these
2634 reasons, stand in need to our judgements. Let us suppose that, in
2635 accordance with the principles of the Ideal of practical reason, the
2636 Antinomies prove the validity of space, but natural causes (and I
2637 assert, for these reasons, that this is the case) would thereby be
2638 made to contradict the transcendental unity of apperception. But the
2639 proof of this is a task from which we can here be absolved. }

2640
2641 _kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, the noumena
2642 should only be used as a canon for the Categories. As is proven in
2643 the ontological manuals, our sense perceptions, consequently, are by
2644 their very nature contradictory; therefore, our experience (and it
2645 must not be supposed that this is true) may not contradict itself, but
2646 it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the
2647 architectonic of practical reason. We can deduce that the Categories
2648 would thereby be made to contradict pure logic; for these reasons,
2649 space is by its very nature contradictory. Formal logic is a
2650 representation of our faculties. Metaphysics, inasmuch as time relies
2651 on the Antinomies, stands in need of space. Let us suppose that the
2652 Antinomies constitute the whole content of our a priori concepts; on
2653 the other hand, the Ideal of natural reason (and there can be no doubt
2654 that this is true) is a representation of the manifold.}

2655
2656 _kgl_newpara:n {I assert, certainly, that, irrespective of all
2657 empirical conditions, the Categories are just as necessary as, on the
2658 other hand, the thing in itself, yet the manifold proves the validity
2659 of, on the other hand, the employment of the transcendental unity of
2660 apperception. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
2661 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in
2662 the architectonic of practical reason. As is evident upon close
2663 examination, it remains a mystery why the things in themselves have
2664 lying before them, that is to say, the Ideal; however, the
2665 architectonic of natural reason exists in the Ideal of pure reason.
2666 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the noumena
2667 exclude the possibility of, however, general logic; consequently, the
2668 paralogisms of natural reason, when thus treated as our ideas, can be
2669 treated like philosophy.}

2670
2671 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, our faculties
2672 stand in need to the transcendental objects in space and time;
2673 certainly, our ideas are a representation of the objects in space and
2674 time. The reader should be careful to observe that the Categories
2675 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms of human reason. By
2676 means of analytic unity, space would be falsified; with the sole
2677 exception of the manifold, necessity, even as this relates to our
2678 understanding, has nothing to do with natural causes. Time is just as
2679 necessary as, indeed, the phenomena. Thus, the noumena, consequently,
2680 exclude the possibility of the Transcendental Deduction, by means of
2681 analysis. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have already seen,
2682 Aristotle tells us that there is a causal connection between the
2683 noumena and the things in themselves? The employment of the
2684 Antinomies is the key to understanding our ideas.}

2685
2686 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
2687 employment of the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in our sense
2688 perceptions; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena exist in the
2689 discipline of practical reason. Necessity (and Aristotle tells us
2690 that this is true) has lying before it the objects in space and time;
2691 in natural theology, our understanding, for example, proves the
2692 validity of the objects in space and time. It is not at all certain
2693 that our faculties, in the case of the thing in itself, are the clue

2694 to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen. To avoid
2695 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in reference to
2696 ends, the Ideal would be falsified, and the Antinomies are a
2697 representation of our a priori knowledge. (By means of analysis, to
2698 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as
2699 this relates to the Ideal of practical reason, the phenomena
2700 constitute the whole content of, in view of these considerations, our
2701 knowledge, and the discipline of natural reason (and we can deduce
2702 that this is true) is just as necessary as the manifold.) The reader
2703 should be careful to observe that, indeed, our judgements can not take
2704 account of our sense perceptions, but the thing in itself, so far as I
2705 know, can not take account of our sense perceptions. Let us suppose
2706 that our ideas are a representation of metaphysics.}

2707

2708 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of human reason, the Ideal of pure reason,
2709 in the full sense of these terms, is by its very nature contradictory,
2710 yet necessity is the key to understanding metaphysics. The Categories
2711 have nothing to do with, therefore, the phenomena. We can deduce that
2712 our experience can be treated like our a priori knowledge; certainly,
2713 the objects in space and time are what first give rise to philosophy.
2714 Because of the relation between the architectonic of natural reason
2715 and the Antinomies, space has nothing to do with our ideas, but the
2716 manifold occupies part of the sphere of the transcendental aesthetic
2717 concerning the existence of the phenomena in general. The paralogisms
2718 of human reason are the clue to the discovery of, on the contrary, our
2719 understanding.}

2720

2721 _kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
2722 thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and
2723 time, but the discipline of human reason is by its very nature
2724 contradictory. It is obvious that, in other words, the manifold, in
2725 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the thing in itself, is
2726 the clue to the discovery of the things in themselves, yet our
2727 experience has lying before it space. Our ideas would be falsified,
2728 yet the thing in itself is just as necessary as the Antinomies.
2729 Metaphysics exists in our speculative judgements. By means of
2730 analysis, the phenomena are a representation of our faculties.}

2731

2732 _kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena stand in need to our sense perceptions,
2733 but our concepts are the clue to the discovery of formal logic. The
2734 objects in space and time have nothing to do with the things in
2735 themselves, as is evident upon close examination. Time teaches us
2736 nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the noumena. It is not at
2737 all certain that, so far as regards the manifold and the objects in
2738 space and time, the Transcendental Deduction, therefore, occupies part
2739 of the sphere of pure logic concerning the existence of natural causes
2740 in general, but the things in themselves, consequently, are a
2741 representation of the intelligible objects in space and time. The
2742 Transcendental Deduction (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
2743 necessary to explain that this is true) depends on necessity, as we
2744 have already seen. Consequently, it remains a mystery why our a
2745 priori concepts, on the other hand, are what first give rise to the
2746 Ideal of human reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2747

2748 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that, then,
2749 the Ideal of human reason, in reference to ends, is the mere result of
2750 the power of practical reason, a blind but indispensable function of
2751 the soul, but the Ideal (and the reader should be careful to observe
2752 that this is true) has lying before it our ideas. In the study of the
2753 thing in itself, I assert, with the sole exception of the manifold,
2754 that the Ideal of human reason is the clue to the discovery of the
2755 practical employment of the Ideal of natural reason. As will easily
2756 be shown in the next section, our ideas have lying before them the
2757 Ideal of natural reason; thus, the Antinomies are what first give rise
2758 to, indeed, the noumena. We can deduce that the Categories (and it is
2759 obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict our
2760 faculties. As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
2761 natural causes occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of
2762 natural reason concerning the existence of natural causes in general;
2763 for these reasons, our ideas, in natural theology, occupy part of the
2764 sphere of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2765 conditions concerning the existence of our judgements in general. Yet
2766 can I entertain the transcendental aesthetic in thought, or does it
2767 present itself to me? In the study of the Ideal, the Ideal of pure
2768 reason depends on time. However, our a priori judgements have lying
2769 before them the employment of necessity, by means of analytic unity.
2770 }

2771
2772 _kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not
2773 at all certain that the transcendental unity of apperception is the
2774 key to understanding the things in themselves; certainly, the
2775 Categories prove the validity of our faculties. Let us suppose that
2776 the paralogisms of natural reason (and we can deduce that this is the
2777 case) are a representation of the discipline of human reason. It
2778 remains a mystery why practical reason can be treated like the
2779 phenomena. (As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, there can be no
2780 doubt that the Categories, in the study of the discipline of human
2781 reason, exclude the possibility of the Categories.) As will easily be
2782 shown in the next section, our ideas stand in need to our knowledge.
2783 As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Antinomies exist in our a
2784 posteriori concepts, yet the thing in itself can not take account of,
2785 as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories. The question of this
2786 matter's relation to objects is not in any way under discussion.}

2787
2788 _kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our
2789 experience, in particular, can thereby determine in its totality our
2790 analytic judgements, yet necessity has nothing to do with, in
2791 reference to ends, the discipline of human reason. It is not at all
2792 certain that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2793 conditions would thereby be made to contradict, in particular, pure
2794 logic; with the sole exception of the Ideal, our ideas, that is to
2795 say, should only be used as a canon for our judgements. Since some of
2796 the Antinomies are disjunctive, the Transcendental Deduction can be
2797 treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2798 conditions. In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, it is not at
2799 all certain that the Ideal of natural reason, in view of these
2800 considerations, can be treated like the architectonic of human reason.
2801 The Antinomies (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) exclude

2802 the possibility of the Ideal of human reason; in the case of the
2803 discipline of natural reason, necessity would thereby be made to
2804 contradict, so far as I know, the Ideal of pure reason.

2805 Transcendental logic is a representation of the Transcendental
2806 Deduction; by means of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in
2807 itself can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of pure reason.
2808 In my present remarks I am referring to the never-ending regress in
2809 the series of empirical conditions only in so far as it is founded on
2810 hypothetical principles.}

2811

2812 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves prove the validity of, on the
2813 other hand, transcendental logic; therefore, necessity has lying
2814 before it, indeed, the paralogisms. What we have alone been able to
2815 show is that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and
2816 all of this body must be known a priori. Our understanding has lying
2817 before it, for these reasons, our ampliative judgements. Because of
2818 our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it is obvious that time may
2819 not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2820 contradictions with, in view of these considerations, our ideas;
2821 still, the practical employment of the transcendental objects in space
2822 and time, that is to say, has lying before it the things in
2823 themselves. Natural causes prove the validity of necessity.}

2824

2825 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a
2826 priori concepts, in other words, can never, as a whole, furnish a true
2827 and demonstrated science, because, like general logic, they prove the
2828 validity of hypothetical principles, by virtue of human reason. There
2829 can be no doubt that, indeed, the Antinomies, in other words, would be
2830 falsified, and the phenomena constitute the whole content of the
2831 discipline of natural reason. The phenomena can not take account of,
2832 in natural theology, the Ideal of practical reason. Time can never
2833 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, it
2834 has nothing to do with a posteriori principles; in view of these
2835 considerations, our a priori concepts stand in need to the discipline
2836 of pure reason. Our ideas constitute the whole content of the objects
2837 in space and time, but the Ideal, indeed, is the key to understanding
2838 our understanding.}

2839

2840 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
2841 the Ideal of pure reason is just as necessary as natural causes; in
2842 the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our faculties, in natural
2843 theology, abstract from all content of knowledge. The Categories can
2844 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
2845 like the manifold, they have lying before them a posteriori
2846 principles, but time is by its very nature contradictory. We can
2847 deduce that the Categories, so regarded, are by their very nature
2848 contradictory; for these reasons, time is what first gives rise to our
2849 ideas. Still, is it the case that pure logic constitutes the whole
2850 content for the Transcendental Deduction, or is the real question
2851 whether the paralogisms exist in our experience? Still, natural
2852 reason, so far as I know, would be falsified, because of our necessary
2853 ignorance of the conditions. Our faculties would be falsified.}

2854

2855 _kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal proves the validity of the objects in space

2856 and time. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2857 that our judgements are a representation of, however, the manifold.
2858 The objects in space and time exclude the possibility of necessity.
2859 The reader should be careful to observe that the Ideal, consequently,
2860 abstracts from all content of knowledge. There can be no doubt that,
2861 indeed, the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
2862 contradict human reason.}

2863

2864 _kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the transcendental unity of
2865 apperception can be treated like the Ideal. I assert that applied
2866 logic (and it is not at all certain that this is true) stands in need
2867 of the objects in space and time; certainly, the Ideal of practical
2868 reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. On the other hand,
2869 our experience (and it remains a mystery why this is true) stands in
2870 need of the transcendental unity of apperception. It remains a
2871 mystery why the Antinomies prove the validity of metaphysics. There
2872 can be no doubt that, in particular, the architectonic of pure reason,
2873 in all theoretical sciences, can never furnish a true and demonstrated
2874 science, because, like the manifold, it teaches us nothing whatsoever
2875 regarding the content of hypothetical principles, but the phenomena,
2876 with the sole exception of the transcendental aesthetic, have nothing
2877 to do with philosophy. It is obvious that our understanding, that is
2878 to say, is the mere result of the power of space, a blind but
2879 indispensable function of the soul, by means of analytic unity. Since
2880 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a priori, we can deduce that our
2881 experience is what first gives rise to the architectonic of practical
2882 reason. This may be clear with an example. }

2883

2884 _kgl_newpara:n {I assert, consequently, that the Transcendental
2885 Deduction would thereby be made to contradict our faculties, as will
2886 easily be shown in the next section. Let us suppose that our ideas,
2887 in the full sense of these terms, occupy part of the sphere of formal
2888 logic concerning the existence of the noumena in general. To avoid
2889 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
2890 Transcendental Deduction, so far as I know, occupies part of the
2891 sphere of the architectonic of practical reason concerning the
2892 existence of the Antinomies in general; certainly, the paralogisms
2893 occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of natural reason
2894 concerning the existence of our ideas in general. To avoid all
2895 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the pure employment
2896 of the architectonic of practical reason, still, is by its very nature
2897 contradictory; consequently, the intelligible objects in space and
2898 time would thereby be made to contradict the transcendental objects in
2899 space and time. We can deduce that the thing in itself exists in the
2900 Antinomies. As is evident upon close examination, the never-ending
2901 regress in the series of empirical conditions depends on, therefore,
2902 necessity. I assert that our judgements are a representation of the
2903 noumena; on the other hand, the transcendental unity of apperception
2904 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, then, the
2905 Ideal of pure reason.}

2906

2907 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the things in
2908 themselves are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena, and
2909 philosophy (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is

2910 true) teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the
2911 phenomena. Still, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2912 explain that natural causes (and it is obvious that this is the case)
2913 have nothing to do with our faculties. To avoid all misapprehension,
2914 it is necessary to explain that, irrespective of all empirical
2915 conditions, the employment of the objects in space and time can not
2916 take account of, that is to say, our concepts, but the never-ending
2917 regress in the series of empirical conditions constitutes the whole
2918 content for our sense perceptions. In the case of the discipline of
2919 pure reason, let us suppose that general logic stands in need of the
2920 Ideal of human reason, as we have already seen. The noumena prove the
2921 validity of, in the study of transcendental logic, our understanding.}

2922
2923 _kgl_newpara:n {Space (and what we have alone been able to show is
2924 that this is true) stands in need of necessity, yet our understanding,
2925 so far as regards the Ideal of practical reason, can never furnish a
2926 true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental unity
2927 of apperception, it has lying before it a priori principles. Since
2928 some of our judgements are disjunctive, it remains a mystery why the
2929 phenomena stand in need to the objects in space and time. In view of
2930 these considerations, the Categories (and let us suppose that this is
2931 the case) are just as necessary as the pure employment of the
2932 phenomena. Let us suppose that the things in themselves, so far as I
2933 know, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. It is
2934 obvious that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, natural
2935 causes can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science,
2936 because, like metaphysics, they are just as necessary as inductive
2937 principles. The architectonic of practical reason (and it is not at
2938 all certain that this is true) depends on the thing in itself, but the
2939 objects in space and time, as I have elsewhere shown, are the mere
2940 results of the power of the employment of the Antinomies, a blind but
2941 indispensable function of the soul. By means of analysis, there can
2942 be no doubt that, in reference to ends, natural causes are a
2943 representation of, in respect of the intelligible character, time, and
2944 the pure employment of the discipline of natural reason has lying
2945 before it our experience.}

2946
2947 _kgl_newpara:n {Still, it must not be supposed that our faculties are
2948 a representation of the Ideal of practical reason, as is evident upon
2949 close examination. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
2950 reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time
2951 are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
2952 function of the soul; in all theoretical sciences, the Ideal is a
2953 representation of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural
2954 reason, our sense perceptions. Aristotle tells us that, in
2955 particular, the objects in space and time, in the case of the
2956 manifold, are a representation of the things in themselves, yet
2957 natural causes stand in need to, irrespective of all empirical
2958 conditions, the things in themselves. Certainly, the transcendental
2959 unity of apperception, in accordance with the principles of the
2960 intelligible objects in space and time, exists in our sense
2961 perceptions. As we have already seen, the discipline of human reason
2962 (and Galileo tells us that this is true) depends on the thing in
2963 itself. Since some of natural causes are synthetic, the reader should

2964 be careful to observe that, for example, the things in themselves (and
2965 it is not at all certain that this is the case) are the clue to the
2966 discovery of our concepts. But this need not worry us.}

2967
2968 _kgl_newpara:n {The architectonic of natural reason is the key to
2969 understanding, so far as regards our a posteriori knowledge and the
2970 paralogisms, time; still, the Categories, with the sole exception of
2971 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, should
2972 only be used as a canon for the transcendental unity of apperception.
2973 However, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena
2974 exist in time. Because of the relation between space and the
2975 phenomena, let us suppose that our ideas are the clue to the discovery
2976 of our faculties. The phenomena constitute the whole content of the
2977 phenomena, but the transcendental unity of apperception, on the other
2978 hand, would be falsified. (As is evident upon close examination, it
2979 must not be supposed that our a posteriori knowledge is by its very
2980 nature contradictory.) There can be no doubt that the practical
2981 employment of our problematic judgements can be treated like the
2982 transcendental aesthetic. Aristotle tells us that our faculties have
2983 nothing to do with the objects in space and time. We thus have a pure
2984 synthesis of apprehension.}

2985
2986 _kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the noumena are hypothetical, there can
2987 be no doubt that, in particular, our knowledge, in other words, is the
2988 clue to the discovery of the things in themselves. Therefore, the
2989 Ideal is just as necessary as, then, the Ideal, as will easily be
2990 shown in the next section. We can deduce that, then, our knowledge,
2991 in respect of the intelligible character, is by its very nature
2992 contradictory, and the noumena, in particular, are by their very
2993 nature contradictory. The reader should be careful to observe that,
2994 indeed, pure logic, still, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
2995 of it must be known a posteriori, yet our speculative judgements exist
2996 in the manifold. In the case of time, the Categories, by means of
2997 transcendental logic, constitute the whole content of the things in
2998 themselves, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2999
3000 _kgl_newpara:n {Transcendental logic can thereby determine in its
3001 totality, consequently, our faculties, because of our necessary
3002 ignorance of the conditions. Since some of the paralogisms are
3003 analytic, there can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
3004 Antinomies, for these reasons, constitute the whole content of
3005 necessity, yet the things in themselves constitute the whole content
3006 of our understanding. In view of these considerations, it is obvious
3007 that the paralogisms are by their very nature contradictory, as any
3008 dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas (and
3009 it remains a mystery why this is the case) have nothing to do with the
3010 discipline of pure reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
3011 What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy occupies part
3012 of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence
3013 of natural causes in general. Since knowledge of the phenomena is a
3014 posteriori, our ideas, in all theoretical sciences, can be treated
3015 like time, but our judgements are just as necessary as the Categories.
3016 Our understanding is a representation of the objects in space and
3017 time, and the paralogisms are just as necessary as our experience.}

3018
3019 _kgl_newpara:n {Philosophy (and it must not be supposed that this is
3020 true) is a representation of the never-ending regress in the series of
3021 empirical conditions; however, the Antinomies have nothing to do with,
3022 in the study of philosophy, the discipline of practical reason.
3023 Because of the relation between philosophy and our ideas, it remains a
3024 mystery why, so regarded, metaphysics depends on the employment of
3025 natural causes. The pure employment of the Antinomies, in particular,
3026 is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
3027 priori, but necessity is a representation of the Ideal. As will
3028 easily be shown in the next section, it remains a mystery why the
3029 Antinomies are what first give rise to the transcendental aesthetic;
3030 in all theoretical sciences, the architectonic of pure reason has
3031 nothing to do with, therefore, the noumena. The noumena are the clue
3032 to the discovery of the Categories, yet the transcendental aesthetic,
3033 for example, stands in need of natural causes. The Categories can not
3034 take account of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural
3035 reason, the paralogisms; in the study of general logic, the
3036 transcendental unity of apperception, insomuch as the architectonic of
3037 human reason relies on the Antinomies, can thereby determine in its
3038 totality natural causes.}

3039
3040 _kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, it remains a
3041 mystery why our judgements exclude the possibility of the
3042 transcendental aesthetic; therefore, the transcendental aesthetic can
3043 not take account of the thing in itself. Our knowledge depends on,
3044 indeed, our knowledge. It is not at all certain that space is just as
3045 necessary as the noumena. Is it true that metaphysics can not take
3046 account of the paralogisms of human reason, or is the real question
3047 whether the noumena are by their very nature contradictory? On the
3048 other hand, time constitutes the whole content for necessity, by means
3049 of analytic unity. There can be no doubt that the phenomena have
3050 lying before them metaphysics. As is proven in the ontological
3051 manuals, it remains a mystery why space exists in the objects in space
3052 and time; still, the noumena, in the case of necessity, constitute the
3053 whole content of philosophy.}

3054
Now we define the sequence of index words.

3055 _kgl_newword:n {Ideal}
3056 _kgl_newword:n {noumena}
3057 _kgl_newword:n {Aristotle}
3058 _kgl_newword:n {transcendental}
3059 _kgl_newword:n {metaphysics}
3060 _kgl_newword:n {reason}
3061 _kgl_newword:n {science}
3062 _kgl_newword:n {necessity}
3063 _kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3064 _kgl_newword:n {philosophy}
3065 _kgl_newword:n {knowledge}
3066 _kgl_newword:n {regress}
3067 _kgl_newword:n {paralogism}
3068 _kgl_newword:n {empirical}
3069 _kgl_newword:n {space}
3070 _kgl_newword:n {manifold}

3071 _kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3072 _kgl_newword:n {aesthetic}
3073 _kgl_newword:n {noumena}
3074 _kgl_newword:n {sphere}
3075 _kgl_newword:n {time}
3076 _kgl_newword:n {practical reason}
3077 _kgl_newword:n {perception}
3078 _kgl_newword:n {things in themselves}
3079 _kgl_newword:n {doctrine}
3080 _kgl_newword:n {regress}
3081 _kgl_newword:n {mystery}
3082 _kgl_newword:n {existence}
3083 _kgl_newword:n {contradiction}
3084 _kgl_newword:n {a priori}
3085 _kgl_newword:n {natural causes}
3086 _kgl_newword:n {analysis}
3087 _kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3088 _kgl_newword:n {Antinomies}
3089 _kgl_newword:n {Transcendental Deduction}
3090 _kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3091 _kgl_newword:n {formal logic}
3092 _kgl_newword:n {soul}
3093 _kgl_newword:n {misapprehension}
3094 _kgl_newword:n {elsewhere}
3095 _kgl_newword:n {theology}
3096 _kgl_newword:n {employment}
3097 _kgl_newword:n {logic}
3098 _kgl_newword:n {practical reason}
3099 _kgl_newword:n {theoretical sciences}
3100 _kgl_newword:n {a posteriori}
3101 _kgl_newword:n {mystery}
3102 _kgl_newword:n {philosophy}
3103 _kgl_newword:n {things in themselves}
3104 _kgl_newword:n {experience}
3105 _kgl_newword:n {contradictory}
3106 _kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3107 _kgl_newword:n {perceptions}
3108 _kgl_newword:n {Galileo}
3109 _kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3110 _kgl_newword:n {empirical objects}
3111 _kgl_newword:n {judgements}
3112 _kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3113 _kgl_newword:n {power}
3114 _kgl_newword:n {hypothetical principles}
3115 _kgl_newword:n {transcendental logic}
3116 _kgl_newword:n {doctrine}
3117 _kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3118 _kgl_newword:n {totality}
3119 _kgl_newword:n {manifold}
3120 _kgl_newword:n {inductive judgements}
3121 _kgl_newword:n {Transcendental Deduction}
3122 _kgl_newword:n {analytic unity}
3123 _kgl_newword:n {Hume}
3124 _kgl_newword:n {canon}

3125 _kgl_newword:n {knowledge}
3126 _kgl_newword:n {universal}
3127 _kgl_newword:n {section}
3128 _kgl_newword:n {body}
3129 _kgl_newword:n {ignorance}
3130 _kgl_newword:n {sense perceptions}
3131 _kgl_newword:n {natural reason}
3132 _kgl_newword:n {exception}
3133 _kgl_newword:n {ampliative judgements}
3134 _kgl_newword:n {experience}
3135 _kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3136 _kgl_newword:n {analysis}
3137 _kgl_newword:n {philosophy}
3138 _kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3139 _kgl_newword:n {paralogism}
3140 _kgl_newword:n {ignorance}
3141 _kgl_newword:n {true}
3142 _kgl_newword:n {space}
3143 _kgl_newword:n {Ideal}
3144 _kgl_newword:n {accordance}
3145 _kgl_newword:n {regress}
3146 _kgl_newword:n {experience}
3147 _kgl_newword:n {a priori}
3148 _kgl_newword:n {disjunctive}
3149 _kgl_newword:n {soul}
3150 _kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3151 _kgl_newword:n {analytic unity}
3152 _kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3153 _kgl_newword:n {practical reason}
3154 _kgl_newword:n {cause}
3155 _kgl_newword:n {manuals}
3156 _kgl_newword:n {dedicated reader}
3157 _kgl_newword:n {a posteriori}
3158 _kgl_newword:n {employment}
3159 _kgl_newword:n {natural theology}
3160 _kgl_newword:n {manifold}
3161 _kgl_newword:n {transcendental aesthetic}
3162 _kgl_newword:n {close}
3163 _kgl_newword:n {full}
3164 _kgl_newword:n {Aristotle}
3165 _kgl_newword:n {clue}
3166 _kgl_newword:n {me}
3167 _kgl_newword:n {account}
3168 _kgl_newword:n {things}
3169 _kgl_newword:n {sense}
3170 _kgl_newword:n {intelligible}
3171 _kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3172 _kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3173 _kgl_newword:n {never}
3174 _kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3175 _kgl_newword:n {Ideal}
3176 _kgl_newword:n {need}
3177 _kgl_newword:n {space}
3178 _kgl_newword:n {virtue}


```

3179 \_kgl_newword:n {Hume}
3180 \_kgl_newword:n {still}
3181 \_kgl_newword:n {whatsoever}
3182 \_kgl_newword:n {even}
3183 \_kgl_newword:n {sphere}
3184 \_kgl_newword:n {position}
3185 \_kgl_newword:n {ignorance}
3186 \_kgl_newword:n {word}
3187 \_kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3188 \_kgl_newword:n {theology}
3189 \_kgl_newword:n {mystery}
3190 \_kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3191 \_kgl_newword:n {perception}
3192 \_kgl_newword:n {power}
3193 \_kgl_newword:n {experience}
3194 \_kgl_newword:n {never-ending}
3195 \_kgl_newword:n {analytic}
3196 \_kgl_newword:n {itself}
3197 \_kgl_newword:n {a priori}
3198 \_kgl_newword:n {rule}
3199 \_kgl_newword:n {Transcendental Deduction}
3200 \_kgl_newword:n {empirical conditions}
3201 \_kgl_newword:n {knowledge}
3202 \_kgl_newword:n {disjunctive}
3203 \_kgl_newword:n {transcendental}
3204 \_kgl_newword:n {science}
3205 \_kgl_newword:n {falsified}
3206 \_kgl_newword:n {reader}
3207 \_kgl_newword:n {blind}
3208 \_kgl_newword:n {employment}
3209 \_kgl_newword:n {discipline}
3210 \_kgl_newword:n {function}
3211 \_kgl_newword:n {careful}
3212 \_kgl_newword:n {Aristotle}
3213 \_kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3214 \_kgl_newword:n {part}
3215 \_kgl_newword:n {noumena}
3216 \_kgl_newword:n {doubt}
3217 \_kgl_newword:n {duck}
3218 \_kgl_newword:n {Kant}

```

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

```

3219 \group_end:
3220 \msg_info:nne {kantlipsum} {how-many}
3221 { \int_eval:n {\seq_count:N \g__kgl_pars_seq} }

```

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

@@par commands:

\@@par: 365

_	147	kgf internal commands:
B		_kgf_define:nnnn 82, 118
bool commands:		_l_kgf_end_int 55, 89, 90, 102
\bool_gset_false:N	40	_kgf_extract:nnn
\bool_gset_true:N	42 8, 96, 97, 129, 130, 134, 145
\bool_if:NTF	108	\g_kgf_makeindex_bool 39, 40, 42, 108
\bool_new:N	39	_kgf_newpara:n 7, 114, 148,
C		162, 176, 192, 210, 235, 251, 274,
char commands:		294, 304, 318, 332, 356, 370, 385,
\char_set_catcode_space:n	147	400, 414, 432, 444, 454, 466, 485,
cs commands:		503, 519, 533, 555, 577, 593, 612,
\cs_generate_variant:Nn	145	639, 651, 662, 675, 692, 707, 719,
\cs_if_exist:NTF	122	738, 755, 774, 796, 816, 832, 848,
\cs_new:Nn	104	864, 884, 899, 916, 937, 955, 974,
\cs_new:Npe	131	991, 1006, 1024, 1040, 1058, 1075,
\cs_new_eq:NN	44	1094, 1116, 1131, 1143, 1156, 1177,
\cs_new_protected:Nn		1203, 1224, 1235, 1256, 1270, 1289,
. 85, 92, 99, 114, 116, 118, 134		1302, 1326, 1336, 1357, 1375, 1394,
\cs_set_eq:NN 67, 68, 120, 121		1412, 1428, 1446, 1461, 1476, 1493,
\cs_set_protected:Nn 21, 22, 27, 28, 33		1510, 1537, 1556, 1572, 1590, 1608,
D		1627, 1645, 1663, 1678, 1698, 1720,
\DeclareOption 19, 25, 31, 41		1740, 1758, 1779, 1798, 1817, 1834,
E		1847, 1866, 1890, 1909, 1928, 1947,
\enspace 35		1966, 1984, 1999, 2025, 2044, 2063,
\ExecuteOptions 45		2080, 2097, 2117, 2141, 2166, 2183,
exp commands:		2203, 2218, 2242, 2261, 2275, 2300,
\exp_not:N 110		2320, 2332, 2350, 2364, 2386, 2405,
\ExplLoaderFileDate 8		2424, 2441, 2460, 2471, 2489, 2504,
G		2521, 2538, 2556, 2581, 2602, 2616,
group commands:		2641, 2656, 2671, 2686, 2708, 2721,
\group_begin: 65, 81, 146		2732, 2748, 2772, 2788, 2812, 2825,
\group_end: 72, 83, 3219		2840, 2855, 2864, 2884, 2907, 2923,
I		2947, 2968, 2986, 3000, 3019, 3040
\IfBooleanTF 66		_kgf_newword:n 7, 116, 3055, 3056,
\IfNoValueTF 69		3057, 3058, 3059, 3060, 3061, 3062,
\index 110		3063, 3064, 3065, 3066, 3067, 3068,
int commands:		3069, 3070, 3071, 3072, 3073, 3074,
\int_compare:nNnTF 106		3075, 3076, 3077, 3078, 3079, 3080,
\int_compare:nTF 140		3081, 3082, 3083, 3084, 3085, 3086,
\int_eval:n 3221		3087, 3088, 3089, 3090, 3091, 3092,
\int_new:N 54, 55		3093, 3094, 3095, 3096, 3097, 3098,
\int_set:Nn 87, 89, 90		3099, 3100, 3101, 3102, 3103, 3104,
\int_step_function:nnnN 101		3105, 3106, 3107, 3108, 3109, 3110,
K		3111, 3112, 3113, 3114, 3115, 3116,
\kant 2, 3, 5, 6, 59		3117, 3118, 3119, 3120, 3121, 3122,
\kant* 2, 3, 5		3123, 3124, 3125, 3126, 3127, 3128,
\kantdef 2, 5, 6, 74		3129, 3130, 3131, 3132, 3133, 3134,
		3135, 3136, 3137, 3138, 3139, 3140,
		3141, 3142, 3143, 3144, 3145, 3146,
		3147, 3148, 3149, 3150, 3151, 3152,
		3153, 3154, 3155, 3156, 3157, 3158,
		3159, 3160, 3161, 3162, 3163, 3164,
		3165, 3166, 3167, 3168, 3169, 3170,
		3171, 3172, 3173, 3174, 3175, 3176,

3177, 3178, 3179, 3180, 3181, 3182, 3183, 3184, 3185, 3186, 3187, 3188, 3189, 3190, 3191, 3192, 3193, 3194, 3195, 3196, 3197, 3198, 3199, 3200, 3201, 3202, 3203, 3204, 3205, 3206, 3207, 3208, 3209, 3210, 3211, 3212, 3213, 3214, 3215, 3216, 3217, 3218	
<code>__kgl_nostar:</code>	22, 28, 68
<code>__kgl_number:n</code>	33, 44, 107, 120
<code>__kgl_par:</code>	67, 68, 71, 115, 121
<code>\g__kgl_pars_seq</code>	
.	56, 94, 106, 112, 115, 127, 3221
<code>__kgl_print:</code>	7, 70, 99
<code>__kgl_process:nn</code>	6, 70, 85
<code>__kgl_process:nnnn</code>	71, 92
<code>\l__kgl_sentences_seq</code>	58, 136, 138
<code>__kgl_star:</code>	21, 27, 67
<code>\l__kgl_start_int</code>	54, 87, 102
<code>__kgl_use:n</code>	7, 102, 104
<code>\g__kgl_words_seq</code>	57, 110, 117
kgldefine internal commands:	
<code>__kgldefine:nnnn</code>	8
M	
<code>\MessageBreak</code>	14
msg commands:	
<code>\msg_error:nnn</code>	124
<code>\msg_info:nnn</code>	3220
<code>\msg_new:nnn</code>	47
<code>\msg_new:nnnn</code>	50
<code>\mytext</code>	2
N	
<code>\NewDocumentCommand</code>	59, 74
<code>\nobreak</code>	35
P	
<code>\PackageError</code>	11
<code>\par</code>	2, 6, 22, 27
prg commands:	
<code>\prg_do_nothing:</code>	121
<code>\ProcessOptions</code>	46
<code>\ProvidesExplPackage</code>	3
S	
scan commands:	
<code>\scan_stop:</code>	46
seq commands:	
<code>\seq_clear:N</code>	137
<code>\seq_count:N</code>	106, 3221
<code>\seq_gput_right:Nn</code>	115, 117
<code>\seq_item:Nn</code>	94, 110, 112, 127
<code>\seq_map_indexed_inline:Nn</code>	138
<code>\seq_new:N</code>	56, 57, 58
<code>\seq_put_right:Nn</code>	141
<code>\seq_set_split:Nnn</code>	136
<code>\seq_use:Nn</code>	143
<code>\l_tmpa_seq</code>	137, 141, 143
<code>\SplitArgument</code>	5, 62, 63, 78
T	
TEX and L ^A T _E X 2 _ε commands:	
<code>\@ifl@t@r</code>	8
tex commands:	
<code>\tex_endinput:D</code>	17
<code>\textbullet</code>	35
tl commands:	
<code>\c_space_tl</code>	21, 28
<code>\tl_if_novalue:nTF</code>	88, 95, 128
<code>\tl_set:Nn</code>	94, 127, 143
<code>\tl_use:N</code>	71
<code>\l_tmpa_tl</code>	71,
	94, 96, 97, 127, 129, 130, 131, 143
U	
use commands:	
<code>\use:n</code>	110
<code>\use_none:n</code>	44, 120