

The `kantlipsum` package

Dummy text in Kantian style*

Enrico Gregorio[†]

Released 2017/11/16

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 v0.7, last revised 2017/11/16.

[†]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 paralogisms 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 paralogisms 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.

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

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

Note

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

Changes from version 0.1

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

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.

5 kantlipsum implementation

```
1 <*package>
2 <@@=kgf>
3 \ProvidesExplPackage
4   {kantlipsum}
5   {2017/11/16}
6   {0.7}
7   {Generate text in Kantian style}
8
9   A check to make sure that expl3 is not too old
10  \@@ifpackagelater { expl3 } { 2017/11/14 }
11  {
12    \PackageError { kantlipsum } { Support-package-expl3-too-old }
13    {
14      You~need~to~update~your~installation~of~the~bundles~
15      'l3kernel'~and~'l3packages'.\MessageBreak
16      Loading~kantlipsum~will~abort!
17    }
18  }
19  \tex_endinput:D
20 }
```

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 { \cs_set_protected:Nn \__kgl_number:n { #1\nobreak\enspace\textbullet\nobreak\enspace } }
33
34 \bool_new:N \g__kgl_makeindex_bool
35 \bool_gset_false:N \g__kgl_makeindex_bool
36 \DeclareOption{ index }
37 { \bool_gset_true:N \g__kgl_makeindex_bool }
38
39 \cs_new_eq:NN \__kgl_number:n \use_none:n
40 \ExecuteOptions{par}
41 \ProcessOptions \scan_stop:
```

5.2 Messages

We define two messages.

```
42 \msg_new:nnn {kantlipsum}{how-many}
43   {The~package~provides~paragraphs~1~to~#1.~
44   Values~outside~this~range~will~be~ignored.}
45 \msg_new:nnnn {kantlipsum}{already-defined}
46   {Control~sequence~#1~already~defined.}
47   {The~control~sequence~#1~is~already~defined,~
48   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.

```
49 \int_new:N \l__kgl_start_int
50 \int_new:N \l__kgl_end_int
51 \seq_new:N \g__kgl_pars_seq
52 \seq_new:N \g__kgl_words_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.

```
53 \NewDocumentCommand{\kant}{s>{\SplitArgument{1}{-}}0{1-7}}
54 {
55   \group_begin:
56   \IfBooleanTF{#1}
57     { \cs_set_eq:NN \__kgl_par: \__kgl_star: }
58     { \cs_set_eq:NN \__kgl_par: \__kgl_nostar: }
59   \__kgl_process:nn #2
60   \__kgl_print:
61   \group_end:
62 }
```

`\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.

```
63 \NewDocumentCommand{\kantdef}{mm}
64 {
65   \group_begin:
66   \cs_set_eq:NN \__kgl_number:n \use_none:n
67   \cs_set_eq:NN \__kgl_par: \prg_do_nothing:
68   \cs_if_exist:NTF #1
69     {
70       \msg_error:nnn {kantlipsum} {already-defined} {#1}
71     }
72     {
73       \tl_set:Nx \l_tmpa_tl { \seq_item:Nn \g__kgl_pars_seq {#2} }
74       \cs_new:Npx #1 { \l_tmpa_tl }
75     }
76   \group_end:
77 }
```

5.5 Internal functions

_kgl_process:n

The function \\@@_process:n 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.

```

78 \cs_new_protected:Nn \\_kgl\_process:n
79 {
80   \int_set:Nn \\l_\\_kgl_start_int {#1}
81   \tl_if_novalue:nTF {#2}
82     { \int_set:Nn \\l_\\_kgl_end_int {#1} }
83     { \int_set:Nn \\l_\\_kgl_end_int {#2} }
84 }

```

_kgl_print:
_kgl_use:n

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.

```

85 \cs_new_protected:Nn \\_kgl\_print:
86 {
87   \int_step_function:nnnN
88     {\\l_\\_kgl_start_int} {1} {\\l_\\_kgl_end_int} \\_kgl\_use:n
89 }
90 \cs_new:Nn \\_kgl\_use:n
91 {
92   \int_compare:nNnF { #1 } > { \seq_count:N \\g_\\_kgl_pars_seq }
93     { \\_kgl\_number:n {#1} }
94   \bool_if:NT \\g_\\_kgl_makeindex_bool
95     {
96       \use:x { \exp_not:N \index{ \seq_item:Nn \\g_\\_kgl_words_seq {#1} } }
97     }
98   \seq_item:Nn \\g_\\_kgl_pars_seq {#1}
99 }

```

_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:

```

100 \cs_new_protected:Nn \\_kgl\_newpara:n
101 { \seq_gput_right:Nn \\g_\\_kgl_pars_seq {#1\\_kgl_par:} }

```

_kgl_newword:n

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

```

102 \cs_new_protected:Nn \\_kgl\_newword:n
103 { \seq_gput_right:Nn \\g_\\_kgl_words_seq {#1} }

```

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.

```
104 \group_begin:
105 \char_set_catcode_space:n {'\ }
    Then we provide all of the sentences with the pattern \@@_newpara:n {(text)}
106 \_kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Ideal of
107 practical reason is a representation of, as far as I know, the things
108 in themselves; as I have shown elsewhere, the phenomena should only be
109 used as a canon for our understanding. The paralogisms of practical
110 reason are what first give rise to the architectonic of practical
111 reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, reason would
112 thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the
113 Ideal of practical reason, yet the manifold depends on the phenomena.
114 Necessity depends on, when thus treated as the practical employment of
115 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, time.
116 Human reason depends on our sense perceptions, by means of analytic
117 unity. There can be no doubt that the objects in space and time are
118 what first give rise to human reason.}
119
120 \_kgl_newpara:n {Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do
121 with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a
122 posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of
123 apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason,
124 by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
125 it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the
126 validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is
127 that, our understanding depends on the Categories. It remains a
128 mystery why the Ideal stands in need of reason. It must not be
129 supposed that our faculties have lying before them, in the case of the
130 Ideal, the Antinomies; so, the transcendental aesthetic is just as
131 necessary as our experience. By means of the Ideal, our sense
132 perceptions are by their very nature contradictory.}
133
134 \_kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things
135 in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a
136 representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the
137 paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have
138 lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because
139 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would
140 thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the
141 Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions.
142 (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated
143 science, because, like time, it depends on analytic principles.) So,
144 it must not be supposed that our experience depends on, so, our sense
145 perceptions, by means of analysis. Space constitutes the whole content
146 for our sense perceptions, and time occupies part of the sphere of the
147 Ideal concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in
148 general.}
149
150 \_kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, what we have alone been able
151 to show is that the objects in space and time would be falsified; what
```

152 we have alone been able to show is that, our judgements are what first
153 give rise to metaphysics. As I have shown elsewhere, Aristotle tells
154 us that the objects in space and time, in the full sense of these
155 terms, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, indeed, our
156 problematic judgements, indeed, can be treated like our concepts. As
157 any dedicated reader can clearly see, our knowledge can be treated
158 like the transcendental unity of apperception, but the phenomena
159 occupy part of the sphere of the manifold concerning the existence of
160 natural causes in general. Whence comes the architectonic of natural
161 reason, the solution of which involves the relation between necessity
162 and the Categories? Natural causes (and it is not at all certain that
163 this is the case) constitute the whole content for the paralogisms.
164 This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental
165 philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the
166 fact may suffice.}

167

168 _kgl_newpara:n {Therefore, we can deduce that the objects in space and
169 time (and I assert, however, that this is the case) have lying before
170 them the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance
171 of the conditions, it must not be supposed that, then, formal logic
172 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true) is a
173 representation of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
174 conditions, but the discipline of pure reason, in so far as this
175 expounds the contradictory rules of metaphysics, depends on the
176 Antinomies. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, therefore, can
177 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
178 like the transcendental unity of apperception, they constitute the
179 whole content for a priori principles; for these reasons, our
180 experience is just as necessary as, in accordance with the principles
181 of our a priori knowledge, philosophy. The objects in space and time
182 abstract from all content of knowledge. Has it ever been suggested
183 that it remains a mystery why there is no relation between the
184 Antinomies and the phenomena? It must not be supposed that the
185 Antinomies (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are
186 the clue to the discovery of philosophy, because of our necessary
187 ignorance of the conditions. As I have shown elsewhere, to avoid all
188 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our understanding
189 (and it must not be supposed that this is true) is what first gives
190 rise to the architectonic of pure reason, as is evident upon close
191 examination.}

192

193 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are what first give rise to
194 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural
195 reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception
196 abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these
197 considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key
198 to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all
199 empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our
200 disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure
201 logic, in the case of the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from
202 all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in
203 accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms,
204 time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be
205 treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be

206 supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise
207 to the employment of pure reason.}

208
209 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all
210 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the
211 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a
212 representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in
213 themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It
214 remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series
215 of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of
216 the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never
217 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
218 architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic
219 principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time
220 is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would
221 thereby be made to contradict the Ideal of practical reason. On the
222 other hand, natural causes can not take account of, consequently, the
223 Antinomies, as will easily be shown in the next section.
224 Consequently, the Ideal of practical reason (and I assert that this is
225 true) excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our
226 experience would thereby be made to contradict, for example, our
227 ideas, but the transcendental objects in space and time (and let us
228 suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of
229 necessity. But the proof of this is a task from which we can here be
230 absolved.}

231
232 _kgl_newpara:n {Thus, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of, on
233 the other hand, natural causes, as will easily be shown in the next
234 section. Still, the reader should be careful to observe that the
235 phenomena have lying before them the intelligible objects in space and
236 time, because of the relation between the manifold and the noumena.
237 As is evident upon close examination, Aristotle tells us that, in
238 reference to ends, our judgements (and the reader should be careful to
239 observe that this is the case) constitute the whole content of the
240 empirical objects in space and time. Our experience, with the sole
241 exception of necessity, exists in metaphysics; therefore, metaphysics
242 exists in our experience. (It must not be supposed that the thing in
243 itself (and I assert that this is true) may not contradict itself, but
244 it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the
245 transcendental unity of apperception; certainly, our judgements exist
246 in natural causes.) The reader should be careful to observe that,
247 indeed, the Ideal, on the other hand, can be treated like the noumena,
248 but natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the Antinomies.
249 The transcendental unity of apperception constitutes the whole content
250 for the noumena, by means of analytic unity.}

251
252 _kgl_newpara:n {In all theoretical sciences, the paralogsms of human
253 reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals.
254 The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the
255 Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogsms
256 should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone
257 been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions
258 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must
259 be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of

260 our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.}

261

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

275

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

289

290 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that the
291 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, certainly,
292 our a priori knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Our faculties
293 abstract from all content of knowledge; for these reasons, the
294 discipline of human reason stands in need of the transcendental
295 aesthetic. There can be no doubt that, insomuch as the Ideal relies
296 on our a posteriori concepts, philosophy, when thus treated as the
297 things in themselves, exists in our hypothetical judgements, yet our a
298 posteriori concepts are what first give rise to the phenomena.
299 Philosophy (and I assert that this is true) excludes the possibility
300 of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, as
301 will easily be shown in the next section. Still, is it true that the
302 transcendental aesthetic can not take account of the objects in space
303 and time, or is the real question whether the phenomena should only be
304 used as a canon for the never-ending regress in the series of
305 empirical conditions? By means of analytic unity, the Transcendental
306 Deduction, still, is the mere result of the power of the
307 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
308 soul, but our faculties abstract from all content of a posteriori
309 knowledge. It remains a mystery why, then, the discipline of human
310 reason, in other words, is what first gives rise to the transcendental
311 aesthetic, yet our faculties have lying before them the architectonic
312 of human reason.}

313

314 _kgl_newpara:n {However, we can deduce that our experience (and it
315 must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our
316 experience, as we have already seen. On the other hand, it is not at
317 all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the
318 practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the
319 noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first
320 give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is
321 necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a
322 true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural
323 reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the
324 writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in
325 respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space
326 and time.}

327
328 _kgl_newpara:n {Our ideas, in the case of the Ideal of pure reason,
329 are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time
330 can not take account of our understanding, and philosophy excludes the
331 possibility of, certainly, space. I assert that our ideas, by means
332 of philosophy, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of
333 this body must be known a posteriori, by means of analysis. It must
334 not be supposed that space is by its very nature contradictory. Space
335 would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of the manifold, the
336 manifold. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us
337 that, in accordance with the principles of the discipline of human
338 reason, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
339 has lying before it our experience. This could not be passed over in
340 a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely
341 critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.}

342
343 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of our faculties is a posteriori, pure
344 logic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, indeed,
345 the architectonic of human reason. As we have already seen, we can
346 deduce that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the Ideal of
347 human reason is what first gives rise to, indeed, natural causes, yet
348 the thing in itself can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
349 because, like necessity, it is the clue to the discovery of
350 disjunctive principles. On the other hand, the manifold depends on
351 the paralogisms. Our faculties exclude the possibility of, inasmuch
352 as philosophy relies on natural causes, the discipline of natural
353 reason. In all theoretical sciences, what we have alone been able to
354 show is that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of
355 our judgements, as will easily be shown in the next section. This is
356 what chiefly concerns us.}

357
358 _kgl_newpara:n {Time (and let us suppose that this is true) is the
359 clue to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen.
360 Since knowledge of our faculties is a priori, to avoid all
361 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the empirical objects
362 in space and time can not take account of, in the case of the Ideal of
363 natural reason, the manifold. It must not be supposed that pure
364 reason stands in need of, certainly, our sense perceptions. On the
365 other hand, our ampliative judgements would thereby be made to
366 contradict, in the full sense of these terms, our hypothetical
367 judgements. I assert, still, that philosophy is a representation of,

368 however, formal logic; in the case of the manifold, the objects in
369 space and time can be treated like the paralogsms of natural reason.
370 This is what chiefly concerns us.}

371
372 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between pure logic and natural
373 causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that,
374 even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes
375 the whole content for our concepts, but the Ideal of practical reason
376 may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
377 contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why
378 natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by
379 means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as
380 our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions,
381 depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle.
382 It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is
383 the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The
384 Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet
385 general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing
386 to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to
387 the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on
388 analytic principles.}

389
390 _kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of our a priori knowledge, our
391 faculties have nothing to do with our faculties. Pure reason (and we
392 can deduce that this is true) would thereby be made to contradict the
393 phenomena. As we have already seen, let us suppose that the
394 transcendental aesthetic can thereby determine in its totality the
395 objects in space and time. We can deduce that, that is to say, our
396 experience is a representation of the paralogsms, and our
397 hypothetical judgements constitute the whole content of our concepts.
398 However, it is obvious that time can be treated like our a priori
399 knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Philosophy has nothing to do
400 with natural causes.}

401
402 _kgl_newpara:n {By means of analysis, our faculties stand in need to,
403 indeed, the empirical objects in space and time. The objects in space
404 and time, for these reasons, have nothing to do with our
405 understanding. There can be no doubt that the noumena can not take
406 account of the objects in space and time; consequently, the Ideal of
407 natural reason has lying before it the noumena. By means of analysis,
408 the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to, therefore,
409 space, yet our sense perceptions exist in the discipline of practical
410 reason.}

411
412 _kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal can not take account of, so far as I know,
413 our faculties. As we have already seen, the objects in space and time
414 are what first give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of
415 empirical conditions; for these reasons, our a posteriori concepts
416 have nothing to do with the paralogsms of pure reason. As we have
417 already seen, metaphysics, by means of the Ideal, occupies part of the
418 sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the objects in
419 space and time in general, yet time excludes the possibility of our
420 sense perceptions. I assert, thus, that our faculties would thereby
421 be made to contradict, indeed, our knowledge. Natural causes, so

422 regarded, exist in our judgements.}

423

424 _kgl_newpara:n {The never-ending regress in the series of empirical
425 conditions may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it
426 may be in contradictions with, then, applied logic. The employment of
427 the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our
428 understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It
429 must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case
430 of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is
431 a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
432 posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes
433 the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be
434 shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe
435 that the things in themselves, in view of these considerations, can be
436 treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical
437 sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense
438 perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the
439 sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental
440 objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological
441 manuals.}

442

443 _kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, in the case
444 of philosophy, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must
445 be known a posteriori. Thus, the objects in space and time, insomuch
446 as the discipline of practical reason relies on the Antinomies,
447 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must
448 be known a priori. Applied logic is a representation of, in natural
449 theology, our experience. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
450 Hume tells us that, that is to say, the Categories (and Aristotle
451 tells us that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the
452 transcendental aesthetic. (Because of our necessary ignorance of the
453 conditions, the paralogisms prove the validity of time.) As is shown
454 in the writings of Hume, it must not be supposed that, in reference to
455 ends, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must
456 be known a priori. By means of analysis, it is not at all certain
457 that our a priori knowledge is just as necessary as our ideas. In my
458 present remarks I am referring to time only in so far as it is founded
459 on disjunctive principles.}

460

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

476
477 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves have lying before them the
478 Antinomies, by virtue of human reason. By means of the transcendental
479 aesthetic, let us suppose that the discipline of natural reason
480 depends on natural causes, because of the relation between the
481 transcendental aesthetic and the things in themselves. In view of
482 these considerations, it is obvious that natural causes are the clue
483 to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception, by means
484 of analysis. We can deduce that our faculties, in particular, can be
485 treated like the thing in itself; in the study of metaphysics, the
486 thing in itself proves the validity of space. And can I entertain the
487 Transcendental Deduction in thought, or does it present itself to me?
488 By means of analysis, the phenomena can not take account of natural
489 causes. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}
490

491 _kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the things in themselves are a
492 posteriori, there can be no doubt that, when thus treated as our
493 understanding, pure reason depends on, still, the Ideal of natural
494 reason, and our speculative judgements constitute a body of
495 demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
496 posteriori. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, it is not at
497 all certain that, in accordance with the principles of natural causes,
498 the Transcendental Deduction is a body of demonstrated science, and
499 all of it must be known a posteriori, yet our concepts are the clue to
500 the discovery of the objects in space and time. Therefore, it is
501 obvious that formal logic would be falsified. By means of analytic
502 unity, it remains a mystery why, in particular, metaphysics teaches us
503 nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal. The phenomena,
504 on the other hand, would thereby be made to contradict the
505 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As is
506 shown in the writings of Aristotle, philosophy is a representation of,
507 on the contrary, the employment of the Categories. Because of the
508 relation between the transcendental unity of apperception and the
509 paralogisms of natural reason, the paralogisms of human reason, in the
510 study of the Transcendental Deduction, would be falsified, but
511 metaphysics abstracts from all content of knowledge.}
512

513 _kgl_newpara:n {Since some of natural causes are disjunctive, the
514 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is the key
515 to understanding, in particular, the noumena. By means of analysis,
516 the Categories (and it is not at all certain that this is the case)
517 exclude the possibility of our faculties. Let us suppose that the
518 objects in space and time, irrespective of all empirical conditions,
519 exist in the architectonic of natural reason, because of the relation
520 between the architectonic of natural reason and our a posteriori
521 concepts. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that, so regarded, our
522 sense perceptions (and let us suppose that this is the case) are a
523 representation of the practical employment of natural causes. (I
524 assert that time constitutes the whole content for, in all theoretical
525 sciences, our understanding, as will easily be shown in the next
526 section.) With the sole exception of our knowledge, the reader should
527 be careful to observe that natural causes (and it remains a mystery
528 why this is the case) can not take account of our sense perceptions,
529 as will easily be shown in the next section. Certainly, natural

530 causes would thereby be made to contradict, with the sole exception of
531 necessity, the things in themselves, because of our necessary
532 ignorance of the conditions. But to this matter no answer is
533 possible.}

534

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

550

551 _kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, what we have alone been able to
552 show is that the architectonic of practical reason is the clue to the
553 discovery of, still, the manifold, by means of analysis. Since
554 knowledge of the objects in space and time is a priori, the things in
555 themselves have lying before them, for example, the paralogisms of
556 human reason. Let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute
557 the whole content of, by means of philosophy, necessity. Our concepts
558 (and the reader should be careful to observe that this is the case)
559 are just as necessary as the Ideal. To avoid all misapprehension, it
560 is necessary to explain that the Categories occupy part of the sphere
561 of the discipline of human reason concerning the existence of our
562 faculties in general. The transcendental aesthetic, in so far as this
563 expounds the contradictory rules of our a priori concepts, is the mere
564 result of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable
565 function of the soul. The manifold, in respect of the intelligible
566 character, teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the
567 thing in itself; however, the objects in space and time exist in
568 natural causes.}

569

570 _kgl_newpara:n {I assert, however, that our a posteriori concepts (and
571 it is obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to
572 contradict the discipline of practical reason; however, the things in
573 themselves, however, constitute the whole content of philosophy. As
574 will easily be shown in the next section, the Antinomies would thereby
575 be made to contradict our understanding; in all theoretical sciences,
576 metaphysics, irrespective of all empirical conditions, excludes the
577 possibility of space. It is not at all certain that necessity (and it
578 is obvious that this is true) constitutes the whole content for the
579 objects in space and time; consequently, the paralogisms of practical
580 reason, however, exist in the Antinomies. The reader should be
581 careful to observe that transcendental logic, in so far as this
582 expounds the universal rules of formal logic, can never furnish a true
583 and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it may not

584 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
585 contradictions with disjunctive principles. (Because of our necessary
586 ignorance of the conditions, the thing in itself is what first gives
587 rise to, insomuch as the transcendental aesthetic relies on the
588 objects in space and time, the transcendental objects in space and
589 time; thus, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
590 conditions excludes the possibility of philosophy.) As we have
591 already seen, time depends on the objects in space and time; in the
592 study of the architectonic of pure reason, the phenomena are the clue
593 to the discovery of our understanding. Because of our necessary
594 ignorance of the conditions, I assert that, indeed, the architectonic
595 of natural reason, as I have elsewhere shown, would be falsified.}

596
597 _kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, the transcendental unity of
598 apperception has nothing to do with the Antinomies. As will easily be
599 shown in the next section, our sense perceptions are by their very
600 nature contradictory, but our ideas, with the sole exception of human
601 reason, have nothing to do with our sense perceptions. Metaphysics is
602 the key to understanding natural causes, by means of analysis. It is
603 not at all certain that the paralogisms of human reason prove the
604 validity of, thus, the noumena, since all of our a posteriori
605 judgements are a priori. We can deduce that, indeed, the objects in
606 space and time can not take account of the Transcendental Deduction,
607 but our knowledge, on the other hand, would be falsified.}

608
609 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, our understanding is the clue
610 to the discovery of necessity. On the other hand, the Ideal of pure
611 reason is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known
612 a posteriori, as is evident upon close examination. It is obvious
613 that the transcendental aesthetic, certainly, is a body of
614 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori; in view
615 of these considerations, the noumena are the clue to the discovery of,
616 so far as I know, natural causes. In the case of space, our
617 experience depends on the Ideal of natural reason, as we have already
618 seen.}

619
620 _kgl_newpara:n {For these reasons, space is the key to understanding
621 the thing in itself. Our sense perceptions abstract from all content
622 of a priori knowledge, but the phenomena can never, as a whole,
623 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they are
624 just as necessary as disjunctive principles. Our problematic
625 judgements constitute the whole content of time. By means of
626 analysis, our ideas are by their very nature contradictory, and our a
627 posteriori concepts are a representation of natural causes. I assert
628 that the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
629 contradict, so far as regards the thing in itself, the Transcendental
630 Deduction; in natural theology, the noumena are the clue to the
631 discovery of, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction.}

632
633 _kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
634 explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the
635 transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet
636 the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental
637 Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would

638 thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our
639 ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the
640 validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings
641 of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that,
642 insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories,
643 the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to
644 contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
645 conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our
646 faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the
647 writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands
648 in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.}

649
650 _kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the
651 case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural
652 theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
653 content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural
654 theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the
655 Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this
656 relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts
657 would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in
658 the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory.
659 Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a
660 representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words,
661 has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us
662 that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the
663 Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.}

664
665 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves can not take account of the
666 Transcendental Deduction. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious
667 that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical
668 sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the
669 transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these
670 terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense
671 perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some
672 of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the
673 possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in
674 themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles
675 of philosophy, our sense perceptions.}

676
677 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, philosophy is
678 the mere result of the power of pure logic, a blind but indispensable
679 function of the soul; however, the phenomena can never, as a whole,
680 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like general logic,
681 they exclude the possibility of problematic principles. To avoid all
682 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the never-ending
683 regress in the series of empirical conditions is by its very nature
684 contradictory. It must not be supposed that our a priori concepts
685 stand in need to natural causes, because of the relation between the
686 Ideal and our ideas. (We can deduce that the Antinomies would be
687 falsified.) Since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori, what
688 we have alone been able to show is that, in the full sense of these
689 terms, necessity (and we can deduce that this is true) is the key to
690 understanding time, but the Ideal of natural reason is just as
691 necessary as our experience. As will easily be shown in the next

692 section, the thing in itself, with the sole exception of the manifold,
693 abstracts from all content of a posteriori knowledge. The question of
694 this matter's relation to objects is not in any way under discussion.}

695
696 _kgl_newpara:n {By means of the transcendental aesthetic, it remains a
697 mystery why the phenomena (and it is not at all certain that this is
698 the case) are the clue to the discovery of the never-ending regress in
699 the series of empirical conditions. In all theoretical sciences,
700 metaphysics exists in the objects in space and time, because of the
701 relation between formal logic and our synthetic judgements. The
702 Categories would thereby be made to contradict the paralogisms, as any
703 dedicated reader can clearly see. Therefore, there can be no doubt
704 that the paralogisms have nothing to do with, so far as regards the
705 Ideal and our faculties, the paralogisms, because of our necessary
706 ignorance of the conditions. It must not be supposed that the objects
707 in space and time occupy part of the sphere of necessity concerning
708 the existence of the noumena in general. In natural theology, the
709 things in themselves, therefore, are by their very nature
710 contradictory, by virtue of natural reason. This is the sense in
711 which it is to be understood in this work.}

712
713 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose
714 that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts
715 are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to
716 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in
717 particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of
718 natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful
719 to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in
720 space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our
721 understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the
722 thing in itself abstracts from all content of a posteriori knowledge.
723 We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can
724 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal
725 of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality
726 speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as
727 necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the
728 Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove
729 the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to
730 understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

731
732 _kgl_newpara:n {Natural causes, when thus treated as the things in
733 themselves, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge, by
734 means of analytic unity. Our a posteriori knowledge, in other words,
735 is the key to understanding the Antinomies. As we have already seen,
736 what we have alone been able to show is that, so far as I know, the
737 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the
738 manifold. The things in themselves are the clue to the discovery of,
739 in the case of the Ideal of natural reason, our concepts. To avoid
740 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, so far as
741 regards philosophy, the discipline of human reason, for these reasons,
742 is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
743 priori, but our faculties, consequently, would thereby be made to
744 contradict the Antinomies. It remains a mystery why our understanding
745 excludes the possibility of, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the

746 objects in space and time, our concepts. It is not at all certain
747 that the pure employment of the objects in space and time (and the
748 reader should be careful to observe that this is true) is the clue to
749 the discovery of the architectonic of pure reason. Let us suppose
750 that natural reason is a representation of, insomuch as space relies
751 on the paralogisms, the Transcendental Deduction, by means of
752 analysis.}

753

754 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, the Ideal constitutes the
755 whole content for the transcendental unity of apperception. By means
756 of analytic unity, let us suppose that, when thus treated as space,
757 our synthetic judgements, therefore, would be falsified, and the
758 objects in space and time are what first give rise to our sense
759 perceptions. Let us suppose that, in the full sense of these terms,
760 the discipline of practical reason can not take account of our
761 experience, and our ideas have lying before them our inductive
762 judgements. (Since all of the phenomena are speculative, to avoid all
763 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena
764 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must
765 be known a posteriori; as I have elsewhere shown, the noumena are a
766 representation of the noumena.) Let us suppose that practical reason
767 can thereby determine in its totality, by means of the Ideal, the pure
768 employment of the discipline of practical reason. Galileo tells us
769 that the employment of the phenomena can be treated like our ideas;
770 still, the Categories, when thus treated as the paralogisms, exist in
771 the employment of the Antinomies. Let us apply this to our
772 experience.}

773

774 _kgl_newpara:n {I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason
775 can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the
776 Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our
777 ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader
778 can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account
779 of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and the
780 noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should
781 only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in
782 natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown
783 in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these
784 reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is
785 that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories,
786 are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a
787 blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the
788 ontological manuals.}

789

790 _kgl_newpara:n {The noumena have nothing to do with, thus, the
791 Antinomies. What we have alone been able to show is that the things
792 in themselves constitute the whole content of human reason, as is
793 proven in the ontological manuals. The noumena (and to avoid all
794 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
795 the clue to the discovery of the architectonic of natural reason. As
796 we have already seen, let us suppose that our experience is what first
797 gives rise to, therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception; in
798 the study of the practical employment of the Antinomies, our
799 ampliative judgements are what first give rise to the objects in space

800 and time. Necessity can never furnish a true and demonstrated
801 science, because, like our understanding, it can thereby determine in
802 its totality hypothetical principles, and the empirical objects in
803 space and time are what first give rise to, in all theoretical
804 sciences, our a posteriori concepts.}

805

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

821

822 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between space and the noumena,
823 our experience is by its very nature contradictory. It is obvious
824 that natural causes constitute the whole content of the transcendental
825 unity of apperception, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. By
826 virtue of pure reason, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical
827 sciences, have lying before them human reason. In view of these
828 considerations, let us suppose that the transcendental objects in
829 space and time, in the study of the architectonic of practical reason,
830 exclude the possibility of the objects in space and time, because of
831 our necessary ignorance of the conditions. By means of philosophy, is
832 it true that formal logic can not take account of the manifold, or is
833 the real question whether our sense perceptions are the mere results
834 of the power of the transcendental aesthetic, a blind but
835 indispensable function of the soul? The objects in space and time are
836 just as necessary as the Antinomies, because of the relation between
837 metaphysics and the things in themselves. Human reason is a
838 representation of the transcendental aesthetic. In my present remarks
839 I am referring to the pure employment of our disjunctive judgements
840 only in so far as it is founded on inductive principles.}

841

842 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that our sense
843 perceptions are the clue to the discovery of our understanding; in
844 natural theology, necessity, in all theoretical sciences, occupies
845 part of the sphere of the transcendental unity of apperception
846 concerning the existence of our faculties in general. The
847 transcendental aesthetic is what first gives rise to the never-ending
848 regress in the series of empirical conditions, as any dedicated reader
849 can clearly see. The transcendental unity of apperception is what
850 first gives rise to, in all theoretical sciences, the Antinomies. The
851 phenomena, consequently, stand in need to the things in themselves.
852 By means of analytic unity, necessity, on the contrary, abstracts from
853 all content of a priori knowledge. The phenomena (and it remains a

854 mystery why this is the case) are just as necessary as the Ideal of
855 human reason.}

856
857 _kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our
858 experience is the clue to the discovery of philosophy; in the study of
859 space, the Categories are what first give rise to the transcendental
860 aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the reader should
861 be careful to observe that, so regarded, the never-ending regress in
862 the series of empirical conditions, as I have elsewhere shown, is the
863 mere result of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception,
864 a blind but indispensable function of the soul, but our judgements can
865 be treated like time. We can deduce that the objects in space and
866 time are just as necessary as the objects in space and time.
867 Aristotle tells us that, even as this relates to time, the objects in
868 space and time, however, abstract from all content of a posteriori
869 knowledge. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
870 that the phenomena (and it is not at all certain that this is the
871 case) stand in need to the discipline of practical reason; thus, our
872 knowledge, indeed, can not take account of our ideas.}

873
874 _kgl_newpara:n {In the study of time, our concepts prove the validity
875 of, as I have elsewhere shown, our understanding, as any dedicated
876 reader can clearly see. As will easily be shown in the next section,
877 the reader should be careful to observe that, so far as regards our
878 knowledge, natural causes, so far as regards the never-ending regress
879 in the series of empirical conditions and our a priori judgements,
880 should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the
881 Transcendental Deduction, and our understanding can not take account
882 of formal logic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, to avoid
883 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the Antinomies
884 are just as necessary as, on the other hand, our ideas; however, the
885 Ideal, in the full sense of these terms, exists in the architectonic
886 of human reason. As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all
887 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in other words, our
888 faculties have nothing to do with the manifold, but our faculties
889 should only be used as a canon for space. Our faculties prove the
890 validity of the Antinomies, and the things in themselves (and let us
891 suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of our
892 ideas. It remains a mystery why, then, the architectonic of practical
893 reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.}

894
895 _kgl_newpara:n {The paralogisms of practical reason can be treated
896 like the paralogisms. The objects in space and time, therefore, are
897 what first give rise to the discipline of human reason; in all
898 theoretical sciences, the things in themselves (and we can deduce that
899 this is the case) have nothing to do with metaphysics. Therefore,
900 Aristotle tells us that our understanding exists in the Ideal of human
901 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Thus, our sense
902 perceptions (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) would
903 thereby be made to contradict space. I assert, on the other hand,
904 that, in reference to ends, the objects in space and time can not take
905 account of the Categories, yet natural causes are the mere results of
906 the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable
907 function of the soul. By virtue of practical reason, it must not be

908 supposed that, that is to say, our faculties would thereby be made to
909 contradict philosophy, yet our a posteriori concepts, insomuch as the
910 Ideal of pure reason relies on the intelligible objects in space and
911 time, are by their very nature contradictory.}

912

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

931

932 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that our a
933 posteriori concepts (and it is obvious that this is the case) are what
934 first give rise to the transcendental unity of apperception. In the
935 case of necessity, the reader should be careful to observe that
936 metaphysics is a representation of natural causes, by means of
937 analysis. In all theoretical sciences, the phenomena (and the reader
938 should be careful to observe that this is the case) would thereby be
939 made to contradict natural reason. The transcendental aesthetic, in
940 the case of space, is by its very nature contradictory. By virtue of
941 human reason, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
942 that the empirical objects in space and time exist in our judgements;
943 for these reasons, the Antinomies, by means of our experience, can be
944 treated like the architectonic of human reason. It must not be
945 supposed that our ideas have lying before them metaphysics;
946 consequently, the architectonic of pure reason, in all theoretical
947 sciences, would be falsified.}

948

949 _kgl_newpara:n {The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the
950 Ideal of pure reason, and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their
951 very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying
952 before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception,
953 indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic
954 of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon
955 close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume
956 tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated
957 as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of
958 knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand
959 in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity,
960 natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics,
961 and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a

962 priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.}

963

964 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
965 what we have alone been able to show is that formal logic can not take
966 account of the Categories; in the study of the transcendental
967 aesthetic, philosophy can thereby determine in its totality the
968 noumena. In all theoretical sciences, I assert that necessity has
969 nothing to do with our sense perceptions. Because of the relation
970 between our understanding and the phenomena, the Categories are what
971 first give rise to, so far as regards time and the phenomena, the
972 transcendental aesthetic; in view of these considerations, the
973 phenomena can not take account of the Antinomies. As is proven in the
974 ontological manuals, the objects in space and time (and to avoid all
975 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
976 what first give rise to the Ideal. In natural theology, let us
977 suppose that the Transcendental Deduction is the key to understanding,
978 so far as regards the thing in itself, the Ideal, as any dedicated
979 reader can clearly see. This is the sense in which it is to be
980 understood in this work.}

981

982 _kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, in respect of the
983 intelligible character, the Antinomies (and we can deduce that this is
984 the case) constitute the whole content of the phenomena, yet the
985 Categories exist in natural causes. The Ideal of natural reason, when
986 thus treated as metaphysics, can be treated like our faculties;
987 consequently, pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is
988 true) is what first gives rise to our sense perceptions. The
989 paralogisms of practical reason exist in the objects in space and
990 time. As we have already seen, our sense perceptions stand in need to
991 space. Still, our a priori concepts, in the case of metaphysics, have
992 nothing to do with the Categories. Because of the relation between
993 the discipline of practical reason and our a posteriori concepts, we
994 can deduce that, when thus treated as the phenomena, our sense
995 perceptions (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) are what
996 first give rise to the discipline of practical reason.}

997

998 _kgl_newpara:n {Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the
999 noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our
1000 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense
1001 perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural
1002 reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery
1003 why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus
1004 treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
1005 demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as
1006 necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be
1007 falsified. The noumena, in all theoretical sciences, can not take
1008 account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since
1009 knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all
1010 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms
1011 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must
1012 be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can
1013 not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of
1014 apperception.}

1015

1016 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that, for
1017 example, pure logic depends on the transcendental unity of
1018 apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our a priori
1019 concepts are what first give rise to the Categories. Hume tells us
1020 that our ideas are just as necessary as, on the other hand, natural
1021 causes; however, natural causes should only be used as a canon for our
1022 faculties. For these reasons, to avoid all misapprehension, it is
1023 necessary to explain that our ideas are the clue to the discovery of
1024 our understanding, as is shown in the writings of Hume. (By virtue of
1025 natural reason, the employment of our disjunctive judgements, then, is
1026 by its very nature contradictory.) By virtue of natural reason, the
1027 Categories can not take account of our hypothetical judgements. The
1028 transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
1029 content of, consequently, the transcendental unity of apperception, as
1030 will easily be shown in the next section. We thus have a pure
1031 synthesis of apprehension.}

1032
1033 _kgl_newpara:n {The Antinomies have nothing to do with our faculties.
1034 As is shown in the writings of Hume, we can deduce that, on the
1035 contrary, the empirical objects in space and time prove the validity
1036 of our ideas. The manifold may not contradict itself, but it is still
1037 possible that it may be in contradictions with our a posteriori
1038 concepts. For these reasons, the transcendental objects in space and
1039 time (and it is obvious that this is the case) have nothing to do with
1040 our faculties, as will easily be shown in the next section. What we
1041 have alone been able to show is that the phenomena constitute the
1042 whole content of the Antinomies; with the sole exception of
1043 philosophy, the Categories have lying before them formal logic. Since
1044 knowledge of the Antinomies is a posteriori, it remains a mystery why
1045 the Antinomies (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) prove
1046 the validity of the thing in itself; for these reasons, metaphysics is
1047 the mere result of the power of the employment of our sense
1048 perceptions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. As I
1049 have elsewhere shown, philosophy proves the validity of our sense
1050 perceptions.}

1051
1052 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
1053 phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our
1054 concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo
1055 tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to
1056 contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our
1057 judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to
1058 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
1059 in space and time exclude the possibility of, insomuch as pure logic
1060 relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of
1061 apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been
1062 suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the
1063 reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection
1064 between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it remains a
1065 mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated
1066 science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be
1067 shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us
1068 suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because
1069 of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of

1070 empirical conditions and the paralogsms. This distinction must have
1071 some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of
1072 empirical conditions.}

1073
1074 _kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1075 explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human
1076 reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to
1077 do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge
1078 and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our
1079 experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural
1080 causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of
1081 our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what
1082 first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena
1083 have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close
1084 examination. The paralogsms of natural reason are a representation
1085 of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise
1086 to the paralogsms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of
1087 Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.}

1088
1089 _kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that the Ideal of practical reason, even
1090 as this relates to our knowledge, is a representation of the
1091 discipline of human reason. The things in themselves are just as
1092 necessary as our understanding. The noumena prove the validity of the
1093 manifold. As will easily be shown in the next section, natural causes
1094 occupy part of the sphere of our a priori knowledge concerning the
1095 existence of the Antinomies in general. The Categories are the clue
1096 to the discovery of, consequently, the Transcendental Deduction. Our
1097 ideas are the mere results of the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a
1098 blind but indispensable function of the soul. The divisions are thus
1099 provided; all that is required is to fill them.}

1100
1101 _kgl_newpara:n {The never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1102 conditions can be treated like the objects in space and time. What we
1103 have alone been able to show is that, then, the transcendental
1104 aesthetic, in reference to ends, would thereby be made to contradict
1105 the Transcendental Deduction. The architectonic of practical reason
1106 has nothing to do with our ideas; however, time can never furnish a
1107 true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it depends on
1108 hypothetical principles. Space has nothing to do with the Antinomies,
1109 because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. In all
1110 theoretical sciences, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1111 explain that the things in themselves are a representation of, in
1112 other words, necessity, as is evident upon close examination.}

1113
1114 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a
1115 mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the
1116 discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
1117 soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself
1118 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of
1119 natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no
1120 doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the
1121 Antinomies. I assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the
1122 noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our
1123 a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our

1124 ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the
1125 architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to
1126 observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts
1127 are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic
1128 unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory
1129 rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the
1130 power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and
1131 the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of,
1132 however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to
1133 the thing in itself.}

1134
1135 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, we can deduce
1136 that the transcendental unity of apperception depends on the Ideal of
1137 practical reason. Certainly, it is obvious that the Antinomies, in
1138 accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time,
1139 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must
1140 be known a posteriori. Because of the relation between the discipline
1141 of pure reason and our a posteriori concepts, I assert that, for
1142 example, metaphysics, consequently, is by its very nature
1143 contradictory, yet the transcendental aesthetic is the key to
1144 understanding our understanding. By virtue of natural reason, the
1145 objects in space and time are what first give rise to, when thus
1146 treated as the paralogisms of human reason, the things in themselves,
1147 but the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions can
1148 not take account of the architectonic of human reason. What we have
1149 alone been able to show is that natural causes, irrespective of all
1150 empirical conditions, exist in the objects in space and time, as is
1151 shown in the writings of Hume. By virtue of practical reason, our
1152 sense perceptions are what first give rise to, irrespective of all
1153 empirical conditions, necessity. Our sense perceptions, in the study
1154 of necessity, would thereby be made to contradict transcendental
1155 logic; consequently, natural reason stands in need of the objects in
1156 space and time. There can be no doubt that, in other words, the
1157 paralogisms of natural reason have nothing to do with the thing in
1158 itself, but the paralogisms prove the validity of transcendental
1159 logic.}

1160
1161 _kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as
1162 necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in
1163 space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do
1164 with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the
1165 noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of
1166 the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1167 Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in
1168 themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
1169 transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the
1170 phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions,
1171 yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
1172 demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole
1173 content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense
1174 perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with
1175 the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility
1176 of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is
1177 still possible that it may be in contradictions with, thus, our sense

1178 perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
1179 that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all
1180 empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.}

1181

1182 _kgl_newpara:n {It remains a mystery why our sense perceptions prove
1183 the validity of our a priori concepts. The objects in space and time,
1184 then, exist in metaphysics; therefore, the things in themselves can
1185 not take account of the transcendental aesthetic. The Ideal of pure
1186 reason can thereby determine in its totality, that is to say, our
1187 ideas, and space constitutes the whole content for the discipline of
1188 human reason. The paralogisms of pure reason are just as necessary
1189 as, in all theoretical sciences, our knowledge. The things in
1190 themselves constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of
1191 this body must be known a posteriori.}

1192

1193 _kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, the
1194 Transcendental Deduction exists in the Ideal. To avoid all
1195 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that pure reason (and it
1196 is obvious that this is true) is the key to understanding the
1197 transcendental unity of apperception. The reader should be careful to
1198 observe that our experience depends on necessity. It is obvious that
1199 space, thus, can be treated like the objects in space and time,
1200 because of the relation between the transcendental unity of
1201 apperception and the objects in space and time. It must not be
1202 supposed that, even as this relates to natural reason, the Antinomies
1203 (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) exclude the
1204 possibility of the empirical objects in space and time, yet philosophy
1205 proves the validity of practical reason. The things in themselves, on
1206 the contrary, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge; in
1207 all theoretical sciences, the noumena (and there can be no doubt that
1208 this is the case) are just as necessary as the Antinomies. As is
1209 shown in the writings of Galileo, I assert, in natural theology, that
1210 the transcendental aesthetic, thus, exists in our faculties. Our
1211 faculties are just as necessary as the Categories, yet the manifold
1212 has lying before it, certainly, our understanding.}

1213

1214 _kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the never-ending regress in the
1215 series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it is
1216 still possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic
1217 of practical reason. The objects in space and time, so regarded,
1218 should only be used as a canon for the architectonic of human reason,
1219 as is proven in the ontological manuals. In all theoretical sciences,
1220 the Antinomies can not take account of our concepts, because of our
1221 necessary ignorance of the conditions. By means of analysis, the
1222 things in themselves are a representation of our experience; for these
1223 reasons, the paralogisms of practical reason have lying before them
1224 our inductive judgements. Still, the architectonic of pure reason is
1225 just as necessary as the never-ending regress in the series of
1226 empirical conditions.}

1227

1228 _kgl_newpara:n {Thus, transcendental logic (and I assert, for these
1229 reasons, that this is true) depends on the Antinomies. Still, general
1230 logic (and it remains a mystery why this is true) is what first gives
1231 rise to the objects in space and time, because of the relation between

1232 metaphysics and the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next
1233 section, the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
1234 and some of this body must be known a priori. On the other hand, the
1235 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in the
1236 case of the Transcendental Deduction, exists in the noumena, as is
1237 proven in the ontological manuals. By means of analytic unity, it
1238 remains a mystery why our judgements are by their very nature
1239 contradictory; however, the objects in space and time exclude the
1240 possibility of the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly
1241 see, the Antinomies would thereby be made to contradict the
1242 transcendental aesthetic; in natural theology, our faculties
1243 constitute the whole content of, for these reasons, the noumena.
1244 However, the objects in space and time are what first give rise to our
1245 understanding, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.}

1246
1247 _kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the Antinomies have nothing to do
1248 with pure reason, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1249 conditions. Our speculative judgements are what first give rise to
1250 the Categories. Time is the key to understanding natural causes, as
1251 is evident upon close examination. Galileo tells us that the objects
1252 in space and time, irrespective of all empirical conditions, should
1253 only be used as a canon for our sense perceptions, since knowledge of
1254 the noumena is a priori. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction
1255 depends on our concepts. By means of analytic unity, our sense
1256 perceptions constitute the whole content of the manifold. In natural
1257 theology, the discipline of natural reason, on the other hand, would
1258 be falsified, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

1259
1260 _kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the discipline of human reason, it is
1261 obvious that the phenomena, still, are the mere results of the power
1262 of the practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind
1263 but indispensable function of the soul, by means of analysis. As any
1264 dedicated reader can clearly see, Aristotle tells us that natural
1265 causes constitute the whole content of, as I have elsewhere shown, the
1266 pure employment of the paralogisms. Aristotle tells us that,
1267 irrespective of all empirical conditions, the thing in itself, indeed,
1268 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1269 architectonic of practical reason, it has lying before it analytic
1270 principles, yet the Categories have nothing to do with the objects in
1271 space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
1272 human reason is just as necessary as our concepts, yet the practical
1273 employment of the paralogisms is the mere result of the power of
1274 metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For
1275 these reasons, Hume tells us that natural causes have nothing to do
1276 with the transcendental unity of apperception, by means of analytic
1277 unity. The Antinomies can not take account of the Antinomies, because
1278 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. I assert, in all
1279 theoretical sciences, that, that is to say, natural causes would
1280 thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, the Ideal of natural
1281 reason. Hume tells us that our ideas abstract from all content of a
1282 posteriori knowledge, as is evident upon close examination.}

1283
1284 _kgl_newpara:n {The manifold is a representation of the phenomena.
1285 Our judgements constitute the whole content of, on the other hand, the

1286 things in themselves, as will easily be shown in the next section. By
1287 means of analytic unity, the phenomena, in the full sense of these
1288 terms, should only be used as a canon for the Ideal of human reason.
1289 It is obvious that, so far as regards metaphysics and our judgements,
1290 pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is the key
1291 to understanding time. In the study of formal logic, the paralogisms
1292 of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.}

1293
1294 _kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that the never-ending regress in
1295 the series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it
1296 is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, indeed, our
1297 sense perceptions. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
1298 architectonic of practical reason proves the validity of, in all
1299 theoretical sciences, metaphysics; in view of these considerations,
1300 our knowledge depends on our faculties. Since knowledge of our sense
1301 perceptions is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary
1302 to explain that natural reason is what first gives rise to our
1303 faculties. There can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these
1304 terms, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the Transcendental
1305 Deduction. (In view of these considerations, the empirical objects in
1306 space and time are by their very nature contradictory.) It is obvious
1307 that the objects in space and time can not take account of the
1308 transcendental objects in space and time, as is proven in the
1309 ontological manuals. As is evident upon close examination, what we
1310 have alone been able to show is that the objects in space and time are
1311 the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
1312 function of the soul. The divisions are thus provided; all that is
1313 required is to fill them.}

1314
1315 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, the Antinomies are a
1316 representation of the Categories. Necessity stands in need of the
1317 Antinomies. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies have lying
1318 before them the Ideal of pure reason; on the other hand, the
1319 Antinomies have nothing to do with natural causes. As I have
1320 elsewhere shown, the reader should be careful to observe that the
1321 things in themselves would thereby be made to contradict, in so far as
1322 this expounds the universal rules of our faculties, our ideas. I
1323 assert that, in so far as this expounds the necessary rules of human
1324 reason, our concepts (and we can deduce that this is the case) prove
1325 the validity of space, but our sense perceptions, so far as regards
1326 the transcendental unity of apperception, can never, as a whole,
1327 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1328 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they have
1329 nothing to do with disjunctive principles. But we have fallen short
1330 of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of
1331 necessity.}

1332
1333 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
1334 abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently,
1335 the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of
1336 the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories
1337 in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute
1338 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
1339 posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be

1340 treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for
1341 example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but
1342 indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of
1343 Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not
1344 be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in
1345 view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the
1346 objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of
1347 the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our
1348 necessary ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the
1349 manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first
1350 gives rise to space.}

1351
1352 _kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, our experience
1353 occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal concerning the existence of
1354 the objects in space and time in general, as will easily be shown in
1355 the next section. It must not be supposed that our ideas (and it
1356 remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of the
1357 intelligible objects in space and time. Consequently, the
1358 Transcendental Deduction can thereby determine in its totality, in
1359 other words, our ideas, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1360 conditions. (In natural theology, our concepts abstract from all
1361 content of a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological
1362 manuals.) I assert, in the case of the manifold, that human reason is
1363 a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
1364 posteriori, by virtue of human reason. As is proven in the
1365 ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the thing in itself, so
1366 far as I know, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
1367 because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as
1368 necessary as a priori principles.}

1369
1370 _kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1371 explain that philosophy can not take account of our sense perceptions;
1372 in the study of the discipline of natural reason, our experience, in
1373 the study of the architectonic of practical reason, is the mere result
1374 of the power of pure logic, a blind but indispensable function of the
1375 soul. As is evident upon close examination, the noumena are what
1376 first give rise to, on the contrary, the phenomena, but natural
1377 reason, that is to say, excludes the possibility of our hypothetical
1378 judgements. The objects in space and time are the clue to the
1379 discovery of the thing in itself, because of our necessary ignorance
1380 of the conditions. Therefore, there can be no doubt that the
1381 architectonic of practical reason depends on the Antinomies, because
1382 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Human reason (and there
1383 can be no doubt that this is true) depends on our understanding, but
1384 the Ideal can thereby determine in its totality metaphysics.}

1385
1386 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
1387 posteriori, general logic, in respect of the intelligible character,
1388 is by its very nature contradictory. By means of analytic unity, it
1389 is not at all certain that space, inasmuch as our understanding relies
1390 on our sense perceptions, would thereby be made to contradict the
1391 Ideal. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are just as
1392 necessary as, indeed, the thing in itself. The manifold, as I have
1393 elsewhere shown, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it

1394 must be known a priori. There can be no doubt that, in particular,
1395 the phenomena are a representation of pure logic, yet our sense
1396 perceptions have lying before them our sense perceptions. I assert,
1397 as I have elsewhere shown, that, indeed, our experience (and let us
1398 suppose that this is true) excludes the possibility of the objects in
1399 space and time, and the discipline of human reason, in accordance with
1400 the principles of the transcendental unity of apperception, occupies
1401 part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of
1402 the phenomena in general.}

1403

1404 _kgl_newpara:n {Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true)
1405 proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid
1406 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the employment of
1407 the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The
1408 transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the
1409 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly,
1410 our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the
1411 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we
1412 have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and
1413 time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance
1414 with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending
1415 regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our
1416 ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the
1417 phenomena.}

1418

1419 _kgl_newpara:n {Necessity, as I have elsewhere shown, is the mere
1420 result of the power of the architectonic of practical reason, a blind
1421 but indispensable function of the soul. The paralogisms of pure
1422 reason are the clue to the discovery of the practical employment of
1423 the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the never-ending
1424 regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it the
1425 paralogisms of human reason; with the sole exception of the
1426 architectonic of pure reason, transcendental logic is just as
1427 necessary as, then, our judgements. What we have alone been able to
1428 show is that our synthetic judgements have lying before them, when
1429 thus treated as space, our knowledge, by means of analysis. By virtue
1430 of natural reason, the transcendental aesthetic can be treated like
1431 general logic, yet the objects in space and time are just as necessary
1432 as the noumena. }

1433

1434 _kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, let us suppose that
1435 the Categories exclude the possibility of the never-ending regress in
1436 the series of empirical conditions. The manifold occupies part of the
1437 sphere of the thing in itself concerning the existence of the things
1438 in themselves in general, and formal logic, indeed, would be
1439 falsified. It is not at all certain that, in reference to ends, the
1440 discipline of practical reason, for example, occupies part of the
1441 sphere of the discipline of practical reason concerning the existence
1442 of our ampliative judgements in general, yet general logic is by its
1443 very nature contradictory. Since all of our judgements are a priori,
1444 there can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these terms, the
1445 phenomena can not take account of the transcendental objects in space
1446 and time. The architectonic of pure reason (and it is not at all
1447 certain that this is true) stands in need of the things in themselves.

1448 Philosophy is the key to understanding, thus, our sense perceptions.
1449 This is what chiefly concerns us.}

1450

1451 _kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding would thereby be made to contradict,
1452 so far as regards the Ideal, necessity. Our faculties, as I have
1453 elsewhere shown, are the mere results of the power of time, a blind
1454 but indispensable function of the soul. Time, with the sole exception
1455 of formal logic, would be falsified, but the Ideal can not take
1456 account of our sense perceptions. It is not at all certain that the
1457 Antinomies are what first give rise to our experience; thus, our a
1458 posteriori concepts are the clue to the discovery of, so regarded, the
1459 practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Natural causes
1460 occupy part of the sphere of practical reason concerning the existence
1461 of the paralogisms of pure reason in general; in view of these
1462 considerations, the noumena exclude the possibility of the employment
1463 of the objects in space and time. The manifold is what first gives
1464 rise to the paralogisms, but our judgements are the clue to the
1465 discovery of, in the study of the thing in itself, the discipline of
1466 practical reason.}

1467

1468 _kgl_newpara:n {Our a priori concepts, with the sole exception of our
1469 experience, have lying before them our judgements. It must not be
1470 supposed that the Antinomies are a representation of the discipline of
1471 human reason, by means of analytic unity. In the study of the
1472 transcendental aesthetic, the paralogisms constitute a body of
1473 demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
1474 posteriori. The Categories are the mere results of the power of the
1475 thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1476 Because of the relation between pure reason and the paralogisms of
1477 human reason, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
1478 that, indeed, the objects in space and time (and to avoid all
1479 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
1480 a representation of our concepts, yet the Ideal can be treated like
1481 our inductive judgements. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
1482 our understanding would thereby be made to contradict, thus, the
1483 Transcendental Deduction; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena
1484 abstract from all content of knowledge. The thing in itself excludes
1485 the possibility of philosophy; therefore, space, for example, teaches
1486 us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of metaphysics. We can
1487 deduce that the noumena (and it must not be supposed that this is the
1488 case) are a representation of the transcendental unity of
1489 apperception; with the sole exception of the thing in itself, our
1490 sense perceptions, as I have elsewhere shown, can never, as a whole,
1491 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1492 transcendental unity of apperception, they exclude the possibility of
1493 hypothetical principles.}

1494

1495 _kgl_newpara:n {Since none of our faculties are speculative, our ideas
1496 should only be used as a canon for time. With the sole exception of
1497 the manifold, our concepts exclude the possibility of the practical
1498 employment of metaphysics, by means of analysis. Aristotle tells us
1499 that necessity (and it is obvious that this is true) would thereby be
1500 made to contradict the thing in itself, because of our necessary
1501 ignorance of the conditions. As is proven in the ontological manuals,

1502 metaphysics (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby
1503 determine in its totality the Ideal. In the study of the
1504 transcendental unity of apperception, it is obvious that the phenomena
1505 have nothing to do with, therefore, natural causes, by means of
1506 analysis. Has it ever been suggested that it must not be supposed
1507 that there is no relation between the paralogisms of practical reason
1508 and the Antinomies? Time, indeed, is a representation of the
1509 Antinomies. The paralogisms of human reason are the clue to the
1510 discovery of natural causes, by means of analysis. Let us suppose
1511 that, in other words, the manifold, that is to say, abstracts from all
1512 content of knowledge.}

1513
1514 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle
1515 tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated
1516 like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding,
1517 our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The
1518 reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human
1519 reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the
1520 existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the
1521 validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude
1522 the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our
1523 a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series
1524 of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since
1525 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental
1526 aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
1527 like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with
1528 ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.}

1529
1530 _kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that the objects in space and
1531 time have nothing to do with our judgements. The architectonic of
1532 human reason has nothing to do with the noumena. What we have alone
1533 been able to show is that natural causes have nothing to do with,
1534 still, our a priori concepts, as we have already seen. As any
1535 dedicated reader can clearly see, it remains a mystery why, for
1536 example, our ideas, with the sole exception of the thing in itself,
1537 can not take account of the objects in space and time. It remains a
1538 mystery why our faculties are a representation of the transcendental
1539 aesthetic. Our ideas, in reference to ends, can never, as a whole,
1540 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the discipline
1541 of natural reason, they are a representation of synthetic principles.
1542 The transcendental unity of apperception is just as necessary as, in
1543 view of these considerations, our ampliative judgements; with the sole
1544 exception of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in itself (and it
1545 remains a mystery why this is true) is the clue to the discovery of
1546 our speculative judgements.}

1547
1548 _kgl_newpara:n {As I have elsewhere shown, the Ideal is a body of
1549 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori, as is
1550 evident upon close examination. Our ideas abstract from all content
1551 of knowledge, and the phenomena have nothing to do with, then,
1552 necessity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the empirical
1553 objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, in other words,
1554 our sense perceptions. It must not be supposed that, then, the
1555 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions stands in

1556 need of, certainly, the Ideal of natural reason, yet pure reason can
1557 not take account of the objects in space and time. The noumena, in
1558 all theoretical sciences, prove the validity of the practical
1559 employment of the manifold; in natural theology, the phenomena are
1560 just as necessary as the paralogisms. It is not at all certain that
1561 our concepts have lying before them our faculties, by means of
1562 analytic unity. It is not at all certain that the architectonic of
1563 practical reason, then, is what first gives rise to necessity; still,
1564 our concepts stand in need to the objects in space and time.}

1566 _kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are
1567 the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown
1568 in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the
1569 possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason
1570 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like
1571 philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic
1572 principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy,
1573 our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in
1574 natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still
1575 possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The
1576 thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.)
1577 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose
1578 that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the
1579 things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from
1580 all content of a priori knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole
1581 content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the
1582 necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the
1583 transcendental aesthetic. }

1585 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, when
1586 thus treated as the phenomena, the transcendental unity of
1587 apperception can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of human
1588 reason. There can be no doubt that natural causes can not take
1589 account of, certainly, the phenomena, since none of the paralogisms
1590 are hypothetical. We can deduce that the transcendental aesthetic is
1591 a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori.
1592 Hume tells us that, for example, our a posteriori knowledge
1593 constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, yet the
1594 discipline of pure reason, when thus treated as our understanding,
1595 constitutes the whole content for the empirical objects in space and
1596 time. The discipline of pure reason occupies part of the sphere of
1597 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
1598 concerning the existence of the things in themselves in general;
1599 consequently, the architectonic of natural reason (and what we have
1600 alone been able to show is that this is true) is the clue to the
1601 discovery of the objects in space and time.}

1603 _kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas
1604 would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects
1605 in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery
1606 why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the
1607 Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of
1608 empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not
1609 take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would

1610 thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in
1611 natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation
1612 of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our
1613 concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the
1614 Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to
1615 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
1616 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore,
1617 necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere
1618 of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
1619 intelligible objects in space and time in general.}

1620
1621 _kgl_newpara:n {Still, time is by its very nature contradictory. The
1622 paralogisms of practical reason constitute a body of demonstrated
1623 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; for these
1624 reasons, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the
1625 transcendental aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the
1626 soul. On the other hand, Aristotle tells us that our a posteriori
1627 concepts are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the transcendental
1628 unity of apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the
1629 discipline of pure reason can not take account of our faculties. It
1630 must not be supposed that the Ideal, in particular, can never furnish
1631 a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it is the clue to
1632 the discovery of problematic principles, since knowledge of the
1633 objects in space and time is a priori. The Categories are what first
1634 give rise to the Transcendental Deduction.}

1635
1636 _kgl_newpara:n {Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist
1637 in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the
1638 phenomena. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
1639 paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our
1640 understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space
1641 and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when
1642 thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated
1643 science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements
1644 stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to
1645 observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole
1646 content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure
1647 logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere
1648 results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
1649 function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding
1650 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
1651 it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be
1652 in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our
1653 knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the
1654 noumena.}

1655
1656 _kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our a posteriori concepts are synthetic,
1657 applied logic has nothing to do with, for example, the noumena. With
1658 the sole exception of philosophy, the Ideal of practical reason is
1659 what first gives rise to our ideas, as is evident upon close
1660 examination. The reader should be careful to observe that the pure
1661 employment of our understanding is what first gives rise to the
1662 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, by virtue
1663 of natural reason. By virtue of natural reason, there can be no doubt

1664 that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the architectonic of
1665 natural reason (and we can deduce that this is true) has nothing to do
1666 with space, but our judgements (and what we have alone been able to do
1667 show is that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of the
1668 paralogisms of human reason. (The things in themselves, however,
1669 exist in the thing in itself, and natural causes can not take account
1670 of the objects in space and time.) We can deduce that the thing in
1671 itself has lying before it the Transcendental Deduction, by virtue of
1672 pure reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, to avoid all
1673 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in other words, the
1674 objects in space and time can not take account of the noumena, but the
1675 empirical objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
1676 metaphysics, exist in the empirical objects in space and time. }

1677
1678 _kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the reader should be careful to
1679 observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and
1680 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby
1681 be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of
1682 the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human
1683 reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for
1684 the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the
1685 universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason.
1686 To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
1687 thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have
1688 already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the
1689 noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of
1690 the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical
1691 reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time.
1692 Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case)
1693 prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense
1694 perceptions is a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete
1695 system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay
1696 the simple mention of the fact may suffice.}

1697
1698 _kgl_newpara:n {Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the
1699 employment of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1700 conditions, but our a priori concepts can never, as a whole, furnish a
1701 true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, they would
1702 thereby be made to contradict problematic principles. What we have
1703 alone been able to show is that our sense perceptions have nothing to
1704 do with, certainly, the Transcendental Deduction. As any dedicated
1705 reader can clearly see, it is obvious that the objects in space and
1706 time constitute the whole content of metaphysics; still, the things in
1707 themselves are the clue to the discovery of pure reason. The Ideal
1708 (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is a representation of
1709 our faculties. The discipline of practical reason is a representation
1710 of, in other words, the Ideal of pure reason. It is not at all
1711 certain that the things in themselves have lying before them the
1712 Antinomies; certainly, the employment of our sense perceptions
1713 abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. The paralogisms of
1714 pure reason should only be used as a canon for time.}

1715
1716 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the
1717 paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive

1718 judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural
1719 reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The
1720 discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and
1721 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it
1722 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive
1723 principles. The paralogsms of pure reason (and what we have alone
1724 been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole
1725 content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should
1726 only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes,
1727 consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in
1728 itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since
1729 knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us
1730 suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the
1731 things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of
1732 pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense
1733 perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts
1734 from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should
1735 only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.}

1736

1737 _kgl_newpara:n {Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before
1738 them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in
1739 space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental
1740 aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so
1741 regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The
1742 Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics,
1743 a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the
1744 noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and
1745 time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will
1746 easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us
1747 suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still
1748 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the
1749 intelligible character, the transcendental unity of apperception;
1750 however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying
1751 before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because
1752 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be
1753 careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still,
1754 exists in natural causes.}

1755

1756 _kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the objects in space and time are
1757 analytic, it remains a mystery why, in the full sense of these terms,
1758 the objects in space and time have lying before them the Categories,
1759 and our ideas (and let us suppose that this is the case) have lying
1760 before them our problematic judgements. In the study of our
1761 understanding, there can be no doubt that necessity (and it is obvious
1762 that this is true) is a representation of the architectonic of natural
1763 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of
1764 the Antinomies is a posteriori, our faculties would thereby be made to
1765 contradict our sense perceptions. As will easily be shown in the next
1766 section, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1767 conditions, in the case of our experience, can be treated like the
1768 phenomena, and the Categories exclude the possibility of, thus, our
1769 knowledge. In which of our cognitive faculties are natural causes and
1770 the objects in space and time connected together? Still, the
1771 Transcendental Deduction stands in need of natural reason. There can

1772 be no doubt that the manifold, when thus treated as the things in
1773 themselves, is by its very nature contradictory.}

1774

1775 _kgl_newpara:n {As I have elsewhere shown, the never-ending regress in
1776 the series of empirical conditions, in the study of the never-ending
1777 regress in the series of empirical conditions, occupies part of the
1778 sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
1779 objects in space and time in general, by means of analytic unity. Our
1780 faculties (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) can not take
1781 account of the discipline of pure reason. As will easily be shown in
1782 the next section, Hume tells us that the phenomena are just as
1783 necessary as, consequently, necessity; for these reasons, formal
1784 logic, that is to say, excludes the possibility of applied logic. As
1785 is shown in the writings of Galileo, I assert, still, that, indeed,
1786 the Ideal, for example, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of
1787 it must be known a priori. As is shown in the writings of Hume, the
1788 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, when thus
1789 treated as the objects in space and time, constitutes the whole
1790 content for the Ideal.}

1791

1792 _kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
1793 manifold and our ideas, the Categories are just as necessary as, in
1794 the study of the architectonic of pure reason, the discipline of human
1795 reason. It must not be supposed that metaphysics is the mere result
1796 of the power of the Ideal of practical reason, a blind but
1797 indispensable function of the soul; in the study of human reason, the
1798 phenomena are a representation of metaphysics. Our understanding
1799 proves the validity of the transcendental unity of apperception;
1800 therefore, human reason depends on natural causes. In the study of
1801 the architectonic of natural reason, what we have alone been able to
1802 show is that our judgements constitute the whole content of, on the
1803 other hand, our inductive judgements, as we have already seen. }

1804

1805 _kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time should only be used as a
1806 canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all
1807 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just
1808 as necessary as pure logic; however, natural causes exist in the Ideal
1809 of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have
1810 lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the
1811 ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction,
1812 irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the
1813 Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to
1814 contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1815 conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our
1816 experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy
1817 part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the
1818 noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo
1819 tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can
1820 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like
1821 philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is
1822 the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.}

1823

1824 _kgl_newpara:n {Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when
1825 thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any

1826 dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes
1827 exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a
1828 body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
1829 posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline
1830 of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori
1831 concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the
1832 contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal
1833 logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in
1834 general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms
1835 of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge.
1836 Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which
1837 involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements?
1838 By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1839 explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never
1840 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it
1841 excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have
1842 already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the
1843 mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception,
1844 a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the
1845 manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human
1846 reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.}

1847
1848 _kgl_newpara:n {Transcendental logic constitutes the whole content
1849 for, for example, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1850 conditions. It remains a mystery why, even as this relates to time,
1851 the Ideal excludes the possibility of the Categories, but natural
1852 reason, then, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
1853 because, like the thing in itself, it is the key to understanding a
1854 posteriori principles. What we have alone been able to show is that
1855 the Transcendental Deduction is what first gives rise to the
1856 Categories. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is not at all
1857 certain that, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction teaches
1858 us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, with the sole
1859 exception of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1860 conditions, natural causes, but the objects in space and time are the
1861 clue to the discovery of the objects in space and time. The objects
1862 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena. The
1863 transcendental aesthetic, in the case of metaphysics, can be treated
1864 like necessity; for these reasons, the noumena exclude the possibility
1865 of the Ideal.}

1866
1867 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a
1868 posteriori knowledge has lying before it the Categories, as is shown
1869 in the writings of Galileo. Thus, the Categories are the mere results
1870 of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1871 In view of these considerations, it is obvious that the Categories are
1872 just as necessary as, however, the never-ending regress in the series
1873 of empirical conditions, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
1874 Because of the relation between the Ideal of human reason and the
1875 objects in space and time, the empirical objects in space and time
1876 have lying before them natural causes; still, our experience (and it
1877 must not be supposed that this is true) depends on the Transcendental
1878 Deduction. Because of the relation between the employment of the
1879 Transcendental Deduction and the Antinomies, pure logic occupies part

1880 of the sphere of necessity concerning the existence of the objects in
1881 space and time in general; however, the things in themselves, still,
1882 stand in need to our judgements. The Transcendental Deduction proves
1883 the validity of the things in themselves, and our sense perceptions
1884 would thereby be made to contradict our understanding.}

1885
1886 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells
1887 us that natural causes, so far as regards necessity, can never, as a
1888 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1889 manifold, they prove the validity of ampliative principles. Let us
1890 suppose that, in particular, the Ideal of human reason is a body of
1891 demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a posteriori. As is
1892 proven in the ontological manuals, our faculties, consequently, are
1893 the mere results of the power of human reason, a blind but
1894 indispensable function of the soul, but the noumena can never, as a
1895 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like space,
1896 they would thereby be made to contradict analytic principles. As is
1897 shown in the writings of Hume, the intelligible objects in space and
1898 time, in the study of the never-ending regress in the series of
1899 empirical conditions, stand in need to our experience. On the other
1900 hand, Galileo tells us that formal logic is by its very nature
1901 contradictory. With the sole exception of the architectonic of
1902 natural reason, there can be no doubt that our understanding would be
1903 falsified. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

1904
1905 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between philosophy and the
1906 objects in space and time, the Categories, in all theoretical
1907 sciences, are by their very nature contradictory. What we have alone
1908 been able to show is that our knowledge is a representation of the
1909 Categories. With the sole exception of the practical employment of
1910 the noumena, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects
1911 in space and time would thereby be made to contradict the discipline
1912 of pure reason, because of the relation between the manifold and our
1913 ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that, then, the
1914 Categories are by their very nature contradictory, but space is the
1915 mere result of the power of the discipline of practical reason, a
1916 blind but indispensable function of the soul. The noumena are by
1917 their very nature contradictory. As any dedicated reader can clearly
1918 see, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
1919 architectonic of human reason, on the contrary, excludes the
1920 possibility of the paralogsms. The thing in itself, in view of these
1921 considerations, is by its very nature contradictory. Let us apply
1922 this to necessity.}

1923
1924 _kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, our sense
1925 perceptions, as I have elsewhere shown, should only be used as a canon
1926 for our ideas; in natural theology, the paralogsms, indeed, are by
1927 their very nature contradictory. By virtue of practical reason, the
1928 manifold, on the contrary, excludes the possibility of the
1929 transcendental aesthetic, yet the thing in itself is by its very
1930 nature contradictory. Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as
1931 the Categories. As we have already seen, what we have alone been able
1932 to show is that, in particular, the Ideal of natural reason stands in
1933 need of, that is to say, our knowledge, but necessity is a body of

1934 demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori. As we
1935 have already seen, our judgements, therefore, constitute a body of
1936 demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a priori.
1937 Galileo tells us that the objects in space and time (and it is not at
1938 all certain that this is the case) are a representation of our ideas;
1939 still, time, with the sole exception of our experience, can be treated
1940 like our sense perceptions. This is what chiefly concerns us. }

1941

1942 _kgl_newpara:n {The Categories, as I have elsewhere shown, constitute
1943 the whole content of necessity. The transcendental unity of
1944 apperception is just as necessary as the transcendental objects in
1945 space and time. Consequently, I assert that the thing in itself is a
1946 representation of, in the full sense of these terms, the objects in
1947 space and time, because of the relation between the transcendental
1948 aesthetic and our sense perceptions. The manifold, in particular, can
1949 thereby determine in its totality metaphysics. Our a posteriori
1950 concepts, in the case of our experience, prove the validity of the
1951 transcendental objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in
1952 the next section. There can be no doubt that necessity, even as this
1953 relates to necessity, may not contradict itself, but it is still
1954 possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic of
1955 human reason.}

1956

1957 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
1958 priori, it remains a mystery why, in reference to ends, the phenomena
1959 prove the validity of the paralogisms. As is proven in the
1960 ontological manuals, the empirical objects in space and time would
1961 thereby be made to contradict the empirical objects in space and time;
1962 in the study of the transcendental unity of apperception, the
1963 Categories exist in our a priori concepts. Because of the relation
1964 between space and our analytic judgements, the reader should be
1965 careful to observe that the Categories (and I assert that this is the
1966 case) can not take account of the discipline of pure reason; in the
1967 study of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1968 conditions, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and
1969 demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it is just as necessary
1970 as problematic principles. In the case of general logic, space (and
1971 it is obvious that this is true) is just as necessary as the things in
1972 themselves. By means of analytic unity, I assert, in view of these
1973 considerations, that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our
1974 speculative judgements (and it is obvious that this is the case) are
1975 what first give rise to the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
1976 the next section, it remains a mystery why our ideas would thereby be
1977 made to contradict our judgements; therefore, our sense perceptions,
1978 certainly, exclude the possibility of the noumena. As is shown in the
1979 writings of Galileo, the objects in space and time exclude the
1980 possibility of our ideas; thus, the objects in space and time, for
1981 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies.}

1982

1983 _kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of the never-ending regress in
1984 the series of empirical conditions, it is not at all certain that the
1985 noumena, in so far as this expounds the practical rules of the
1986 paralogisms of pure reason, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
1987 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, they

1988 are just as necessary as ampliative principles, as will easily be
1989 shown in the next section. As is evident upon close examination, the
1990 objects in space and time constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
1991 and all of this body must be known a posteriori, but the architectonic
1992 of practical reason would be falsified. Because of our necessary
1993 ignorance of the conditions, it is not at all certain that, then, our
1994 understanding proves the validity of, on the contrary, formal logic.
1995 With the sole exception of the Ideal of natural reason, the Categories
1996 exist in the paralogisms, since knowledge of the Antinomies is a
1997 posteriori. Since knowledge of our ideas is a priori, it must not be
1998 supposed that the manifold, as I have elsewhere shown, abstracts from
1999 all content of knowledge; in the study of the Ideal of practical
2000 reason, our concepts are the clue to the discovery of our experience.}

2001
2002 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
2003 Categories would be falsified. Consequently, there can be no doubt
2004 that the noumena can not take account of, even as this relates to
2005 philosophy, the Antinomies, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
2006 Our judgements (and I assert that this is the case) are what first
2007 give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2008 conditions. It is not at all certain that, in the full sense of these
2009 terms, the objects in space and time stand in need to the Ideal of
2010 pure reason, yet the Transcendental Deduction, in reference to ends,
2011 is just as necessary as the Ideal. Has it ever been suggested that it
2012 must not be supposed that there is a causal connection between the
2013 transcendental objects in space and time and the discipline of natural
2014 reason? As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not at all
2015 certain that the noumena can not take account of the Transcendental
2016 Deduction. By virtue of human reason, I assert, in the study of the
2017 manifold, that, indeed, the objects in space and time have lying
2018 before them our faculties, and the architectonic of natural reason
2019 stands in need of the things in themselves.}

2020
2021 _kgl_newpara:n {By means of analytic unity, the objects in space and
2022 time (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the
2023 whole content of the Antinomies, but our ideas have lying before them
2024 the noumena. The Ideal is the key to understanding, that is to say,
2025 the things in themselves. By means of analytic unity, our judgements
2026 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case)
2027 have lying before them the Transcendental Deduction. Aristotle tells
2028 us that metaphysics, in the study of the Ideal of practical reason,
2029 occupies part of the sphere of applied logic concerning the existence
2030 of the paralogisms in general; certainly, metaphysics can not take
2031 account of necessity. But can I entertain human reason in thought, or
2032 does it present itself to me? The things in themselves stand in need
2033 to natural causes, by means of analytic unity. Since knowledge of
2034 natural causes is a posteriori, the empirical objects in space and
2035 time have nothing to do with philosophy. The divisions are thus
2036 provided; all that is required is to fill them.}

2037
2038 _kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, the noumena would
2039 thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the
2040 paralogisms of natural reason. Because of the relation between the
2041 discipline of pure reason and our sense perceptions, we can deduce

2042 that, on the contrary, the Categories are just as necessary as natural
2043 causes, and metaphysics, in the full sense of these terms, can never
2044 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2045 transcendental unity of apperception, it is the clue to the discovery
2046 of speculative principles. We can deduce that natural causes, still,
2047 are by their very nature contradictory, as we have already seen. As
2048 we have already seen, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2049 explain that, so far as I know, the objects in space and time, for
2050 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Ideal of human
2051 reason. The reader should be careful to observe that the manifold,
2052 irrespective of all empirical conditions, is by its very nature
2053 contradictory. }

2054
2055 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that natural
2056 causes (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2057 that this is the case) have lying before them necessity. We can
2058 deduce that our a priori knowledge (and Galileo tells us that this is
2059 true) depends on the employment of the never-ending regress in the
2060 series of empirical conditions. It remains a mystery why the
2061 paralogisms of practical reason, for these reasons, exist in the
2062 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, because of
2063 the relation between the architectonic of pure reason and the
2064 phenomena. Thus, the architectonic of pure reason excludes the
2065 possibility of, on the other hand, the phenomena. And can I entertain
2066 philosophy in thought, or does it present itself to me? Galileo tells
2067 us that, that is to say, the practical employment of the architectonic
2068 of natural reason, with the sole exception of the transcendental
2069 aesthetic, abstracts from all content of knowledge. As is proven in
2070 the ontological manuals, our ideas constitute the whole content of the
2071 objects in space and time, but the objects in space and time (and it
2072 is obvious that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of the
2073 paralogisms.}

2074
2075 _kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is not at
2076 all certain that, on the contrary, the objects in space and time, in
2077 the case of space, stand in need to the objects in space and time, but
2078 the phenomena have lying before them the discipline of human reason.
2079 The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in
2080 other words, is what first gives rise to general logic. Because of
2081 our necessary ignorance of the conditions, our concepts, so far as
2082 regards the Ideal of human reason, exist in the paralogisms; in the
2083 study of time, the thing in itself is the clue to the discovery of the
2084 manifold. I assert that our experience, in natural theology,
2085 abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge; therefore, our ideas
2086 are what first give rise to the Categories. As is evident upon close
2087 examination, our ideas, for these reasons, can not take account of
2088 philosophy. Has it ever been suggested that what we have alone been
2089 able to show is that there is no relation between the architectonic of
2090 human reason and our sense perceptions? Since all of the noumena are
2091 a priori, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the thing
2092 in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can
2093 be no doubt that the empirical objects in space and time constitute a
2094 body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a
2095 posteriori; thus, time is the mere result of the power of the

2096 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
2097 soul. But this need not worry us.}

2098
2099 _kgl_newpara:n {Aristotle tells us that, inasmuch as the pure
2100 employment of the Categories relies on our ideas, the things in
2101 themselves are just as necessary as, in all theoretical sciences, the
2102 noumena. Therefore, let us suppose that the phenomena occupy part of
2103 the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of our concepts in
2104 general. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the
2105 architectonic of pure reason is what first gives rise to the
2106 employment of our concepts, by means of analysis. The things in
2107 themselves occupy part of the sphere of the never-ending regress in
2108 the series of empirical conditions concerning the existence of our
2109 sense perceptions in general; thus, metaphysics may not contradict
2110 itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions
2111 with, in other words, the transcendental unity of apperception. By
2112 means of the architectonic of practical reason, our sense perceptions,
2113 irrespective of all empirical conditions, abstract from all content of
2114 knowledge. As is proven in the ontological manuals, metaphysics, so
2115 far as regards the transcendental aesthetic and the intelligible
2116 objects in space and time, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
2117 of it must be known a priori; by means of philosophy, the Categories
2118 are a representation of, in the case of time, the phenomena. As any
2119 dedicated reader can clearly see, the Transcendental Deduction, in
2120 other words, would thereby be made to contradict our understanding;
2121 still, the employment of the noumena is a representation of the
2122 Ideal.}

2123
2124 _kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that the paralogisms of human reason are
2125 a representation of, in the full sense of these terms, our experience.
2126 The thing in itself, in reference to ends, exists in our judgements.
2127 As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, let us suppose that, in
2128 respect of the intelligible character, the Categories constitute the
2129 whole content of our knowledge, yet metaphysics is a representation of
2130 our judgements. As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
2131 would thereby be made to contradict the manifold; therefore, pure
2132 logic is a representation of time. In natural theology, the
2133 discipline of natural reason abstracts from all content of a priori
2134 knowledge. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2135 that the paralogisms of human reason have lying before them the Ideal
2136 of pure reason, since none of the things in themselves are a priori.
2137 Consequently, it remains a mystery why our concepts abstract from all
2138 content of knowledge, since knowledge of the objects in space and time
2139 is a posteriori.}

2140
2141 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between practical reason and
2142 our problematic judgements, what we have alone been able to show is
2143 that, in respect of the intelligible character, our faculties,
2144 inasmuch as our knowledge relies on the Categories, can be treated
2145 like natural reason. In view of these considerations, the reader
2146 should be careful to observe that the transcendental aesthetic is the
2147 clue to the discovery of, in view of these considerations, the
2148 phenomena. As is evident upon close examination, it remains a mystery
2149 why the objects in space and time occupy part of the sphere of the

2150 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions concerning
2151 the existence of the Categories in general; in view of these
2152 considerations, our experience, indeed, stands in need of the
2153 phenomena. (However, the phenomena prove the validity of the Ideal,
2154 by virtue of human reason.) We can deduce that, so regarded, our
2155 faculties (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are what
2156 first give rise to the architectonic of pure reason. Our ideas can
2157 not take account of, by means of space, our knowledge. But we have
2158 fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind
2159 when we speak of necessity.}

2160

2161 _kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that space can not take
2162 account of natural causes. The Transcendental Deduction can not take
2163 account of our a priori knowledge; as I have elsewhere shown, the
2164 objects in space and time (and let us suppose that this is the case)
2165 can not take account of the objects in space and time. As is shown in
2166 the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary
2167 to explain that the Categories have lying before them, as I have
2168 elsewhere shown, our ideas. The Ideal of human reason excludes the
2169 possibility of the Ideal of human reason. By virtue of natural
2170 reason, our ideas stand in need to the Ideal of practical reason. By
2171 means of analysis, the phenomena, in the study of our understanding,
2172 can not take account of the noumena, but the paralogisms of natural
2173 reason, thus, abstract from all content of knowledge. This is not
2174 something we are in a position to establish.}

2175

2176 _kgl_newpara:n {Since none of our ideas are inductive, our ideas
2177 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms; consequently, our
2178 faculties can not take account of metaphysics. As will easily be
2179 shown in the next section, the Ideal, in reference to ends, may not
2180 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2181 contradictions with the Categories; in all theoretical sciences, the
2182 architectonic of practical reason, in the case of the practical
2183 employment of our experience, can be treated like necessity. Because
2184 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the things in themselves
2185 are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
2186 function of the soul, and the Transcendental Deduction exists in the
2187 Antinomies. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the thing in
2188 itself (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true)
2189 constitutes the whole content for time. It remains a mystery why our
2190 understanding (and Aristotle tells us that this is true) may not
2191 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2192 contradictions with our judgements; in all theoretical sciences, the
2193 objects in space and time constitute the whole content of our ideas.
2194 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, we can deduce
2195 that, for example, our concepts, for example, are the mere results of
2196 the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
2197 soul, yet the objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
2198 the manifold, exist in our ideas.}

2199

2200 _kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, it must not be supposed that the
2201 objects in space and time, so far as regards the manifold, should only
2202 be used as a canon for natural reason. The manifold, so far as
2203 regards our a priori knowledge, teaches us nothing whatsoever

2204 regarding the content of the Transcendental Deduction. By means of
2205 analytic unity, we can deduce that, so far as regards our experience
2206 and the objects in space and time, the objects in space and time would
2207 thereby be made to contradict the Categories, but our concepts can
2208 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
2209 like our experience, they stand in need to ampliative principles. The
2210 noumena, so far as I know, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
2211 demonstrated science, because, like the employment of the Categories,
2212 they have lying before them ampliative principles, yet the phenomena
2213 are just as necessary as natural causes. The reader should be careful
2214 to observe that, so far as I know, the Ideal has nothing to do with
2215 the Categories, but the things in themselves, however, constitute a
2216 body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
2217 posteriori. And similarly with all the others.}

2218
2219 _kgl_newpara:n {Our speculative judgements, therefore, prove the
2220 validity of the transcendental unity of apperception. Necessity is
2221 just as necessary as, that is to say, transcendental logic. The
2222 reader should be careful to observe that the noumena (and it must not
2223 be supposed that this is the case) can not take account of our
2224 faculties, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. The Ideal (and
2225 to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is
2226 true) can not take account of the transcendental aesthetic, and the
2227 employment of the manifold has nothing to do with, insomuch as the
2228 architectonic of natural reason relies on the Antinomies, the
2229 discipline of human reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
2230 the paralogisms prove the validity of, as I have elsewhere shown, the
2231 architectonic of pure reason.}

2232
2233 _kgl_newpara:n {Space may not contradict itself, but it is still
2234 possible that it may be in contradictions with, for these reasons, the
2235 phenomena; with the sole exception of metaphysics, our ideas exclude
2236 the possibility of, in natural theology, the thing in itself. What we
2237 have alone been able to show is that, for example, the Ideal excludes
2238 the possibility of time, yet the noumena (and I assert, in view of
2239 these considerations, that this is the case) are just as necessary as
2240 the objects in space and time. Because of the relation between
2241 metaphysics and the paralogisms, the Categories are the mere results
2242 of the power of the discipline of natural reason, a blind but
2243 indispensable function of the soul. The objects in space and time, in
2244 other words, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental
2245 aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since
2246 knowledge of our faculties is a priori, what we have alone been able
2247 to show is that necessity, in reference to ends, constitutes the whole
2248 content for metaphysics; still, our understanding (and we can deduce
2249 that this is true) excludes the possibility of our experience. As
2250 will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed
2251 that, even as this relates to philosophy, the phenomena (and I assert,
2252 with the sole exception of metaphysics, that this is the case) are a
2253 representation of the objects in space and time, but the Antinomies
2254 should only be used as a canon for our knowledge. But we have fallen
2255 short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we
2256 speak of necessity.}

2257

2258 _kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time are the mere results of
2259 the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the
2260 soul; in the study of our a posteriori knowledge, the manifold, so far
2261 as I know, proves the validity of the Ideal. Hume tells us that, so
2262 far as regards time, the phenomena, in view of these considerations,
2263 stand in need to the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the
2264 things in themselves, in respect of the intelligible character, can be
2265 treated like our ideas; as I have elsewhere shown, our concepts have
2266 lying before them the phenomena. As is proven in the ontological
2267 manuals, there can be no doubt that the phenomena, in all theoretical
2268 sciences, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this
2269 body must be known a priori. As is evident upon close examination,
2270 the architectonic of natural reason, so regarded, is by its very
2271 nature contradictory; for these reasons, the phenomena are a
2272 representation of time. In natural theology, the Antinomies (and it
2273 remains a mystery why this is the case) constitute the whole content
2274 of the Categories, because of our necessary ignorance of the
2275 conditions. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection
2276 that we have in mind when we speak of the Categories.}

2277

2278 _kgl_newpara:n {Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
2279 it is not at all certain that, for example, the thing in itself (and
2280 the reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not
2281 take account of our experience, and our concepts, in all theoretical
2282 sciences, are a representation of the phenomena. Since some of the
2283 phenomena are problematic, Hume tells us that metaphysics has lying
2284 before it, however, natural causes. By virtue of natural reason,
2285 Aristotle tells us that the things in themselves, therefore, should
2286 only be used as a canon for our a posteriori judgements. Our
2287 understanding can be treated like the transcendental unity of
2288 apperception. The Categories can be treated like space.}

2289

2290 _kgl_newpara:n {Since some of our sense perceptions are hypothetical,
2291 philosophy proves the validity of natural causes; on the other hand,
2292 our experience, in other words, can never furnish a true and
2293 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it depends on
2294 synthetic principles. Natural causes, in natural theology, constitute
2295 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
2296 priori. What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy is a
2297 representation of our concepts, as will easily be shown in the next
2298 section. The Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still
2299 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in the study of the
2300 transcendental aesthetic, our sense perceptions. (As is shown in the
2301 writings of Galileo, the reader should be careful to observe that the
2302 objects in space and time, by means of necessity, are by their very
2303 nature contradictory.) The Antinomies can not take account of our
2304 experience, by virtue of natural reason. Therefore, the noumena, in
2305 view of these considerations, are by their very nature contradictory,
2306 as will easily be shown in the next section.}

2307

2308 _kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the never-ending regress in the
2309 series of empirical conditions stands in need of practical reason. As
2310 will easily be shown in the next section, there can be no doubt that,
2311 in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the discipline

2312 of natural reason, metaphysics can be treated like metaphysics. As is
2313 shown in the writings of Hume, what we have alone been able to show is
2314 that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
2315 would be falsified. Our experience can be treated like the
2316 architectonic of human reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo.
2317 The thing in itself proves the validity of the phenomena, as is shown
2318 in the writings of Hume. Certainly, what we have alone been able to
2319 show is that natural causes, in reference to ends, would be falsified.
2320 But this need not worry us.}

2321
2322 _kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the objects in space and time are
2323 speculative, let us suppose that our sense perceptions are the clue to
2324 the discovery of, in particular, our a posteriori knowledge. Since
2325 knowledge of the transcendental objects in space and time is a
2326 posteriori, what we have alone been able to show is that our a
2327 posteriori concepts exclude the possibility of the never-ending
2328 regress in the series of empirical conditions; by means of the
2329 discipline of pure reason, our faculties are the clue to the discovery
2330 of our a priori knowledge. Because of the relation between the
2331 transcendental unity of apperception and the things in themselves,
2332 there can be no doubt that our sense perceptions (and it is obvious
2333 that this is the case) are what first give rise to the Categories. To
2334 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
2335 phenomena can not take account of, with the sole exception of the
2336 transcendental unity of apperception, the noumena. Certainly, the
2337 things in themselves are by their very nature contradictory, as is
2338 shown in the writings of Galileo. Because of our necessary ignorance
2339 of the conditions, we can deduce that, then, the thing in itself
2340 constitutes the whole content for, still, the intelligible objects in
2341 space and time, and space is the clue to the discovery of, in
2342 particular, our a posteriori concepts. }

2343
2344 _kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal of human reason has nothing to do with time.
2345 As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, so far as regards
2346 the Transcendental Deduction, the transcendental aesthetic, inasmuch
2347 as the practical employment of the never-ending regress in the series
2348 of empirical conditions relies on the things in themselves, can never
2349 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2350 transcendental unity of apperception, it excludes the possibility of
2351 speculative principles, and the Ideal is a representation of our
2352 experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
2353 phenomena (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) are the clue
2354 to the discovery of our speculative judgements; in all theoretical
2355 sciences, our understanding, when thus treated as the noumena, is a
2356 body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori.
2357 We can deduce that our knowledge, for example, exists in the
2358 transcendental unity of apperception. Consequently, I assert, by
2359 means of general logic, that the transcendental unity of apperception
2360 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, consequently,
2361 the Antinomies, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.}

2362
2363 _kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our concepts are inductive, there can be
2364 no doubt that, in respect of the intelligible character, our ideas are
2365 the clue to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception,

2366 and the paralogisms of natural reason should only be used as a canon
2367 for our judgements. Still, I assert that the objects in space and
2368 time have lying before them, by means of transcendental logic, the
2369 Transcendental Deduction. Our faculties can be treated like our
2370 experience; thus, our ideas have lying before them the objects in
2371 space and time. Our judgements constitute a body of demonstrated
2372 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a posteriori. Time can
2373 be treated like the manifold. As any dedicated reader can clearly
2374 see, the employment of the noumena proves the validity of, certainly,
2375 human reason, and space excludes the possibility of general logic.
2376 Let us suppose that, indeed, the Ideal of pure reason, even as this
2377 relates to our a priori knowledge, is the key to understanding the
2378 Antinomies, yet the employment of the pure employment of our a
2379 posteriori concepts is what first gives rise to, in all theoretical
2380 sciences, the noumena.}

2381

2382 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori, it
2383 is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception is the mere
2384 result of the power of the never-ending regress in the series of
2385 empirical conditions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul;
2386 in all theoretical sciences, natural causes exclude the possibility of
2387 the noumena. Let us suppose that the transcendental objects in space
2388 and time would thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, natural
2389 causes. There can be no doubt that our understanding is the clue to
2390 the discovery of the Ideal. Because of the relation between the Ideal
2391 of pure reason and the Antinomies, the transcendental unity of
2392 apperception, as I have elsewhere shown, can be treated like the
2393 paralogisms, yet the phenomena are the clue to the discovery of the
2394 Ideal. As I have elsewhere shown, I assert, in view of these
2395 considerations, that our faculties, even as this relates to the thing
2396 in itself, occupy part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction
2397 concerning the existence of the Categories in general.}

2398

2399 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain
2400 that, that is to say, the Transcendental Deduction is the clue to the
2401 discovery of, in particular, our knowledge, yet the thing in itself
2402 would thereby be made to contradict our faculties. As is proven in
2403 the ontological manuals, it is obvious that, when thus treated as our
2404 understanding, the Categories have nothing to do with our
2405 understanding, yet the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2406 conditions occupies part of the sphere of the architectonic of human
2407 reason concerning the existence of the paralogisms in general. As
2408 will easily be shown in the next section, general logic has nothing to
2409 do with, in the full sense of these terms, the discipline of pure
2410 reason. As is evident upon close examination, the Ideal of human
2411 reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may
2412 be in contradictions with the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
2413 the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that, even
2414 as this relates to the transcendental unity of apperception, the
2415 Categories, certainly, should only be used as a canon for the thing in
2416 itself. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}

2417

2418 _kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that space depends on the things in
2419 themselves. There can be no doubt that, in particular, the Ideal, in

2420 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the phenomena, is just
2421 as necessary as the transcendental unity of apperception. There can
2422 be no doubt that the manifold can not take account of, so far as
2423 regards the architectonic of human reason, the things in themselves.
2424 Thus, it remains a mystery why space depends on the manifold. To
2425 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our
2426 understanding (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2427 explain that this is true) is a representation of the Antinomies.}

2428
2429 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are a
2430 representation of metaphysics; in the case of the practical employment
2431 of the transcendental aesthetic, the Categories are by their very
2432 nature contradictory. It is not at all certain that the phenomena
2433 have lying before them the objects in space and time, because of our
2434 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Because of the relation
2435 between applied logic and our faculties, it remains a mystery why our
2436 ideas, consequently, exclude the possibility of philosophy; however,
2437 the things in themselves prove the validity of, in the case of
2438 metaphysics, the phenomena. By means of the transcendental aesthetic,
2439 let us suppose that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated
2440 doctrine, and all of this body must be known a priori. Since all of
2441 the objects in space and time are hypothetical, metaphysics is the key
2442 to understanding the paralogisms, yet the Transcendental Deduction has
2443 nothing to do with our a posteriori knowledge. There can be no doubt
2444 that metaphysics is a representation of the transcendental unity of
2445 apperception, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2446
2447 _kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that our concepts, in accordance
2448 with the principles of the noumena, are by their very nature
2449 contradictory, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. Space is what
2450 first gives rise to, in other words, the Antinomies, and space depends
2451 on the Ideal. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
2452 our experience, indeed, proves the validity of the noumena. Hume
2453 tells us that the phenomena can not take account of transcendental
2454 logic. The objects in space and time, thus, exist in the manifold.
2455 In which of our cognitive faculties are the manifold and the
2456 Categories connected together? As will easily be shown in the next
2457 section, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that
2458 metaphysics, on the contrary, occupies part of the sphere of the thing
2459 in itself concerning the existence of our synthetic judgements in
2460 general.}

2461
2462 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, I assert that,
2463 so far as regards metaphysics, our knowledge proves the validity of,
2464 on the contrary, the manifold, yet the objects in space and time are
2465 what first give rise to, in the study of formal logic, the paralogisms
2466 of pure reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, I
2467 assert, in all theoretical sciences, that our understanding (and the
2468 reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not take
2469 account of our sense perceptions. Because of the relation between the
2470 Transcendental Deduction and our a priori concepts, the phenomena are
2471 what first give rise to the intelligible objects in space and time,
2472 and natural causes, indeed, abstract from all content of a priori
2473 knowledge. By means of analysis, Galileo tells us that the Ideal has

2474 lying before it, on the contrary, our sense perceptions. I assert,
2475 for these reasons, that our knowledge stands in need of the things in
2476 themselves, since knowledge of our faculties is a priori. But this is
2477 to be dismissed as random groping.}

2478

2479 _kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding can not take account of our
2480 faculties; certainly, the never-ending regress in the series of
2481 empirical conditions is what first gives rise to, therefore, the
2482 things in themselves. It is not at all certain that, then, time
2483 occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning
2484 the existence of the paralogisms of practical reason in general. We
2485 can deduce that the thing in itself, on the other hand, abstracts from
2486 all content of knowledge. On the other hand, our a priori knowledge
2487 has lying before it the practical employment of the Antinomies. The
2488 employment of our sense perceptions is what first gives rise to the
2489 Antinomies, but the Categories, for these reasons, are by their very
2490 nature contradictory. In natural theology, it is not at all certain
2491 that our sense perceptions can not take account of our knowledge, by
2492 means of analysis. Thus, the Categories would thereby be made to
2493 contradict the things in themselves, as any dedicated reader can
2494 clearly see.}

2495

2496 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are just as necessary as the
2497 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As any
2498 dedicated reader can clearly see, the architectonic of natural reason
2499 (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby determine in
2500 its totality general logic. As will easily be shown in the next
2501 section, natural causes are a representation of, on the contrary, the
2502 Ideal of pure reason; as I have elsewhere shown, the things in
2503 themselves, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
2504 and none of this body must be known a priori. As we have already
2505 seen, our ideas are the clue to the discovery of our faculties.
2506 Whence comes applied logic, the solution of which involves the
2507 relation between the noumena and the Transcendental Deduction?
2508 Therefore, it is obvious that the empirical objects in space and time
2509 can not take account of the noumena, because of our necessary
2510 ignorance of the conditions. It is not at all certain that the
2511 manifold stands in need of, for these reasons, the Antinomies, by
2512 virtue of human reason.}

2513

2514 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of practical reason, there can be no doubt
2515 that our experience, still, occupies part of the sphere of the
2516 manifold concerning the existence of our analytic judgements in
2517 general; as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories can never, as a
2518 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2519 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they are a
2520 representation of synthetic principles. As is proven in the
2521 ontological manuals, the Categories are what first give rise to,
2522 consequently, our faculties. We can deduce that, inasmuch as the
2523 discipline of practical reason relies on our ideas, necessity can be
2524 treated like the thing in itself, yet the noumena can never, as a
2525 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
2526 they are a representation of problematic principles. However, let us
2527 suppose that the things in themselves are the clue to the discovery

2528 of, consequently, our judgements, as we have already seen. Whence
2529 comes time, the solution of which involves the relation between the
2530 phenomena and the noumena? In the study of our experience, I assert
2531 that the Ideal can not take account of the discipline of practical
2532 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The reader should be
2533 careful to observe that the phenomena are what first give rise to the
2534 Categories, by virtue of natural reason. As is proven in the
2535 ontological manuals, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and
2536 some of it must be known a priori. This may be clear with an
2537 example.}

2538
2539 _kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, so far as
2540 regards the Ideal of practical reason and the noumena, abstracts from
2541 all content of a posteriori knowledge, by virtue of human reason. To
2542 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, that is to
2543 say, our inductive judgements have nothing to do with, in the case of
2544 the discipline of human reason, the things in themselves, and the
2545 paralogisms of natural reason are the clue to the discovery of the
2546 Transcendental Deduction. It remains a mystery why the noumena, in
2547 natural theology, would be falsified; however, the things in
2548 themselves can not take account of the thing in itself. As any
2549 dedicated reader can clearly see, philosophy, in the study of the
2550 thing in itself, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
2551 because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it proves the validity of
2552 inductive principles, but our sense perceptions, with the sole
2553 exception of necessity, are the clue to the discovery of the
2554 transcendental unity of apperception. Let us suppose that the
2555 Categories can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated
2556 science, because, like the employment of philosophy, they have nothing
2557 to do with hypothetical principles. Our ideas have nothing to do with
2558 the transcendental aesthetic.}

2559
2560 _kgl_newpara:n {In the case of philosophy, the Transcendental
2561 Deduction proves the validity of necessity, by means of analysis. Our
2562 sense perceptions have lying before them, certainly, our experience.
2563 There can be no doubt that space (and it remains a mystery why this is
2564 true) stands in need of the noumena. As I have elsewhere shown, the
2565 transcendental unity of apperception has lying before it, irrespective
2566 of all empirical conditions, the Transcendental Deduction. The
2567 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of our
2568 faculties, but the thing in itself, in accordance with the principles
2569 of our experience, can be treated like the paralogisms. As is proven
2570 in the ontological manuals, space has nothing to do with, thus, our
2571 ideas, yet the things in themselves, in natural theology, can be
2572 treated like the transcendental aesthetic.}

2573
2574 _kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Galileo, it remains a
2575 mystery why, so far as I know, the phenomena are the mere results of
2576 the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
2577 function of the soul, but the paralogisms (and there can be no doubt
2578 that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the transcendental
2579 aesthetic. Our experience, in accordance with the principles of
2580 transcendental logic, occupies part of the sphere of the manifold
2581 concerning the existence of the Categories in general. Our sense

2582 perceptions can not take account of the Ideal, by virtue of natural
2583 reason. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
2584 objects in space and time (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
2585 necessary to explain that this is the case) would thereby be made to
2586 contradict the pure employment of space; in the case of the discipline
2587 of human reason, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the
2588 transcendental aesthetic. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have
2589 already seen, it remains a mystery why there is a causal connection
2590 between the Ideal of human reason and the Ideal of human reason? What
2591 we have alone been able to show is that the Antinomies, for these
2592 reasons, stand in need to our judgements. Let us suppose that, in
2593 accordance with the principles of the Ideal of practical reason, the
2594 Antinomies prove the validity of space, but natural causes (and I
2595 assert, for these reasons, that this is the case) would thereby be
2596 made to contradict the transcendental unity of apperception. But the
2597 proof of this is a task from which we can here be absolved. }

2598
2599 _kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, the noumena
2600 should only be used as a canon for the Categories. As is proven in
2601 the ontological manuals, our sense perceptions, consequently, are by
2602 their very nature contradictory; therefore, our experience (and it
2603 must not be supposed that this is true) may not contradict itself, but
2604 it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the
2605 architectonic of practical reason. We can deduce that the Categories
2606 would thereby be made to contradict pure logic; for these reasons,
2607 space is by its very nature contradictory. Formal logic is a
2608 representation of our faculties. Metaphysics, inasmuch as time relies
2609 on the Antinomies, stands in need of space. Let us suppose that the
2610 Antinomies constitute the whole content of our a priori concepts; on
2611 the other hand, the Ideal of natural reason (and there can be no doubt
2612 that this is true) is a representation of the manifold.}

2613
2614 _kgl_newpara:n {I assert, certainly, that, irrespective of all
2615 empirical conditions, the Categories are just as necessary as, on the
2616 other hand, the thing in itself, yet the manifold proves the validity
2617 of, on the other hand, the employment of the transcendental unity of
2618 apperception. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
2619 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in
2620 the architectonic of practical reason. As is evident upon close
2621 examination, it remains a mystery why the things in themselves have
2622 lying before them, that is to say, the Ideal; however, the
2623 architectonic of natural reason exists in the Ideal of pure reason.
2624 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the noumena
2625 exclude the possibility of, however, general logic; consequently, the
2626 paralogisms of natural reason, when thus treated as our ideas, can be
2627 treated like philosophy.}

2628
2629 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, our faculties
2630 stand in need to the transcendental objects in space and time;
2631 certainly, our ideas are a representation of the objects in space and
2632 time. The reader should be careful to observe that the Categories
2633 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms of human reason. By
2634 means of analytic unity, space would be falsified; with the sole
2635 exception of the manifold, necessity, even as this relates to our

2636 understanding, has nothing to do with natural causes. Time is just as
2637 necessary as, indeed, the phenomena. Thus, the noumena, consequently,
2638 exclude the possibility of the Transcendental Deduction, by means of
2639 analysis. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have already seen,
2640 Aristotle tells us that there is a causal connection between the
2641 noumena and the things in themselves? The employment of the
2642 Antinomies is the key to understanding our ideas.}

2643

2644 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
2645 employment of the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in our sense
2646 perceptions; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena exist in the
2647 discipline of practical reason. Necessity (and Aristotle tells us
2648 that this is true) has lying before it the objects in space and time;
2649 in natural theology, our understanding, for example, proves the
2650 validity of the objects in space and time. It is not at all certain
2651 that our faculties, in the case of the thing in itself, are the clue
2652 to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen. To avoid
2653 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in reference to
2654 ends, the Ideal would be falsified, and the Antinomies are a
2655 representation of our a priori knowledge. (By means of analysis, to
2656 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as
2657 this relates to the Ideal of practical reason, the phenomena
2658 constitute the whole content of, in view of these considerations, our
2659 knowledge, and the discipline of natural reason (and we can deduce
2660 that this is true) is just as necessary as the manifold.) The reader
2661 should be careful to observe that, indeed, our judgements can not take
2662 account of our sense perceptions, but the thing in itself, so far as I
2663 know, can not take account of our sense perceptions. Let us suppose
2664 that our ideas are a representation of metaphysics.}

2665

2666 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of human reason, the Ideal of pure reason,
2667 in the full sense of these terms, is by its very nature contradictory,
2668 yet necessity is the key to understanding metaphysics. The Categories
2669 have nothing to do with, therefore, the phenomena. We can deduce that
2670 our experience can be treated like our a priori knowledge; certainly,
2671 the objects in space and time are what first give rise to philosophy.
2672 Because of the relation between the architectonic of natural reason
2673 and the Antinomies, space has nothing to do with our ideas, but the
2674 manifold occupies part of the sphere of the transcendental aesthetic
2675 concerning the existence of the phenomena in general. The paralogisms
2676 of human reason are the clue to the discovery of, on the contrary, our
2677 understanding.}

2678

2679 _kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
2680 thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and
2681 time, but the discipline of human reason is by its very nature
2682 contradictory. It is obvious that, in other words, the manifold, in
2683 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the thing in itself, is
2684 the clue to the discovery of the things in themselves, yet our
2685 experience has lying before it space. Our ideas would be falsified,
2686 yet the thing in itself is just as necessary as the Antinomies.
2687 Metaphysics exists in our speculative judgements. By means of
2688 analysis, the phenomena are a representation of our faculties.}

2689

2690 _kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena stand in need to our sense perceptions,
2691 but our concepts are the clue to the discovery of formal logic. The
2692 objects in space and time have nothing to do with the things in
2693 themselves, as is evident upon close examination. Time teaches us
2694 nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the noumena. It is not at
2695 all certain that, so far as regards the manifold and the objects in
2696 space and time, the Transcendental Deduction, therefore, occupies part
2697 of the sphere of pure logic concerning the existence of natural causes
2698 in general, but the things in themselves, consequently, are a
2699 representation of the intelligible objects in space and time. The
2700 Transcendental Deduction (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
2701 necessary to explain that this is true) depends on necessity, as we
2702 have already seen. Consequently, it remains a mystery why our a
2703 priori concepts, on the other hand, are what first give rise to the
2704 Ideal of human reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2705

2706 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that, then,
2707 the Ideal of human reason, in reference to ends, is the mere result of
2708 the power of practical reason, a blind but indispensable function of
2709 the soul, but the Ideal (and the reader should be careful to observe
2710 that this is true) has lying before it our ideas. In the study of the
2711 thing in itself, I assert, with the sole exception of the manifold,
2712 that the Ideal of human reason is the clue to the discovery of the
2713 practical employment of the Ideal of natural reason. As will easily
2714 be shown in the next section, our ideas have lying before them the
2715 Ideal of natural reason; thus, the Antinomies are what first give rise
2716 to, indeed, the noumena. We can deduce that the Categories (and it is
2717 obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict our
2718 faculties. As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
2719 natural causes occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of
2720 natural reason concerning the existence of natural causes in general;
2721 for these reasons, our ideas, in natural theology, occupy part of the
2722 sphere of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2723 conditions concerning the existence of our judgements in general. Yet
2724 can I entertain the transcendental aesthetic in thought, or does it
2725 present itself to me? In the study of the Ideal, the Ideal of pure
2726 reason depends on time. However, our a priori judgements have lying
2727 before them the employment of necessity, by means of analytic unity.
2728 }

2729

2730 _kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not
2731 at all certain that the transcendental unity of apperception is the
2732 key to understanding the things in themselves; certainly, the
2733 Categories prove the validity of our faculties. Let us suppose that
2734 the paralogisms of natural reason (and we can deduce that this is the
2735 case) are a representation of the discipline of human reason. It
2736 remains a mystery why practical reason can be treated like the
2737 phenomena. (As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, there can be no
2738 doubt that the Categories, in the study of the discipline of human
2739 reason, exclude the possibility of the Categories.) As will easily be
2740 shown in the next section, our ideas stand in need to our knowledge.
2741 As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Antinomies exist in our a
2742 posteriori concepts, yet the thing in itself can not take account of,
2743 as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories. The question of this

2744 matter's relation to objects is not in any way under discussion.}

2745

2746 _kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our
2747 experience, in particular, can thereby determine in its totality our
2748 analytic judgements, yet necessity has nothing to do with, in
2749 reference to ends, the discipline of human reason. It is not at all
2750 certain that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2751 conditions would thereby be made to contradict, in particular, pure
2752 logic; with the sole exception of the Ideal, our ideas, that is to
2753 say, should only be used as a canon for our judgements. Since some of
2754 the Antinomies are disjunctive, the Transcendental Deduction can be
2755 treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2756 conditions. In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, it is not at
2757 all certain that the Ideal of natural reason, in view of these
2758 considerations, can be treated like the architectonic of human reason.
2759 The Antinomies (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) exclude
2760 the possibility of the Ideal of human reason; in the case of the
2761 discipline of natural reason, necessity would thereby be made to
2762 contradict, so far as I know, the Ideal of pure reason.
2763 Transcendental logic is a representation of the Transcendental
2764 Deduction; by means of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in
2765 itself can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of pure reason.
2766 In my present remarks I am referring to the never-ending regress in
2767 the series of empirical conditions only in so far as it is founded on
2768 hypothetical principles.}

2769

2770 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves prove the validity of, on the
2771 other hand, transcendental logic; therefore, necessity has lying
2772 before it, indeed, the paralogisms. What we have alone been able to
2773 show is that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and
2774 all of this body must be known a priori. Our understanding has lying
2775 before it, for these reasons, our ampliative judgements. Because of
2776 our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it is obvious that time may
2777 not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2778 contradictions with, in view of these considerations, our ideas;
2779 still, the practical employment of the transcendental objects in space
2780 and time, that is to say, has lying before it the things in
2781 themselves. Natural causes prove the validity of necessity.}

2782

2783 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a
2784 priori concepts, in other words, can never, as a whole, furnish a true
2785 and demonstrated science, because, like general logic, they prove the
2786 validity of hypothetical principles, by virtue of human reason. There
2787 can be no doubt that, indeed, the Antinomies, in other words, would be
2788 falsified, and the phenomena constitute the whole content of the
2789 discipline of natural reason. The phenomena can not take account of,
2790 in natural theology, the Ideal of practical reason. Time can never
2791 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, it
2792 has nothing to do with a posteriori principles; in view of these
2793 considerations, our a priori concepts stand in need to the discipline
2794 of pure reason. Our ideas constitute the whole content of the objects
2795 in space and time, but the Ideal, indeed, is the key to understanding
2796 our understanding.}

2797

2798 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
2799 the Ideal of pure reason is just as necessary as natural causes; in
2800 the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our faculties, in natural
2801 theology, abstract from all content of knowledge. The Categories can
2802 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
2803 like the manifold, they have lying before them a posteriori
2804 principles, but time is by its very nature contradictory. We can
2805 deduce that the Categories, so regarded, are by their very nature
2806 contradictory; for these reasons, time is what first gives rise to our
2807 ideas. Still, is it the case that pure logic constitutes the whole
2808 content for the Transcendental Deduction, or is the real question
2809 whether the paralogisms exist in our experience? Still, natural
2810 reason, so far as I know, would be falsified, because of our necessary
2811 ignorance of the conditions. Our faculties would be falsified.}

2812
2813 _kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal proves the validity of the objects in space
2814 and time. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2815 that our judgements are a representation of, however, the manifold.
2816 The objects in space and time exclude the possibility of necessity.
2817 The reader should be careful to observe that the Ideal, consequently,
2818 abstracts from all content of knowledge. There can be no doubt that,
2819 indeed, the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
2820 contradict human reason.}

2821
2822 _kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the transcendental unity of
2823 apperception can be treated like the Ideal. I assert that applied
2824 logic (and it is not at all certain that this is true) stands in need
2825 of the objects in space and time; certainly, the Ideal of practical
2826 reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. On the other hand,
2827 our experience (and it remains a mystery why this is true) stands in
2828 need of the transcendental unity of apperception. It remains a
2829 mystery why the Antinomies prove the validity of metaphysics. There
2830 can be no doubt that, in particular, the architectonic of pure reason,
2831 in all theoretical sciences, can never furnish a true and demonstrated
2832 science, because, like the manifold, it teaches us nothing whatsoever
2833 regarding the content of hypothetical principles, but the phenomena,
2834 with the sole exception of the transcendental aesthetic, have nothing
2835 to do with philosophy. It is obvious that our understanding, that is
2836 to say, is the mere result of the power of space, a blind but
2837 indispensable function of the soul, by means of analytic unity. Since
2838 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a priori, we can deduce that our
2839 experience is what first gives rise to the architectonic of practical
2840 reason. This may be clear with an example. }

2841
2842 _kgl_newpara:n {I assert, consequently, that the Transcendental
2843 Deduction would thereby be made to contradict our faculties, as will
2844 easily be shown in the next section. Let us suppose that our ideas,
2845 in the full sense of these terms, occupy part of the sphere of formal
2846 logic concerning the existence of the noumena in general. To avoid
2847 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
2848 Transcendental Deduction, so far as I know, occupies part of the
2849 sphere of the architectonic of practical reason concerning the
2850 existence of the Antinomies in general; certainly, the paralogisms
2851 occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of natural reason

2852 concerning the existence of our ideas in general. To avoid all
2853 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the pure employment
2854 of the architectonic of practical reason, still, is by its very nature
2855 contradictory; consequently, the intelligible objects in space and
2856 time would thereby be made to contradict the transcendental objects in
2857 space and time. We can deduce that the thing in itself exists in the
2858 Antinomies. As is evident upon close examination, the never-ending
2859 regress in the series of empirical conditions depends on, therefore,
2860 necessity. I assert that our judgements are a representation of the
2861 noumena; on the other hand, the transcendental unity of apperception
2862 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, then, the
2863 Ideal of pure reason.}

2864

2865 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the things in
2866 themselves are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena, and
2867 philosophy (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is
2868 true) teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the
2869 phenomena. Still, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2870 explain that natural causes (and it is obvious that this is the case)
2871 have nothing to do with our faculties. To avoid all misapprehension,
2872 it is necessary to explain that, irrespective of all empirical
2873 conditions, the employment of the objects in space and time can not
2874 take account of, that is to say, our concepts, but the never-ending
2875 regress in the series of empirical conditions constitutes the whole
2876 content for our sense perceptions. In the case of the discipline of
2877 pure reason, let us suppose that general logic stands in need of the
2878 Ideal of human reason, as we have already seen. The noumena prove the
2879 validity of, in the study of transcendental logic, our understanding.}

2880

2881 _kgl_newpara:n {Space (and what we have alone been able to show is
2882 that this is true) stands in need of necessity, yet our understanding,
2883 so far as regards the Ideal of practical reason, can never furnish a
2884 true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental unity
2885 of apperception, it has lying before it a priori principles. Since
2886 some of our judgements are disjunctive, it remains a mystery why the
2887 phenomena stand in need to the objects in space and time. In view of
2888 these considerations, the Categories (and let us suppose that this is
2889 the case) are just as necessary as the pure employment of the
2890 phenomena. Let us suppose that the things in themselves, so far as I
2891 know, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. It is
2892 obvious that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, natural
2893 causes can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science,
2894 because, like metaphysics, they are just as necessary as inductive
2895 principles. The architectonic of practical reason (and it is not at
2896 all certain that this is true) depends on the thing in itself, but the
2897 objects in space and time, as I have elsewhere shown, are the mere
2898 results of the power of the employment of the Antinomies, a blind but
2899 indispensable function of the soul. By means of analysis, there can
2900 be no doubt that, in reference to ends, natural causes are a
2901 representation of, in respect of the intelligible character, time, and
2902 the pure employment of the discipline of natural reason has lying
2903 before it our experience.}

2904

2905 _kgl_newpara:n {Still, it must not be supposed that our faculties are

2906 a representation of the Ideal of practical reason, as is evident upon
2907 close examination. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
2908 reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time
2909 are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
2910 function of the soul; in all theoretical sciences, the Ideal is a
2911 representation of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural
2912 reason, our sense perceptions. Aristotle tells us that, in
2913 particular, the objects in space and time, in the case of the
2914 manifold, are a representation of the things in themselves, yet
2915 natural causes stand in need to, irrespective of all empirical
2916 conditions, the things in themselves. Certainly, the transcendental
2917 unity of apperception, in accordance with the principles of the
2918 intelligible objects in space and time, exists in our sense
2919 perceptions. As we have already seen, the discipline of human reason
2920 (and Galileo tells us that this is true) depends on the thing in
2921 itself. Since some of natural causes are synthetic, the reader should
2922 be careful to observe that, for example, the things in themselves (and
2923 it is not at all certain that this is the case) are the clue to the
2924 discovery of our concepts. But this need not worry us.}

2925

2926 _kgl_newpara:n {The architectonic of natural reason is the key to
2927 understanding, so far as regards our a posteriori knowledge and the
2928 paralogisms, time; still, the Categories, with the sole exception of
2929 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, should
2930 only be used as a canon for the transcendental unity of apperception.
2931 However, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena
2932 exist in time. Because of the relation between space and the
2933 phenomena, let us suppose that our ideas are the clue to the discovery
2934 of our faculties. The phenomena constitute the whole content of the
2935 phenomena, but the transcendental unity of apperception, on the other
2936 hand, would be falsified. (As is evident upon close examination, it
2937 must not be supposed that our a posteriori knowledge is by its very
2938 nature contradictory.) There can be no doubt that the practical
2939 employment of our problematic judgements can be treated like the
2940 transcendental aesthetic. Aristotle tells us that our faculties have
2941 nothing to do with the objects in space and time. We thus have a pure
2942 synthesis of apprehension.}

2943

2944 _kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the noumena are hypothetical, there can
2945 be no doubt that, in particular, our knowledge, in other words, is the
2946 clue to the discovery of the things in themselves. Therefore, the
2947 Ideal is just as necessary as, then, the Ideal, as will easily be
2948 shown in the next section. We can deduce that, then, our knowledge,
2949 in respect of the intelligible character, is by its very nature
2950 contradictory, and the noumena, in particular, are by their very
2951 nature contradictory. The reader should be careful to observe that,
2952 indeed, pure logic, still, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
2953 of it must be known a posteriori, yet our speculative judgements exist
2954 in the manifold. In the case of time, the Categories, by means of
2955 transcendental logic, constitute the whole content of the things in
2956 themselves, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2957

2958 _kgl_newpara:n {Transcendental logic can thereby determine in its
2959 totality, consequently, our faculties, because of our necessary

2960 ignorance of the conditions. Since some of the paralogisms are
 2961 analytic, there can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
 2962 Antinomies, for these reasons, constitute the whole content of
 2963 necessity, yet the things in themselves constitute the whole content
 2964 of our understanding. In view of these considerations, it is obvious
 2965 that the paralogisms are by their very nature contradictory, as any
 2966 dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas (and
 2967 it remains a mystery why this is the case) have nothing to do with the
 2968 discipline of pure reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
 2969 What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy occupies part
 2970 of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence
 2971 of natural causes in general. Since knowledge of the phenomena is a
 2972 posteriori, our ideas, in all theoretical sciences, can be treated
 2973 like time, but our judgements are just as necessary as the Categories.
 2974 Our understanding is a representation of the objects in space and
 2975 time, and the paralogisms are just as necessary as our experience.}

2976
 2977 _kgl_newpara:n {Philosophy (and it must not be supposed that this is
 2978 true) is a representation of the never-ending regress in the series of
 2979 empirical conditions; however, the Antinomies have nothing to do with,
 2980 in the study of philosophy, the discipline of practical reason.
 2981 Because of the relation between philosophy and our ideas, it remains a
 2982 mystery why, so regarded, metaphysics depends on the employment of
 2983 natural causes. The pure employment of the Antinomies, in particular,
 2984 is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
 2985 priori, but necessity is a representation of the Ideal. As will
 2986 easily be shown in the next section, it remains a mystery why the
 2987 Antinomies are what first give rise to the transcendental aesthetic;
 2988 in all theoretical sciences, the architectonic of pure reason has
 2989 nothing to do with, therefore, the noumena. The noumena are the clue
 2990 to the discovery of the Categories, yet the transcendental aesthetic,
 2991 for example, stands in need of natural causes. The Categories can not
 2992 take account of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural
 2993 reason, the paralogisms; in the study of general logic, the
 2994 transcendental unity of apperception, insomuch as the architectonic of
 2995 human reason relies on the Antinomies, can thereby determine in its
 2996 totality natural causes.}

2997
 2998 _kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, it remains a
 2999 mystery why our judgements exclude the possibility of the
 3000 transcendental aesthetic; therefore, the transcendental aesthetic can
 3001 not take account of the thing in itself. Our knowledge depends on,
 3002 indeed, our knowledge. It is not at all certain that space is just as
 3003 necessary as the noumena. Is it true that metaphysics can not take
 3004 account of the paralogisms of human reason, or is the real question
 3005 whether the noumena are by their very nature contradictory? On the
 3006 other hand, time constitutes the whole content for necessity, by means
 3007 of analytic unity. There can be no doubt that the phenomena have
 3008 lying before them metaphysics. As is proven in the ontological
 3009 manuals, it remains a mystery why space exists in the objects in space
 3010 and time; still, the noumena, in the case of necessity, constitute the
 3011 whole content of philosophy.}

3012

Now we define the sequence of index words.

```
3013 \_kgl_newword:n {Ideal}
3014 \_kgl_newword:n {noumena}
3015 \_kgl_newword:n {Aristotle}
3016 \_kgl_newword:n {transcendental}
3017 \_kgl_newword:n {metaphysics}
3018 \_kgl_newword:n {reason}
3019 \_kgl_newword:n {science}
3020 \_kgl_newword:n {necessity}
3021 \_kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3022 \_kgl_newword:n {philosophy}
3023 \_kgl_newword:n {knowledge}
3024 \_kgl_newword:n {regress}
3025 \_kgl_newword:n {paralogism}
3026 \_kgl_newword:n {empirical}
3027 \_kgl_newword:n {space}
3028 \_kgl_newword:n {manifold}
3029 \_kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3030 \_kgl_newword:n {aesthetic}
3031 \_kgl_newword:n {noumena}
3032 \_kgl_newword:n {sphere}
3033 \_kgl_newword:n {time}
3034 \_kgl_newword:n {practical reason}
3035 \_kgl_newword:n {perception}
3036 \_kgl_newword:n {things in themselves}
3037 \_kgl_newword:n {doctrine}
3038 \_kgl_newword:n {regress}
3039 \_kgl_newword:n {mystery}
3040 \_kgl_newword:n {existence}
3041 \_kgl_newword:n {contradiction}
3042 \_kgl_newword:n {a priori}
3043 \_kgl_newword:n {natural causes}
3044 \_kgl_newword:n {analysis}
3045 \_kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3046 \_kgl_newword:n {Antinomies}
3047 \_kgl_newword:n {Transcendental Deduction}
3048 \_kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3049 \_kgl_newword:n {formal logic}
3050 \_kgl_newword:n {soul}
3051 \_kgl_newword:n {misapprehension}
3052 \_kgl_newword:n {elsewhere}
3053 \_kgl_newword:n {theology}
3054 \_kgl_newword:n {employment}
3055 \_kgl_newword:n {logic}
3056 \_kgl_newword:n {practical reason}
3057 \_kgl_newword:n {theoretical sciences}
3058 \_kgl_newword:n {a posteriori}
3059 \_kgl_newword:n {mystery}
3060 \_kgl_newword:n {philosophy}
3061 \_kgl_newword:n {things in themselves}
3062 \_kgl_newword:n {experience}
3063 \_kgl_newword:n {contradictory}
3064 \_kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3065 \_kgl_newword:n {perceptions}
```

3066 _kgl_newword:n {Galileo}
3067 _kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3068 _kgl_newword:n {empirical objects}
3069 _kgl_newword:n {judgements}
3070 _kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3071 _kgl_newword:n {power}
3072 _kgl_newword:n {hypothetical principles}
3073 _kgl_newword:n {transcendental logic}
3074 _kgl_newword:n {doctrine}
3075 _kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3076 _kgl_newword:n {totality}
3077 _kgl_newword:n {manifold}
3078 _kgl_newword:n {inductive judgements}
3079 _kgl_newword:n {Transcendental Deduction}
3080 _kgl_newword:n {analytic unity}
3081 _kgl_newword:n {Hume}
3082 _kgl_newword:n {canon}
3083 _kgl_newword:n {knowledge}
3084 _kgl_newword:n {universal}
3085 _kgl_newword:n {section}
3086 _kgl_newword:n {body}
3087 _kgl_newword:n {ignorance}
3088 _kgl_newword:n {sense perceptions}
3089 _kgl_newword:n {natural reason}
3090 _kgl_newword:n {exception}
3091 _kgl_newword:n {ampliative judgements}
3092 _kgl_newword:n {experience}
3093 _kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3094 _kgl_newword:n {analysis}
3095 _kgl_newword:n {philosophy}
3096 _kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3097 _kgl_newword:n {paralogism}
3098 _kgl_newword:n {ignorance}
3099 _kgl_newword:n {true}
3100 _kgl_newword:n {space}
3101 _kgl_newword:n {Ideal}
3102 _kgl_newword:n {accordance}
3103 _kgl_newword:n {regress}
3104 _kgl_newword:n {experience}
3105 _kgl_newword:n {a priori}
3106 _kgl_newword:n {disjunctive}
3107 _kgl_newword:n {soul}
3108 _kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3109 _kgl_newword:n {analytic unity}
3110 _kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3111 _kgl_newword:n {practical reason}
3112 _kgl_newword:n {cause}
3113 _kgl_newword:n {manuals}
3114 _kgl_newword:n {dedicated reader}
3115 _kgl_newword:n {a posteriori}
3116 _kgl_newword:n {employment}
3117 _kgl_newword:n {natural theology}
3118 _kgl_newword:n {manifold}
3119 _kgl_newword:n {transcendental aesthetic}

3120 _kgl_newword:n {close}
3121 _kgl_newword:n {full}
3122 _kgl_newword:n {Aristotle}
3123 _kgl_newword:n {clue}
3124 _kgl_newword:n {me}
3125 _kgl_newword:n {account}
3126 _kgl_newword:n {things}
3127 _kgl_newword:n {sense}
3128 _kgl_newword:n {intelligible}
3129 _kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3130 _kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3131 _kgl_newword:n {never}
3132 _kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3133 _kgl_newword:n {Ideal}
3134 _kgl_newword:n {need}
3135 _kgl_newword:n {space}
3136 _kgl_newword:n {virtue}
3137 _kgl_newword:n {Hume}
3138 _kgl_newword:n {still}
3139 _kgl_newword:n {whatsoever}
3140 _kgl_newword:n {even}
3141 _kgl_newword:n {sphere}
3142 _kgl_newword:n {position}
3143 _kgl_newword:n {ignorance}
3144 _kgl_newword:n {word}
3145 _kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3146 _kgl_newword:n {theology}
3147 _kgl_newword:n {mystery}
3148 _kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3149 _kgl_newword:n {perception}
3150 _kgl_newword:n {power}
3151 _kgl_newword:n {experience}
3152 _kgl_newword:n {never-ending}
3153 _kgl_newword:n {analytic}
3154 _kgl_newword:n {itself}
3155 _kgl_newword:n {a priori}
3156 _kgl_newword:n {rule}
3157 _kgl_newword:n {Transcendental Deduction}
3158 _kgl_newword:n {empirical conditions}
3159 _kgl_newword:n {knowledge}
3160 _kgl_newword:n {disjunctive}
3161 _kgl_newword:n {transcendental}
3162 _kgl_newword:n {science}
3163 _kgl_newword:n {falsified}
3164 _kgl_newword:n {reader}
3165 _kgl_newword:n {blind}
3166 _kgl_newword:n {employment}
3167 _kgl_newword:n {discipline}
3168 _kgl_newword:n {function}
3169 _kgl_newword:n {careful}
3170 _kgl_newword:n {Aristotle}
3171 _kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3172 _kgl_newword:n {part}
3173 _kgl_newword:n {noumena}

2479, 2496, 2514, 2539, 2560, 2574, 2599, 2614, 2629, 2644, 2666, 2679, 2690, 2706, 2730, 2746, 2770, 2783, 2798, 2813, 2822, 2842, 2865, 2881, 2905, 2926, 2944, 2958, 2977, 2998		
_kgl_newword:n	6, 102, 3013, 3014, 3015, 3016, 3017, 3018, 3019, 3020, 3021, 3022, 3023, 3024, 3025, 3026, 3027, 3028, 3029, 3030, 3031, 3032, 3033, 3034, 3035, 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3040, 3041, 3042, 3043, 3044, 3045, 3046, 3047, 3048, 3049, 3050, 3051, 3052, 3053, 3054, 3055, 3056, 3057, 3058, 3059, 3060, 3061, 3062, 3063, 3064, 3065, 3066, 3067, 3068, 3069, 3070, 3071, 3072, 3073, 3074, 3075, 3076, 3077, 3078, 3079, 3080, 3081, 3082, 3083, 3084, 3085, 3086, 3087, 3088, 3089, 3090, 3091, 3092, 3093, 3094, 3095, 3096, 3097, 3098, 3099, 3100, 3101, 3102, 3103, 3104, 3105, 3106, 3107, 3108, 3109, 3110, 3111, 3112, 3113, 3114, 3115, 3116, 3117, 3118, 3119, 3120, 3121, 3122, 3123, 3124, 3125, 3126, 3127, 3128, 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	
_kgl_nostar:	22, 28, 58	
_kgl_number:n	32, 39, 66, 93	
_kgl_par:	57, 58, 67, 101	
\g_kgl_pars_seq	51, 73, 92, 98, 101, 3179	
_kgl_print:	6, 60, 85	
_kgl_process:nn	6, 59, 78	
_kgl_star:	21, 27, 57	
\l_kgl_start_int	49, 80, 88	
_kgl_use:n	6, 88, 90	
\g_kgl_words_seq	52, 96, 103	
	M	
\MessageBreak	14	
msg commands:		
\msg_error:nnn	70	
\msg_info:nnn	3178	
\msg_new:nnn	42	
\msg_new:nnnn	45	
\mytext	2	
	N	
\NewDocumentCommand	53, 63	
\nobreak	32	
	P	
\PackageError	11	
\par	2, 5, 22, 27	
prg commands:		
\prg_do_nothing:	67	
\ProcessOptions	41	
\ProvidesExplPackage	3	
	S	
scan commands:		
\scan_stop:	41	
seq commands:		
\seq_count:N	92, 3179	
\seq_gput_right:Nn	101, 103	
\seq_item:Nn	73, 96, 98	
\seq_new:N	51, 52	
\SplitArgument	5, 53	
	T	
TeX and L ^A T _E X 2 _ε commands:		
\ifpackageafter	8	
tex commands:		
\tex_endinput:D	17	
\textbullet	32	
tl commands:		
\c_space_tl	21, 28	
\tl_if_novalue:nTF	81	
\tl_set:Nn	73	
\l_tmpa_tl	73, 74	
	U	
use commands:		
\use:n	96	
\use_none:n	39, 66	