

The `kantlipsum` package

Dummy text in Kantian style*

Enrico Gregorio[†]

Released 2012/10/14

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

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

1 Options

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

- `par` | `nopar` With the default `par` all pieces of text will be ended by a `\par` command; specifying `par` is optional; the option `nopar` will not add this `\par` at the end of each fragment of Kantian prose.
- `numbers` Each piece of Kantian prose will be preceded by its number (such as in “1 • As any dedicated reader can clearly see. . .”), which can be useful for better control of what is produced.
- `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.

2 Commands

The commands provided by the package are:

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

*This file describes version 0.6, last revised 2012/10/14.

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

`\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.

3 kantlipsum implementation

```
1 \ProvidesExplPackage
2   {\ExplFileName}{\ExplFileDate}{\ExplFileVersion}{\ExplFileDescription}
3
4   A check to make sure that expl3 is not too old
5   \@ifpackagelater { expl3 } { 2012/07/15 }
6   {
7     \PackageError { kantlipsum } { Support-package~l3kernel~too~old. }
8     {
9       Please~install~an~up-to-date~version~of~l3kernel~
10      using~your~TeX~package~manager~or~from~CTAN.\\ \\
11      Loading~xparse~will~abort!
12    }
13  }
```

3.1 Package options and required packages

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

```
14 \DeclareOption { par }
15 {
16   \cs_set_protected:Nn \kgl_star: { \c_space_tl }
17   \cs_set_protected:Nn \kgl_nostar: { \par }
18 }
19
20 \DeclareOption{ nopar }
21 {
22   \cs_set_protected:Nn \kgl_star: { \par }
23   \cs_set_protected:Nn \kgl_nostar: { \c_space_tl }
24 }
25
26 \DeclareOption{ numbers }
27 { \cs_set_protected:Nn \kgl_number:n { #1\nobreakspace\textbullet\nobreakspace } }
28
29 \bool_new:N \g_kgl_makeindex_bool
30 \bool_gset_false:N \g_kgl_makeindex_bool
31 \DeclareOption{ index }
32 { \bool_gset_true:N \g_kgl_makeindex_bool }
33
34 \cs_new_eq:NN \kgl_number:n \use_none:n
35 \ExecuteOptions{par}
36 \ProcessOptions \scan_stop:
37   The xparse package is required.
38 \RequirePackage{xparse}
```

3.2 Messages

We define two messages.

```
38 \msg_new:nnn {kantlipsum}{how-many}
39 {The~package~provides~paragraphs~1~to~#1.~
40   Values~outside~this~range~will~be~ignored.}
41 \msg_new:nnnn {kantlipsum}{already-defined}
42 {Control~sequence~#1~already~defined.}
43 {The~control~sequence~#1~is~already~defined,~
44   I'll~ignore~it}
```

3.3 Variables and constants

The `\l_kgl_start_int` variable will contain the starting number for processing, while `\l_kgl_end_int` the ending number. The `\g_kgl_pars_seq` sequence will contain the pseudokantian sentences and `\g_kgl_words_seq` that contains the words to index.

```
45 \int_new:N \l_kgl_start_int
46 \int_new:N \l_kgl_end_int
47 \seq_new:N \g_kgl_pars_seq
48 \seq_new:N \g_kgl_words_seq
```

3.4 User level commands

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

`\kant`

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

```
49 \NewDocumentCommand{\kant}{s>{\SplitArgument{1}{-}}0{1-7}}
50 {
51   \group_begin:
52   \IfBooleanTF{#1}
53     { \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_par: \kgl_star: }
54     { \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_par: \kgl_nostar: }
55   \kgl_process:nn #2
56   \kgl_print:
57   \group_end:
58 }
```

`\kantdef`

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

```
59 \NewDocumentCommand{\kantdef}{mm}
60 {
61   \group_begin:
62   \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_number:n \use_none:n
63   \cs_set_eq:NN \kgl_par: \prg_do_nothing:
64   \cs_if_exist:NTF #1
65     {
66       \msg_error:nnn {kantlipsum} {already-defined} {#1}
67     }
68     {
69       \tl_set:Nx \l_tmpa_tl { \seq_item:Nn \g_kgl_pars_seq {#2} }
70       \cs_new:Npx #1 { \l_tmpa_tl }
71     }
72   \group_end:
73 }
```

3.5 Internal functions

\kgl_process:n

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

```

74 \cs_new_protected:Nn \kgl_process:n
75 {
76   \int_set:Nn \l_kgl_start_int {#1}
77   \IfNoValueTF{#2}
78     { \int_set:Nn \l_kgl_end_int {#1} }
79     { \int_set:Nn \l_kgl_end_int {#2} }
80 }
```

\kgl_print:
\kgl_use:n

The printing routine is in the function `\kgl_print:`; we start a loop printing item number x in the sequence `\g_kgl_pars_seq` for all numbers x in the specified range. The function `\kgl_use:n` function is a wrapper to be used with `\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_kgl_words_seq` is used; the page reference might not be correct, though.

```

81 \cs_new_protected:Nn \kgl_print:
82 {
83   \int_step_function:nnnN
84     {\l_kgl_start_int} {1} {\l_kgl_end_int} \kgl_use:n
85 }
86 \cs_new:Nn \kgl_use:n
87 {
88   \kgl_number:n {#1}
89   \bool_if:NT \g_kgl_makeindex_bool
90     {
91     \use:x { \exp_not:N \index{ \seq_item:Nn \g_kgl_words_seq {#1} } }
92     }
93   \seq_item:Nn \g_kgl_pars_seq {#1}
94 }
```

\kgl_newpara:n

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

```

95 \cs_new_protected:Nn \kgl_newpara:n
96 { \seq_gput_right:Nn \g_kgl_pars_seq {#1\kgl_par:} }
```

\kgl_newword:n

The `\kgl_newword:n` appends a new item to the sequence `\g_kgl_words_seq` consisting of one word from the corresponding paragraph.

```

97 \cs_new_protected:Nn \kgl_newword:n
98 { \seq_gput_right:Nn \g_kgl_words_seq {#1} }
```

3.6 Defining the sentences

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

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

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

162

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

187

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

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

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

226
227 \kgl_newpara:n {Thus, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of, on
228 the other hand, natural causes, as will easily be shown in the next
229 section. Still, the reader should be careful to observe that the
230 phenomena have lying before them the intelligible objects in space and
231 time, because of the relation between the manifold and the noumena.
232 As is evident upon close examination, Aristotle tells us that, in
233 reference to ends, our judgements (and the reader should be careful to
234 observe that this is the case) constitute the whole content of the
235 empirical objects in space and time. Our experience, with the sole
236 exception of necessity, exists in metaphysics; therefore, metaphysics
237 exists in our experience. (It must not be supposed that the thing in
238 itself (and I assert that this is true) may not contradict itself, but
239 it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the
240 transcendental unity of apperception; certainly, our judgements exist
241 in natural causes.) The reader should be careful to observe that,
242 indeed, the Ideal, on the other hand, can be treated like the noumena,
243 but natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the Antinomies.
244 The transcendental unity of apperception constitutes the whole content
245 for the noumena, by means of analytic unity.}

246
247 \kgl_newpara:n {In all theoretical sciences, the paralogsms of human
248 reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals.
249 The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the
250 Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogsms
251 should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone
252 been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions
253 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must
254 be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of

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

256

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

270

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

284

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

308

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

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

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

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

363 however, formal logic; in the case of the manifold, the objects in
364 space and time can be treated like the paralogisms of natural reason.
365 This is what chiefly concerns us.}

366
367 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between pure logic and natural
368 causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that,
369 even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes
370 the whole content for our concepts, but the Ideal of practical reason
371 may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
372 contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why
373 natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by
374 means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as
375 our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions,
376 depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle.
377 It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is
378 the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The
379 Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet
380 general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing
381 to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to
382 the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on
383 analytic principles.}

384
385 \kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of our a priori knowledge, our
386 faculties have nothing to do with our faculties. Pure reason (and we
387 can deduce that this is true) would thereby be made to contradict the
388 phenomena. As we have already seen, let us suppose that the
389 transcendental aesthetic can thereby determine in its totality the
390 objects in space and time. We can deduce that, that is to say, our
391 experience is a representation of the paralogisms, and our
392 hypothetical judgements constitute the whole content of our concepts.
393 However, it is obvious that time can be treated like our a priori
394 knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Philosophy has nothing to do
395 with natural causes.}

396
397 \kgl_newpara:n {By means of analysis, our faculties stand in need to,
398 indeed, the empirical objects in space and time. The objects in space
399 and time, for these reasons, have nothing to do with our
400 understanding. There can be no doubt that the noumena can not take
401 account of the objects in space and time; consequently, the Ideal of
402 natural reason has lying before it the noumena. By means of analysis,
403 the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to, therefore,
404 space, yet our sense perceptions exist in the discipline of practical
405 reason.}

406
407 \kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal can not take account of, so far as I know,
408 our faculties. As we have already seen, the objects in space and time
409 are what first give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of
410 empirical conditions; for these reasons, our a posteriori concepts
411 have nothing to do with the paralogisms of pure reason. As we have
412 already seen, metaphysics, by means of the Ideal, occupies part of the
413 sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the objects in
414 space and time in general, yet time excludes the possibility of our
415 sense perceptions. I assert, thus, that our faculties would thereby
416 be made to contradict, indeed, our knowledge. Natural causes, so

417 regarded, exist in our judgements.}

418

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

437

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

455

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

471
472 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves have lying before them the
473 Antinomies, by virtue of human reason. By means of the transcendental
474 aesthetic, let us suppose that the discipline of natural reason
475 depends on natural causes, because of the relation between the
476 transcendental aesthetic and the things in themselves. In view of
477 these considerations, it is obvious that natural causes are the clue
478 to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception, by means
479 of analysis. We can deduce that our faculties, in particular, can be
480 treated like the thing in itself; in the study of metaphysics, the
481 thing in itself proves the validity of space. And can I entertain the
482 Transcendental Deduction in thought, or does it present itself to me?
483 By means of analysis, the phenomena can not take account of natural
484 causes. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}
485

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

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

525 causes would thereby be made to contradict, with the sole exception of
526 necessity, the things in themselves, because of our necessary
527 ignorance of the conditions. But to this matter no answer is
528 possible.}

529

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

545

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

564

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

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

591
592 \kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, the transcendental unity of
593 apperception has nothing to do with the Antinomies. As will easily be
594 shown in the next section, our sense perceptions are by their very
595 nature contradictory, but our ideas, with the sole exception of human
596 reason, have nothing to do with our sense perceptions. Metaphysics is
597 the key to understanding natural causes, by means of analysis. It is
598 not at all certain that the paralogisms of human reason prove the
599 validity of, thus, the noumena, since all of our a posteriori
600 judgements are a priori. We can deduce that, indeed, the objects in
601 space and time can not take account of the Transcendental Deduction,
602 but our knowledge, on the other hand, would be falsified.}

603
604 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, our understanding is the clue
605 to the discovery of necessity. On the other hand, the Ideal of pure
606 reason is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known
607 a posteriori, as is evident upon close examination. It is obvious
608 that the transcendental aesthetic, certainly, is a body of
609 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori; in view
610 of these considerations, the noumena are the clue to the discovery of,
611 so far as I know, natural causes. In the case of space, our
612 experience depends on the Ideal of natural reason, as we have already
613 seen.}

614
615 \kgl_newpara:n {For these reasons, space is the key to understanding
616 the thing in itself. Our sense perceptions abstract from all content
617 of a priori knowledge, but the phenomena can never, as a whole,
618 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they are
619 just as necessary as disjunctive principles. Our problematic
620 judgements constitute the whole content of time. By means of
621 analysis, our ideas are by their very nature contradictory, and our a
622 posteriori concepts are a representation of natural causes. I assert
623 that the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
624 contradict, so far as regards the thing in itself, the Transcendental
625 Deduction; in natural theology, the noumena are the clue to the
626 discovery of, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction.}

627
628 \kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
629 explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the
630 transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet
631 the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental
632 Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would

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

644
645 \kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the
646 case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural
647 theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
648 content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural
649 theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the
650 Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this
651 relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts
652 would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in
653 the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory.
654 Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a
655 representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words,
656 has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us
657 that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the
658 Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.}

659
660 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves can not take account of the
661 Transcendental Deduction. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious
662 that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical
663 sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the
664 transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these
665 terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense
666 perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some
667 of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the
668 possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in
669 themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles
670 of philosophy, our sense perceptions.}

671
672 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, philosophy is
673 the mere result of the power of pure logic, a blind but indispensable
674 function of the soul; however, the phenomena can never, as a whole,
675 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like general logic,
676 they exclude the possibility of problematic principles. To avoid all
677 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the never-ending
678 regress in the series of empirical conditions is by its very nature
679 contradictory. It must not be supposed that our a priori concepts
680 stand in need to natural causes, because of the relation between the
681 Ideal and our ideas. (We can deduce that the Antinomies would be
682 falsified.) Since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori, what
683 we have alone been able to show is that, in the full sense of these
684 terms, necessity (and we can deduce that this is true) is the key to
685 understanding time, but the Ideal of natural reason is just as
686 necessary as our experience. As will easily be shown in the next

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

690
691 \kgl_newpara:n {By means of the transcendental aesthetic, it remains a
692 mystery why the phenomena (and it is not at all certain that this is
693 the case) are the clue to the discovery of the never-ending regress in
694 the series of empirical conditions. In all theoretical sciences,
695 metaphysics exists in the objects in space and time, because of the
696 relation between formal logic and our synthetic judgements. The
697 Categories would thereby be made to contradict the paralogisms, as any
698 dedicated reader can clearly see. Therefore, there can be no doubt
699 that the paralogisms have nothing to do with, so far as regards the
700 Ideal and our faculties, the paralogisms, because of our necessary
701 ignorance of the conditions. It must not be supposed that the objects
702 in space and time occupy part of the sphere of necessity concerning
703 the existence of the noumena in general. In natural theology, the
704 things in themselves, therefore, are by their very nature
705 contradictory, by virtue of natural reason. This is the sense in
706 which it is to be understood in this work.}

707
708 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose
709 that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts
710 are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to
711 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in
712 particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of
713 natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful
714 to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in
715 space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our
716 understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the
717 thing in itself abstracts from all content of a posteriori knowledge.
718 We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can
719 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal
720 of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality
721 speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as
722 necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the
723 Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove
724 the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to
725 understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

726
727 \kgl_newpara:n {Natural causes, when thus treated as the things in
728 themselves, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge, by
729 means of analytic unity. Our a posteriori knowledge, in other words,
730 is the key to understanding the Antinomies. As we have already seen,
731 what we have alone been able to show is that, so far as I know, the
732 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the
733 manifold. The things in themselves are the clue to the discovery of,
734 in the case of the Ideal of natural reason, our concepts. To avoid
735 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, so far as
736 regards philosophy, the discipline of human reason, for these reasons,
737 is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
738 priori, but our faculties, consequently, would thereby be made to
739 contradict the Antinomies. It remains a mystery why our understanding
740 excludes the possibility of, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the

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

748

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

768

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

784

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

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

800

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

816

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

836

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

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

851

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

868

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

889

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

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

907

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

926

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

943

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

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

958

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

976

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

992

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

1010

1011 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that, for
1012 example, pure logic depends on the transcendental unity of
1013 apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our a priori
1014 concepts are what first give rise to the Categories. Hume tells us
1015 that our ideas are just as necessary as, on the other hand, natural
1016 causes; however, natural causes should only be used as a canon for our
1017 faculties. For these reasons, to avoid all misapprehension, it is
1018 necessary to explain that our ideas are the clue to the discovery of
1019 our understanding, as is shown in the writings of Hume. (By virtue of
1020 natural reason, the employment of our disjunctive judgements, then, is
1021 by its very nature contradictory.) By virtue of natural reason, the
1022 Categories can not take account of our hypothetical judgements. The
1023 transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
1024 content of, consequently, the transcendental unity of apperception, as
1025 will easily be shown in the next section. We thus have a pure
1026 synthesis of apprehension.}

1027

1028 \kgl_newpara:n {The Antinomies have nothing to do with our faculties.
1029 As is shown in the writings of Hume, we can deduce that, on the
1030 contrary, the empirical objects in space and time prove the validity
1031 of our ideas. The manifold may not contradict itself, but it is still
1032 possible that it may be in contradictions with our a posteriori
1033 concepts. For these reasons, the transcendental objects in space and
1034 time (and it is obvious that this is the case) have nothing to do with
1035 our faculties, as will easily be shown in the next section. What we
1036 have alone been able to show is that the phenomena constitute the
1037 whole content of the Antinomies; with the sole exception of
1038 philosophy, the Categories have lying before them formal logic. Since
1039 knowledge of the Antinomies is a posteriori, it remains a mystery why
1040 the Antinomies (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) prove
1041 the validity of the thing in itself; for these reasons, metaphysics is
1042 the mere result of the power of the employment of our sense
1043 perceptions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. As I
1044 have elsewhere shown, philosophy proves the validity of our sense
1045 perceptions.}

1046

1047 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
1048 phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our
1049 concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo
1050 tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to
1051 contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our
1052 judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to
1053 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
1054 in space and time exclude the possibility of, insomuch as pure logic
1055 relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of
1056 apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been
1057 suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the
1058 reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection
1059 between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it remains a
1060 mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated
1061 science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be
1062 shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us
1063 suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because
1064 of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of

1065 empirical conditions and the paralogsms. This distinction must have
1066 some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of
1067 empirical conditions.}

1068
1069 \kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1070 explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human
1071 reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to
1072 do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge
1073 and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our
1074 experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural
1075 causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of
1076 our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what
1077 first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena
1078 have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close
1079 examination. The paralogsms of natural reason are a representation
1080 of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise
1081 to the paralogsms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of
1082 Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.}

1083
1084 \kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that the Ideal of practical reason, even
1085 as this relates to our knowledge, is a representation of the
1086 discipline of human reason. The things in themselves are just as
1087 necessary as our understanding. The noumena prove the validity of the
1088 manifold. As will easily be shown in the next section, natural causes
1089 occupy part of the sphere of our a priori knowledge concerning the
1090 existence of the Antinomies in general. The Categories are the clue
1091 to the discovery of, consequently, the Transcendental Deduction. Our
1092 ideas are the mere results of the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a
1093 blind but indispensable function of the soul. The divisions are thus
1094 provided; all that is required is to fill them.}

1095
1096 \kgl_newpara:n {The never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1097 conditions can be treated like the objects in space and time. What we
1098 have alone been able to show is that, then, the transcendental
1099 aesthetic, in reference to ends, would thereby be made to contradict
1100 the Transcendental Deduction. The architectonic of practical reason
1101 has nothing to do with our ideas; however, time can never furnish a
1102 true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it depends on
1103 hypothetical principles. Space has nothing to do with the Antinomies,
1104 because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. In all
1105 theoretical sciences, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1106 explain that the things in themselves are a representation of, in
1107 other words, necessity, as is evident upon close examination.}

1108
1109 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a
1110 mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the
1111 discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
1112 soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself
1113 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of
1114 natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no
1115 doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the
1116 Antinomies. I assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the
1117 noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our
1118 a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our

1119 ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the
1120 architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to
1121 observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts
1122 are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic
1123 unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory
1124 rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the
1125 power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and
1126 the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of,
1127 however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to
1128 the thing in itself.}

1129

1130 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, we can deduce
1131 that the transcendental unity of apperception depends on the Ideal of
1132 practical reason. Certainly, it is obvious that the Antinomies, in
1133 accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time,
1134 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must
1135 be known a posteriori. Because of the relation between the discipline
1136 of pure reason and our a posteriori concepts, I assert that, for
1137 example, metaphysics, consequently, is by its very nature
1138 contradictory, yet the transcendental aesthetic is the key to
1139 understanding our understanding. By virtue of natural reason, the
1140 objects in space and time are what first give rise to, when thus
1141 treated as the paralogisms of human reason, the things in themselves,
1142 but the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions can
1143 not take account of the architectonic of human reason. What we have
1144 alone been able to show is that natural causes, irrespective of all
1145 empirical conditions, exist in the objects in space and time, as is
1146 shown in the writings of Hume. By virtue of practical reason, our
1147 sense perceptions are what first give rise to, irrespective of all
1148 empirical conditions, necessity. Our sense perceptions, in the study
1149 of necessity, would thereby be made to contradict transcendental
1150 logic; consequently, natural reason stands in need of the objects in
1151 space and time. There can be no doubt that, in other words, the
1152 paralogisms of natural reason have nothing to do with the thing in
1153 itself, but the paralogisms prove the validity of transcendental
1154 logic.}

1155

1156 \kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as
1157 necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in
1158 space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do
1159 with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the
1160 noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of
1161 the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1162 Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in
1163 themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
1164 transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the
1165 phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions,
1166 yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
1167 demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole
1168 content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense
1169 perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with
1170 the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility
1171 of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is
1172 still possible that it may be in contradictions with, thus, our sense

1173 perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
1174 that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all
1175 empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.}

1176

1177 \kgl_newpara:n {It remains a mystery why our sense perceptions prove
1178 the validity of our a priori concepts. The objects in space and time,
1179 then, exist in metaphysics; therefore, the things in themselves can
1180 not take account of the transcendental aesthetic. The Ideal of pure
1181 reason can thereby determine in its totality, that is to say, our
1182 ideas, and space constitutes the whole content for the discipline of
1183 human reason. The paralogisms of pure reason are just as necessary
1184 as, in all theoretical sciences, our knowledge. The things in
1185 themselves constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of
1186 this body must be known a posteriori.}

1187

1188 \kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, the
1189 Transcendental Deduction exists in the Ideal. To avoid all
1190 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that pure reason (and it
1191 is obvious that this is true) is the key to understanding the
1192 transcendental unity of apperception. The reader should be careful to
1193 observe that our experience depends on necessity. It is obvious that
1194 space, thus, can be treated like the objects in space and time,
1195 because of the relation between the transcendental unity of
1196 apperception and the objects in space and time. It must not be
1197 supposed that, even as this relates to natural reason, the Antinomies
1198 (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) exclude the
1199 possibility of the empirical objects in space and time, yet philosophy
1200 proves the validity of practical reason. The things in themselves, on
1201 the contrary, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge; in
1202 all theoretical sciences, the noumena (and there can be no doubt that
1203 this is the case) are just as necessary as the Antinomies. As is
1204 shown in the writings of Galileo, I assert, in natural theology, that
1205 the transcendental aesthetic, thus, exists in our faculties. Our
1206 faculties are just as necessary as the Categories, yet the manifold
1207 has lying before it, certainly, our understanding.}

1208

1209 \kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the never-ending regress in the
1210 series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it is
1211 still possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic
1212 of practical reason. The objects in space and time, so regarded,
1213 should only be used as a canon for the architectonic of human reason,
1214 as is proven in the ontological manuals. In all theoretical sciences,
1215 the Antinomies can not take account of our concepts, because of our
1216 necessary ignorance of the conditions. By means of analysis, the
1217 things in themselves are a representation of our experience; for these
1218 reasons, the paralogisms of practical reason have lying before them
1219 our inductive judgements. Still, the architectonic of pure reason is
1220 just as necessary as the never-ending regress in the series of
1221 empirical conditions.}

1222

1223 \kgl_newpara:n {Thus, transcendental logic (and I assert, for these
1224 reasons, that this is true) depends on the Antinomies. Still, general
1225 logic (and it remains a mystery why this is true) is what first gives
1226 rise to the objects in space and time, because of the relation between

1227 metaphysics and the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next
1228 section, the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
1229 and some of this body must be known a priori. On the other hand, the
1230 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in the
1231 case of the Transcendental Deduction, exists in the noumena, as is
1232 proven in the ontological manuals. By means of analytic unity, it
1233 remains a mystery why our judgements are by their very nature
1234 contradictory; however, the objects in space and time exclude the
1235 possibility of the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly
1236 see, the Antinomies would thereby be made to contradict the
1237 transcendental aesthetic; in natural theology, our faculties
1238 constitute the whole content of, for these reasons, the noumena.
1239 However, the objects in space and time are what first give rise to our
1240 understanding, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.}

1241
1242 \kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the Antinomies have nothing to do
1243 with pure reason, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1244 conditions. Our speculative judgements are what first give rise to
1245 the Categories. Time is the key to understanding natural causes, as
1246 is evident upon close examination. Galileo tells us that the objects
1247 in space and time, irrespective of all empirical conditions, should
1248 only be used as a canon for our sense perceptions, since knowledge of
1249 the noumena is a priori. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction
1250 depends on our concepts. By means of analytic unity, our sense
1251 perceptions constitute the whole content of the manifold. In natural
1252 theology, the discipline of natural reason, on the other hand, would
1253 be falsified, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

1254
1255 \kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the discipline of human reason, it is
1256 obvious that the phenomena, still, are the mere results of the power
1257 of the practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind
1258 but indispensable function of the soul, by means of analysis. As any
1259 dedicated reader can clearly see, Aristotle tells us that natural
1260 causes constitute the whole content of, as I have elsewhere shown, the
1261 pure employment of the paralogisms. Aristotle tells us that,
1262 irrespective of all empirical conditions, the thing in itself, indeed,
1263 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1264 architectonic of practical reason, it has lying before it analytic
1265 principles, yet the Categories have nothing to do with the objects in
1266 space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
1267 human reason is just as necessary as our concepts, yet the practical
1268 employment of the paralogisms is the mere result of the power of
1269 metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For
1270 these reasons, Hume tells us that natural causes have nothing to do
1271 with the transcendental unity of apperception, by means of analytic
1272 unity. The Antinomies can not take account of the Antinomies, because
1273 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. I assert, in all
1274 theoretical sciences, that, that is to say, natural causes would
1275 thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, the Ideal of natural
1276 reason. Hume tells us that our ideas abstract from all content of a
1277 posteriori knowledge, as is evident upon close examination.}

1278
1279 \kgl_newpara:n {The manifold is a representation of the phenomena.
1280 Our judgements constitute the whole content of, on the other hand, the

1281 things in themselves, as will easily be shown in the next section. By
1282 means of analytic unity, the phenomena, in the full sense of these
1283 terms, should only be used as a canon for the Ideal of human reason.
1284 It is obvious that, so far as regards metaphysics and our judgements,
1285 pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is the key
1286 to understanding time. In the study of formal logic, the paralogisms
1287 of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.}

1288
1289 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that the never-ending regress in
1290 the series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it
1291 is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, indeed, our
1292 sense perceptions. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
1293 architectonic of practical reason proves the validity of, in all
1294 theoretical sciences, metaphysics; in view of these considerations,
1295 our knowledge depends on our faculties. Since knowledge of our sense
1296 perceptions is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary
1297 to explain that natural reason is what first gives rise to our
1298 faculties. There can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these
1299 terms, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the Transcendental
1300 Deduction. (In view of these considerations, the empirical objects in
1301 space and time are by their very nature contradictory.) It is obvious
1302 that the objects in space and time can not take account of the
1303 transcendental objects in space and time, as is proven in the
1304 ontological manuals. As is evident upon close examination, what we
1305 have alone been able to show is that the objects in space and time are
1306 the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
1307 function of the soul. The divisions are thus provided; all that is
1308 required is to fill them.}

1309
1310 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, the Antinomies are a
1311 representation of the Categories. Necessity stands in need of the
1312 Antinomies. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies have lying
1313 before them the Ideal of pure reason; on the other hand, the
1314 Antinomies have nothing to do with natural causes. As I have
1315 elsewhere shown, the reader should be careful to observe that the
1316 things in themselves would thereby be made to contradict, in so far as
1317 this expounds the universal rules of our faculties, our ideas. I
1318 assert that, in so far as this expounds the necessary rules of human
1319 reason, our concepts (and we can deduce that this is the case) prove
1320 the validity of space, but our sense perceptions, so far as regards
1321 the transcendental unity of apperception, can never, as a whole,
1322 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1323 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they have
1324 nothing to do with disjunctive principles. But we have fallen short
1325 of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of
1326 necessity.}

1327
1328 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
1329 abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently,
1330 the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of
1331 the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories
1332 in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute
1333 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
1334 posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be

1335 treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for
1336 example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but
1337 indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of
1338 Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not
1339 be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in
1340 view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the
1341 objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of
1342 the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our
1343 necessary ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the
1344 manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first
1345 gives rise to space.}

1346
1347 \kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, our experience
1348 occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal concerning the existence of
1349 the objects in space and time in general, as will easily be shown in
1350 the next section. It must not be supposed that our ideas (and it
1351 remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of the
1352 intelligible objects in space and time. Consequently, the
1353 Transcendental Deduction can thereby determine in its totality, in
1354 other words, our ideas, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1355 conditions. (In natural theology, our concepts abstract from all
1356 content of a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological
1357 manuals.) I assert, in the case of the manifold, that human reason is
1358 a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
1359 posteriori, by virtue of human reason. As is proven in the
1360 ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the thing in itself, so
1361 far as I know, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
1362 because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as
1363 necessary as a priori principles.}

1364
1365 \kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1366 explain that philosophy can not take account of our sense perceptions;
1367 in the study of the discipline of natural reason, our experience, in
1368 the study of the architectonic of practical reason, is the mere result
1369 of the power of pure logic, a blind but indispensable function of the
1370 soul. As is evident upon close examination, the noumena are what
1371 first give rise to, on the contrary, the phenomena, but natural
1372 reason, that is to say, excludes the possibility of our hypothetical
1373 judgements. The objects in space and time are the clue to the
1374 discovery of the thing in itself, because of our necessary ignorance
1375 of the conditions. Therefore, there can be no doubt that the
1376 architectonic of practical reason depends on the Antinomies, because
1377 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Human reason (and there
1378 can be no doubt that this is true) depends on our understanding, but
1379 the Ideal can thereby determine in its totality metaphysics.}

1380
1381 \kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
1382 posteriori, general logic, in respect of the intelligible character,
1383 is by its very nature contradictory. By means of analytic unity, it
1384 is not at all certain that space, inasmuch as our understanding relies
1385 on our sense perceptions, would thereby be made to contradict the
1386 Ideal. By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are just as
1387 necessary as, indeed, the thing in itself. The manifold, as I have
1388 elsewhere shown, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it

1389 must be known a priori. There can be no doubt that, in particular,
1390 the phenomena are a representation of pure logic, yet our sense
1391 perceptions have lying before them our sense perceptions. I assert,
1392 as I have elsewhere shown, that, indeed, our experience (and let us
1393 suppose that this is true) excludes the possibility of the objects in
1394 space and time, and the discipline of human reason, in accordance with
1395 the principles of the transcendental unity of apperception, occupies
1396 part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of
1397 the phenomena in general.}

1398

1399 \kgl_newpara:n {Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true)
1400 proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid
1401 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the employment of
1402 the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The
1403 transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the
1404 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly,
1405 our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the
1406 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we
1407 have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and
1408 time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance
1409 with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending
1410 regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our
1411 ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the
1412 phenomena.}

1413

1414 \kgl_newpara:n {Necessity, as I have elsewhere shown, is the mere
1415 result of the power of the architectonic of practical reason, a blind
1416 but indispensable function of the soul. The paralogisms of pure
1417 reason are the clue to the discovery of the practical employment of
1418 the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the never-ending
1419 regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it the
1420 paralogisms of human reason; with the sole exception of the
1421 architectonic of pure reason, transcendental logic is just as
1422 necessary as, then, our judgements. What we have alone been able to
1423 show is that our synthetic judgements have lying before them, when
1424 thus treated as space, our knowledge, by means of analysis. By virtue
1425 of natural reason, the transcendental aesthetic can be treated like
1426 general logic, yet the objects in space and time are just as necessary
1427 as the noumena. }

1428

1429 \kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, let us suppose that
1430 the Categories exclude the possibility of the never-ending regress in
1431 the series of empirical conditions. The manifold occupies part of the
1432 sphere of the thing in itself concerning the existence of the things
1433 in themselves in general, and formal logic, indeed, would be
1434 falsified. It is not at all certain that, in reference to ends, the
1435 discipline of practical reason, for example, occupies part of the
1436 sphere of the discipline of practical reason concerning the existence
1437 of our ampliative judgements in general, yet general logic is by its
1438 very nature contradictory. Since all of our judgements are a priori,
1439 there can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these terms, the
1440 phenomena can not take account of the transcendental objects in space
1441 and time. The architectonic of pure reason (and it is not at all
1442 certain that this is true) stands in need of the things in themselves.

1443 Philosophy is the key to understanding, thus, our sense perceptions.
1444 This is what chiefly concerns us.}

1445

1446 \kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding would thereby be made to contradict,
1447 so far as regards the Ideal, necessity. Our faculties, as I have
1448 elsewhere shown, are the mere results of the power of time, a blind
1449 but indispensable function of the soul. Time, with the sole exception
1450 of formal logic, would be falsified, but the Ideal can not take
1451 account of our sense perceptions. It is not at all certain that the
1452 Antinomies are what first give rise to our experience; thus, our a
1453 posteriori concepts are the clue to the discovery of, so regarded, the
1454 practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Natural causes
1455 occupy part of the sphere of practical reason concerning the existence
1456 of the paralogisms of pure reason in general; in view of these
1457 considerations, the noumena exclude the possibility of the employment
1458 of the objects in space and time. The manifold is what first gives
1459 rise to the paralogisms, but our judgements are the clue to the
1460 discovery of, in the study of the thing in itself, the discipline of
1461 practical reason.}

1462

1463 \kgl_newpara:n {Our a priori concepts, with the sole exception of our
1464 experience, have lying before them our judgements. It must not be
1465 supposed that the Antinomies are a representation of the discipline of
1466 human reason, by means of analytic unity. In the study of the
1467 transcendental aesthetic, the paralogisms constitute a body of
1468 demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
1469 posteriori. The Categories are the mere results of the power of the
1470 thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1471 Because of the relation between pure reason and the paralogisms of
1472 human reason, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
1473 that, indeed, the objects in space and time (and to avoid all
1474 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is the case) are
1475 a representation of our concepts, yet the Ideal can be treated like
1476 our inductive judgements. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
1477 our understanding would thereby be made to contradict, thus, the
1478 Transcendental Deduction; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena
1479 abstract from all content of knowledge. The thing in itself excludes
1480 the possibility of philosophy; therefore, space, for example, teaches
1481 us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of metaphysics. We can
1482 deduce that the noumena (and it must not be supposed that this is the
1483 case) are a representation of the transcendental unity of
1484 apperception; with the sole exception of the thing in itself, our
1485 sense perceptions, as I have elsewhere shown, can never, as a whole,
1486 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1487 transcendental unity of apperception, they exclude the possibility of
1488 hypothetical principles.}

1489

1490 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of our faculties are speculative, our ideas
1491 should only be used as a canon for time. With the sole exception of
1492 the manifold, our concepts exclude the possibility of the practical
1493 employment of metaphysics, by means of analysis. Aristotle tells us
1494 that necessity (and it is obvious that this is true) would thereby be
1495 made to contradict the thing in itself, because of our necessary
1496 ignorance of the conditions. As is proven in the ontological manuals,

1497 metaphysics (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby
1498 determine in its totality the Ideal. In the study of the
1499 transcendental unity of apperception, it is obvious that the phenomena
1500 have nothing to do with, therefore, natural causes, by means of
1501 analysis. Has it ever been suggested that it must not be supposed
1502 that there is no relation between the paralogisms of practical reason
1503 and the Antinomies? Time, indeed, is a representation of the
1504 Antinomies. The paralogisms of human reason are the clue to the
1505 discovery of natural causes, by means of analysis. Let us suppose
1506 that, in other words, the manifold, that is to say, abstracts from all
1507 content of knowledge.}

1508
1509 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle
1510 tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated
1511 like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding,
1512 our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The
1513 reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human
1514 reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the
1515 existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the
1516 validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude
1517 the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our
1518 a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series
1519 of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since
1520 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental
1521 aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
1522 like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with
1523 ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.}

1524
1525 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that the objects in space and
1526 time have nothing to do with our judgements. The architectonic of
1527 human reason has nothing to do with the noumena. What we have alone
1528 been able to show is that natural causes have nothing to do with,
1529 still, our a priori concepts, as we have already seen. As any
1530 dedicated reader can clearly see, it remains a mystery why, for
1531 example, our ideas, with the sole exception of the thing in itself,
1532 can not take account of the objects in space and time. It remains a
1533 mystery why our faculties are a representation of the transcendental
1534 aesthetic. Our ideas, in reference to ends, can never, as a whole,
1535 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the discipline
1536 of natural reason, they are a representation of synthetic principles.
1537 The transcendental unity of apperception is just as necessary as, in
1538 view of these considerations, our ampliative judgements; with the sole
1539 exception of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in itself (and it
1540 remains a mystery why this is true) is the clue to the discovery of
1541 our speculative judgements.}

1542
1543 \kgl_newpara:n {As I have elsewhere shown, the Ideal is a body of
1544 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori, as is
1545 evident upon close examination. Our ideas abstract from all content
1546 of knowledge, and the phenomena have nothing to do with, then,
1547 necessity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the empirical
1548 objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, in other words,
1549 our sense perceptions. It must not be supposed that, then, the
1550 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions stands in

1551 need of, certainly, the Ideal of natural reason, yet pure reason can
1552 not take account of the objects in space and time. The noumena, in
1553 all theoretical sciences, prove the validity of the practical
1554 employment of the manifold; in natural theology, the phenomena are
1555 just as necessary as the paralogisms. It is not at all certain that
1556 our concepts have lying before them our faculties, by means of
1557 analytic unity. It is not at all certain that the architectonic of
1558 practical reason, then, is what first gives rise to necessity; still,
1559 our concepts stand in need to the objects in space and time.}

1560
1561 \kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are
1562 the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown
1563 in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the
1564 possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason
1565 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like
1566 philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic
1567 principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy,
1568 our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in
1569 natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still
1570 possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The
1571 thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.)
1572 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose
1573 that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the
1574 things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from
1575 all content of a priori knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole
1576 content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the
1577 necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the
1578 transcendental aesthetic. }

1579
1580 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, when
1581 thus treated as the phenomena, the transcendental unity of
1582 apperception can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of human
1583 reason. There can be no doubt that natural causes can not take
1584 account of, certainly, the phenomena, since none of the paralogisms
1585 are hypothetical. We can deduce that the transcendental aesthetic is
1586 a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori.
1587 Hume tells us that, for example, our a posteriori knowledge
1588 constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, yet the
1589 discipline of pure reason, when thus treated as our understanding,
1590 constitutes the whole content for the empirical objects in space and
1591 time. The discipline of pure reason occupies part of the sphere of
1592 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
1593 concerning the existence of the things in themselves in general;
1594 consequently, the architectonic of natural reason (and what we have
1595 alone been able to show is that this is true) is the clue to the
1596 discovery of the objects in space and time.}

1597
1598 \kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas
1599 would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects
1600 in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery
1601 why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the
1602 Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of
1603 empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not
1604 take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would

1605 thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in
1606 natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation
1607 of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our
1608 concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the
1609 Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to
1610 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
1611 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore,
1612 necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere
1613 of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
1614 intelligible objects in space and time in general.}

1615
1616 \kgl_newpara:n {Still, time is by its very nature contradictory. The
1617 paralogisms of practical reason constitute a body of demonstrated
1618 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; for these
1619 reasons, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the
1620 transcendental aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the
1621 soul. On the other hand, Aristotle tells us that our a posteriori
1622 concepts are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the transcendental
1623 unity of apperception. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the
1624 discipline of pure reason can not take account of our faculties. It
1625 must not be supposed that the Ideal, in particular, can never furnish
1626 a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it is the clue to
1627 the discovery of problematic principles, since knowledge of the
1628 objects in space and time is a priori. The Categories are what first
1629 give rise to the Transcendental Deduction.}

1630
1631 \kgl_newpara:n {Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist
1632 in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the
1633 phenomena. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
1634 paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our
1635 understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space
1636 and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when
1637 thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated
1638 science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements
1639 stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to
1640 observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole
1641 content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure
1642 logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere
1643 results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
1644 function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding
1645 can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
1646 it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be
1647 in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our
1648 knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the
1649 noumena.}

1650
1651 \kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our a posteriori concepts are synthetic,
1652 applied logic has nothing to do with, for example, the noumena. With
1653 the sole exception of philosophy, the Ideal of practical reason is
1654 what first gives rise to our ideas, as is evident upon close
1655 examination. The reader should be careful to observe that the pure
1656 employment of our understanding is what first gives rise to the
1657 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, by virtue
1658 of natural reason. By virtue of natural reason, there can be no doubt

1659 that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the architectonic of
1660 natural reason (and we can deduce that this is true) has nothing to do
1661 with space, but our judgements (and what we have alone been able to do
1662 show is that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of the
1663 paralogisms of human reason. (The things in themselves, however,
1664 exist in the thing in itself, and natural causes can not take account
1665 of the objects in space and time.) We can deduce that the thing in
1666 itself has lying before it the Transcendental Deduction, by virtue of
1667 pure reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, to avoid all
1668 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in other words, the
1669 objects in space and time can not take account of the noumena, but the
1670 empirical objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
1671 metaphysics, exist in the empirical objects in space and time. }

1672
1673 \kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the reader should be careful to
1674 observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and
1675 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby
1676 be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of
1677 the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human
1678 reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for
1679 the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the
1680 universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason.
1681 To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
1682 thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have
1683 already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the
1684 noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of
1685 the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical
1686 reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time.
1687 Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case)
1688 prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense
1689 perceptions is a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete
1690 system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay
1691 the simple mention of the fact may suffice.}

1692
1693 \kgl_newpara:n {Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the
1694 employment of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1695 conditions, but our a priori concepts can never, as a whole, furnish a
1696 true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, they would
1697 thereby be made to contradict problematic principles. What we have
1698 alone been able to show is that our sense perceptions have nothing to
1699 do with, certainly, the Transcendental Deduction. As any dedicated
1700 reader can clearly see, it is obvious that the objects in space and
1701 time constitute the whole content of metaphysics; still, the things in
1702 themselves are the clue to the discovery of pure reason. The Ideal
1703 (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is a representation of
1704 our faculties. The discipline of practical reason is a representation
1705 of, in other words, the Ideal of pure reason. It is not at all
1706 certain that the things in themselves have lying before them the
1707 Antinomies; certainly, the employment of our sense perceptions
1708 abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. The paralogisms of
1709 pure reason should only be used as a canon for time.}

1710
1711 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the
1712 paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive

1713 judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural
1714 reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The
1715 discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and
1716 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it
1717 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive
1718 principles. The paralogsms of pure reason (and what we have alone
1719 been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole
1720 content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should
1721 only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes,
1722 consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in
1723 itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since
1724 knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us
1725 suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the
1726 things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of
1727 pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense
1728 perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts
1729 from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should
1730 only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.}

1731
1732 \kgl_newpara:n {Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before
1733 them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in
1734 space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental
1735 aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so
1736 regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The
1737 Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics,
1738 a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the
1739 noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and
1740 time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will
1741 easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us
1742 suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still
1743 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the
1744 intelligible character, the transcendental unity of apperception;
1745 however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying
1746 before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because
1747 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be
1748 careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still,
1749 exists in natural causes.}

1750
1751 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the objects in space and time are
1752 analytic, it remains a mystery why, in the full sense of these terms,
1753 the objects in space and time have lying before them the Categories,
1754 and our ideas (and let us suppose that this is the case) have lying
1755 before them our problematic judgements. In the study of our
1756 understanding, there can be no doubt that necessity (and it is obvious
1757 that this is true) is a representation of the architectonic of natural
1758 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of
1759 the Antinomies is a posteriori, our faculties would thereby be made to
1760 contradict our sense perceptions. As will easily be shown in the next
1761 section, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1762 conditions, in the case of our experience, can be treated like the
1763 phenomena, and the Categories exclude the possibility of, thus, our
1764 knowledge. In which of our cognitive faculties are natural causes and
1765 the objects in space and time connected together? Still, the
1766 Transcendental Deduction stands in need of natural reason. There can

1767 be no doubt that the manifold, when thus treated as the things in
1768 themselves, is by its very nature contradictory.}

1769

1770 \kgl_newpara:n {As I have elsewhere shown, the never-ending regress in
1771 the series of empirical conditions, in the study of the never-ending
1772 regress in the series of empirical conditions, occupies part of the
1773 sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
1774 objects in space and time in general, by means of analytic unity. Our
1775 faculties (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) can not take
1776 account of the discipline of pure reason. As will easily be shown in
1777 the next section, Hume tells us that the phenomena are just as
1778 necessary as, consequently, necessity; for these reasons, formal
1779 logic, that is to say, excludes the possibility of applied logic. As
1780 is shown in the writings of Galileo, I assert, still, that, indeed,
1781 the Ideal, for example, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of
1782 it must be known a priori. As is shown in the writings of Hume, the
1783 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, when thus
1784 treated as the objects in space and time, constitutes the whole
1785 content for the Ideal.}

1786

1787 \kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
1788 manifold and our ideas, the Categories are just as necessary as, in
1789 the study of the architectonic of pure reason, the discipline of human
1790 reason. It must not be supposed that metaphysics is the mere result
1791 of the power of the Ideal of practical reason, a blind but
1792 indispensable function of the soul; in the study of human reason, the
1793 phenomena are a representation of metaphysics. Our understanding
1794 proves the validity of the transcendental unity of apperception;
1795 therefore, human reason depends on natural causes. In the study of
1796 the architectonic of natural reason, what we have alone been able to
1797 show is that our judgements constitute the whole content of, on the
1798 other hand, our inductive judgements, as we have already seen. }

1799

1800 \kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time should only be used as a
1801 canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all
1802 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just
1803 as necessary as pure logic; however, natural causes exist in the Ideal
1804 of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have
1805 lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the
1806 ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction,
1807 irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the
1808 Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to
1809 contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the
1810 conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our
1811 experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy
1812 part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the
1813 noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo
1814 tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can
1815 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like
1816 philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is
1817 the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.}

1818

1819 \kgl_newpara:n {Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when
1820 thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any

1821 dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes
1822 exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a
1823 body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
1824 posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline
1825 of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori
1826 concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the
1827 contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal
1828 logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in
1829 general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms
1830 of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge.
1831 Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which
1832 involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements?
1833 By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1834 explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never
1835 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it
1836 excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have
1837 already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the
1838 mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception,
1839 a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the
1840 manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human
1841 reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.}

1842
1843 \kgl_newpara:n {Transcendental logic constitutes the whole content
1844 for, for example, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1845 conditions. It remains a mystery why, even as this relates to time,
1846 the Ideal excludes the possibility of the Categories, but natural
1847 reason, then, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
1848 because, like the thing in itself, it is the key to understanding a
1849 posteriori principles. What we have alone been able to show is that
1850 the Transcendental Deduction is what first gives rise to the
1851 Categories. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is not at all
1852 certain that, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction teaches
1853 us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, with the sole
1854 exception of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1855 conditions, natural causes, but the objects in space and time are the
1856 clue to the discovery of the objects in space and time. The objects
1857 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena. The
1858 transcendental aesthetic, in the case of metaphysics, can be treated
1859 like necessity; for these reasons, the noumena exclude the possibility
1860 of the Ideal.}

1861
1862 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a
1863 posteriori knowledge has lying before it the Categories, as is shown
1864 in the writings of Galileo. Thus, the Categories are the mere results
1865 of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
1866 In view of these considerations, it is obvious that the Categories are
1867 just as necessary as, however, the never-ending regress in the series
1868 of empirical conditions, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
1869 Because of the relation between the Ideal of human reason and the
1870 objects in space and time, the empirical objects in space and time
1871 have lying before them natural causes; still, our experience (and it
1872 must not be supposed that this is true) depends on the Transcendental
1873 Deduction. Because of the relation between the employment of the
1874 Transcendental Deduction and the Antinomies, pure logic occupies part

1875 of the sphere of necessity concerning the existence of the objects in
1876 space and time in general; however, the things in themselves, still,
1877 stand in need to our judgements. The Transcendental Deduction proves
1878 the validity of the things in themselves, and our sense perceptions
1879 would thereby be made to contradict our understanding.}

1880

1881 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells
1882 us that natural causes, so far as regards necessity, can never, as a
1883 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
1884 manifold, they prove the validity of ampliative principles. Let us
1885 suppose that, in particular, the Ideal of human reason is a body of
1886 demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a posteriori. As is
1887 proven in the ontological manuals, our faculties, consequently, are
1888 the mere results of the power of human reason, a blind but
1889 indispensable function of the soul, but the noumena can never, as a
1890 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like space,
1891 they would thereby be made to contradict analytic principles. As is
1892 shown in the writings of Hume, the intelligible objects in space and
1893 time, in the study of the never-ending regress in the series of
1894 empirical conditions, stand in need to our experience. On the other
1895 hand, Galileo tells us that formal logic is by its very nature
1896 contradictory. With the sole exception of the architectonic of
1897 natural reason, there can be no doubt that our understanding would be
1898 falsified. This is what chiefly concerns us.}

1899

1900 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between philosophy and the
1901 objects in space and time, the Categories, in all theoretical
1902 sciences, are by their very nature contradictory. What we have alone
1903 been able to show is that our knowledge is a representation of the
1904 Categories. With the sole exception of the practical employment of
1905 the noumena, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects
1906 in space and time would thereby be made to contradict the discipline
1907 of pure reason, because of the relation between the manifold and our
1908 ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that, then, the
1909 Categories are by their very nature contradictory, but space is the
1910 mere result of the power of the discipline of practical reason, a
1911 blind but indispensable function of the soul. The noumena are by
1912 their very nature contradictory. As any dedicated reader can clearly
1913 see, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
1914 architectonic of human reason, on the contrary, excludes the
1915 possibility of the paralogsms. The thing in itself, in view of these
1916 considerations, is by its very nature contradictory. Let us apply
1917 this to necessity.}

1918

1919 \kgl_newpara:n {As is proven in the ontological manuals, our sense
1920 perceptions, as I have elsewhere shown, should only be used as a canon
1921 for our ideas; in natural theology, the paralogsms, indeed, are by
1922 their very nature contradictory. By virtue of practical reason, the
1923 manifold, on the contrary, excludes the possibility of the
1924 transcendental aesthetic, yet the thing in itself is by its very
1925 nature contradictory. Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as
1926 the Categories. As we have already seen, what we have alone been able
1927 to show is that, in particular, the Ideal of natural reason stands in
1928 need of, that is to say, our knowledge, but necessity is a body of

1929 demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori. As we
1930 have already seen, our judgements, therefore, constitute a body of
1931 demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a priori.
1932 Galileo tells us that the objects in space and time (and it is not at
1933 all certain that this is the case) are a representation of our ideas;
1934 still, time, with the sole exception of our experience, can be treated
1935 like our sense perceptions. This is what chiefly concerns us. }

1936

1937 \kgl_newpara:n {The Categories, as I have elsewhere shown, constitute
1938 the whole content of necessity. The transcendental unity of
1939 apperception is just as necessary as the transcendental objects in
1940 space and time. Consequently, I assert that the thing in itself is a
1941 representation of, in the full sense of these terms, the objects in
1942 space and time, because of the relation between the transcendental
1943 aesthetic and our sense perceptions. The manifold, in particular, can
1944 thereby determine in its totality metaphysics. Our a posteriori
1945 concepts, in the case of our experience, prove the validity of the
1946 transcendental objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in
1947 the next section. There can be no doubt that necessity, even as this
1948 relates to necessity, may not contradict itself, but it is still
1949 possible that it may be in contradictions with the architectonic of
1950 human reason.}

1951

1952 \kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
1953 priori, it remains a mystery why, in reference to ends, the phenomena
1954 prove the validity of the paralogisms. As is proven in the
1955 ontological manuals, the empirical objects in space and time would
1956 thereby be made to contradict the empirical objects in space and time;
1957 in the study of the transcendental unity of apperception, the
1958 Categories exist in our a priori concepts. Because of the relation
1959 between space and our analytic judgements, the reader should be
1960 careful to observe that the Categories (and I assert that this is the
1961 case) can not take account of the discipline of pure reason; in the
1962 study of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
1963 conditions, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and
1964 demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it is just as necessary
1965 as problematic principles. In the case of general logic, space (and
1966 it is obvious that this is true) is just as necessary as the things in
1967 themselves. By means of analytic unity, I assert, in view of these
1968 considerations, that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our
1969 speculative judgements (and it is obvious that this is the case) are
1970 what first give rise to the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
1971 the next section, it remains a mystery why our ideas would thereby be
1972 made to contradict our judgements; therefore, our sense perceptions,
1973 certainly, exclude the possibility of the noumena. As is shown in the
1974 writings of Galileo, the objects in space and time exclude the
1975 possibility of our ideas; thus, the objects in space and time, for
1976 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies.}

1977

1978 \kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of the never-ending regress in
1979 the series of empirical conditions, it is not at all certain that the
1980 noumena, in so far as this expounds the practical rules of the
1981 paralogisms of pure reason, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
1982 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, they

1983 are just as necessary as ampliative principles, as will easily be
1984 shown in the next section. As is evident upon close examination, the
1985 objects in space and time constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
1986 and all of this body must be known a posteriori, but the architectonic
1987 of practical reason would be falsified. Because of our necessary
1988 ignorance of the conditions, it is not at all certain that, then, our
1989 understanding proves the validity of, on the contrary, formal logic.
1990 With the sole exception of the Ideal of natural reason, the Categories
1991 exist in the paralogisms, since knowledge of the Antinomies is a
1992 posteriori. Since knowledge of our ideas is a priori, it must not be
1993 supposed that the manifold, as I have elsewhere shown, abstracts from
1994 all content of knowledge; in the study of the Ideal of practical
1995 reason, our concepts are the clue to the discovery of our experience.}

1996
1997 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
1998 Categories would be falsified. Consequently, there can be no doubt
1999 that the noumena can not take account of, even as this relates to
2000 philosophy, the Antinomies, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
2001 Our judgements (and I assert that this is the case) are what first
2002 give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2003 conditions. It is not at all certain that, in the full sense of these
2004 terms, the objects in space and time stand in need to the Ideal of
2005 pure reason, yet the Transcendental Deduction, in reference to ends,
2006 is just as necessary as the Ideal. Has it ever been suggested that it
2007 must not be supposed that there is a causal connection between the
2008 transcendental objects in space and time and the discipline of natural
2009 reason? As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not at all
2010 certain that the noumena can not take account of the Transcendental
2011 Deduction. By virtue of human reason, I assert, in the study of the
2012 manifold, that, indeed, the objects in space and time have lying
2013 before them our faculties, and the architectonic of natural reason
2014 stands in need of the things in themselves.}

2015
2016 \kgl_newpara:n {By means of analytic unity, the objects in space and
2017 time (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the
2018 whole content of the Antinomies, but our ideas have lying before them
2019 the noumena. The Ideal is the key to understanding, that is to say,
2020 the things in themselves. By means of analytic unity, our judgements
2021 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case)
2022 have lying before them the Transcendental Deduction. Aristotle tells
2023 us that metaphysics, in the study of the Ideal of practical reason,
2024 occupies part of the sphere of applied logic concerning the existence
2025 of the paralogisms in general; certainly, metaphysics can not take
2026 account of necessity. But can I entertain human reason in thought, or
2027 does it present itself to me? The things in themselves stand in need
2028 to natural causes, by means of analytic unity. Since knowledge of
2029 natural causes is a posteriori, the empirical objects in space and
2030 time have nothing to do with philosophy. The divisions are thus
2031 provided; all that is required is to fill them.}

2032
2033 \kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, the noumena would
2034 thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the
2035 paralogisms of natural reason. Because of the relation between the
2036 discipline of pure reason and our sense perceptions, we can deduce

2037 that, on the contrary, the Categories are just as necessary as natural
2038 causes, and metaphysics, in the full sense of these terms, can never
2039 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2040 transcendental unity of apperception, it is the clue to the discovery
2041 of speculative principles. We can deduce that natural causes, still,
2042 are by their very nature contradictory, as we have already seen. As
2043 we have already seen, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2044 explain that, so far as I know, the objects in space and time, for
2045 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Ideal of human
2046 reason. The reader should be careful to observe that the manifold,
2047 irrespective of all empirical conditions, is by its very nature
2048 contradictory. }

2049
2050 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that natural
2051 causes (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2052 that this is the case) have lying before them necessity. We can
2053 deduce that our a priori knowledge (and Galileo tells us that this is
2054 true) depends on the employment of the never-ending regress in the
2055 series of empirical conditions. It remains a mystery why the
2056 paralogisms of practical reason, for these reasons, exist in the
2057 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, because of
2058 the relation between the architectonic of pure reason and the
2059 phenomena. Thus, the architectonic of pure reason excludes the
2060 possibility of, on the other hand, the phenomena. And can I entertain
2061 philosophy in thought, or does it present itself to me? Galileo tells
2062 us that, that is to say, the practical employment of the architectonic
2063 of natural reason, with the sole exception of the transcendental
2064 aesthetic, abstracts from all content of knowledge. As is proven in
2065 the ontological manuals, our ideas constitute the whole content of the
2066 objects in space and time, but the objects in space and time (and it
2067 is obvious that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of the
2068 paralogisms.}

2069
2070 \kgl_newpara:n {As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is not at
2071 all certain that, on the contrary, the objects in space and time, in
2072 the case of space, stand in need to the objects in space and time, but
2073 the phenomena have lying before them the discipline of human reason.
2074 The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, in
2075 other words, is what first gives rise to general logic. Because of
2076 our necessary ignorance of the conditions, our concepts, so far as
2077 regards the Ideal of human reason, exist in the paralogisms; in the
2078 study of time, the thing in itself is the clue to the discovery of the
2079 manifold. I assert that our experience, in natural theology,
2080 abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge; therefore, our ideas
2081 are what first give rise to the Categories. As is evident upon close
2082 examination, our ideas, for these reasons, can not take account of
2083 philosophy. Has it ever been suggested that what we have alone been
2084 able to show is that there is no relation between the architectonic of
2085 human reason and our sense perceptions? Since all of the noumena are
2086 a priori, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the thing
2087 in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can
2088 be no doubt that the empirical objects in space and time constitute a
2089 body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a
2090 posteriori; thus, time is the mere result of the power of the

2091 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
2092 soul. But this need not worry us.}

2093

2094 \kgl_newpara:n {Aristotle tells us that, inasmuch as the pure
2095 employment of the Categories relies on our ideas, the things in
2096 themselves are just as necessary as, in all theoretical sciences, the
2097 noumena. Therefore, let us suppose that the phenomena occupy part of
2098 the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of our concepts in
2099 general. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the
2100 architectonic of pure reason is what first gives rise to the
2101 employment of our concepts, by means of analysis. The things in
2102 themselves occupy part of the sphere of the never-ending regress in
2103 the series of empirical conditions concerning the existence of our
2104 sense perceptions in general; thus, metaphysics may not contradict
2105 itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions
2106 with, in other words, the transcendental unity of apperception. By
2107 means of the architectonic of practical reason, our sense perceptions,
2108 irrespective of all empirical conditions, abstract from all content of
2109 knowledge. As is proven in the ontological manuals, metaphysics, so
2110 far as regards the transcendental aesthetic and the intelligible
2111 objects in space and time, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
2112 of it must be known a priori; by means of philosophy, the Categories
2113 are a representation of, in the case of time, the phenomena. As any
2114 dedicated reader can clearly see, the Transcendental Deduction, in
2115 other words, would thereby be made to contradict our understanding;
2116 still, the employment of the noumena is a representation of the
2117 Ideal.}

2118

2119 \kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that the paralogisms of human reason are
2120 a representation of, in the full sense of these terms, our experience.
2121 The thing in itself, in reference to ends, exists in our judgements.
2122 As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, let us suppose that, in
2123 respect of the intelligible character, the Categories constitute the
2124 whole content of our knowledge, yet metaphysics is a representation of
2125 our judgements. As is evident upon close examination, the paralogisms
2126 would thereby be made to contradict the manifold; therefore, pure
2127 logic is a representation of time. In natural theology, the
2128 discipline of natural reason abstracts from all content of a priori
2129 knowledge. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2130 that the paralogisms of human reason have lying before them the Ideal
2131 of pure reason, since none of the things in themselves are a priori.
2132 Consequently, it remains a mystery why our concepts abstract from all
2133 content of knowledge, since knowledge of the objects in space and time
2134 is a posteriori.}

2135

2136 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of the relation between practical reason and
2137 our problematic judgements, what we have alone been able to show is
2138 that, in respect of the intelligible character, our faculties,
2139 inasmuch as our knowledge relies on the Categories, can be treated
2140 like natural reason. In view of these considerations, the reader
2141 should be careful to observe that the transcendental aesthetic is the
2142 clue to the discovery of, in view of these considerations, the
2143 phenomena. As is evident upon close examination, it remains a mystery
2144 why the objects in space and time occupy part of the sphere of the

2145 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions concerning
2146 the existence of the Categories in general; in view of these
2147 considerations, our experience, indeed, stands in need of the
2148 phenomena. (However, the phenomena prove the validity of the Ideal,
2149 by virtue of human reason.) We can deduce that, so regarded, our
2150 faculties (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are what
2151 first give rise to the architectonic of pure reason. Our ideas can
2152 not take account of, by means of space, our knowledge. But we have
2153 fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind
2154 when we speak of necessity.}

2155
2156 \kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that space can not take
2157 account of natural causes. The Transcendental Deduction can not take
2158 account of our a priori knowledge; as I have elsewhere shown, the
2159 objects in space and time (and let us suppose that this is the case)
2160 can not take account of the objects in space and time. As is shown in
2161 the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary
2162 to explain that the Categories have lying before them, as I have
2163 elsewhere shown, our ideas. The Ideal of human reason excludes the
2164 possibility of the Ideal of human reason. By virtue of natural
2165 reason, our ideas stand in need to the Ideal of practical reason. By
2166 means of analysis, the phenomena, in the study of our understanding,
2167 can not take account of the noumena, but the paralogisms of natural
2168 reason, thus, abstract from all content of knowledge. This is not
2169 something we are in a position to establish.}

2170
2171 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of our ideas are inductive, our ideas
2172 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms; consequently, our
2173 faculties can not take account of metaphysics. As will easily be
2174 shown in the next section, the Ideal, in reference to ends, may not
2175 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2176 contradictions with the Categories; in all theoretical sciences, the
2177 architectonic of practical reason, in the case of the practical
2178 employment of our experience, can be treated like necessity. Because
2179 of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the things in themselves
2180 are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
2181 function of the soul, and the Transcendental Deduction exists in the
2182 Antinomies. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the thing in
2183 itself (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true)
2184 constitutes the whole content for time. It remains a mystery why our
2185 understanding (and Aristotle tells us that this is true) may not
2186 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2187 contradictions with our judgements; in all theoretical sciences, the
2188 objects in space and time constitute the whole content of our ideas.
2189 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, we can deduce
2190 that, for example, our concepts, for example, are the mere results of
2191 the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
2192 soul, yet the objects in space and time, with the sole exception of
2193 the manifold, exist in our ideas.}

2194
2195 \kgl_newpara:n {In natural theology, it must not be supposed that the
2196 objects in space and time, so far as regards the manifold, should only
2197 be used as a canon for natural reason. The manifold, so far as
2198 regards our a priori knowledge, teaches us nothing whatsoever

2199 regarding the content of the Transcendental Deduction. By means of
2200 analytic unity, we can deduce that, so far as regards our experience
2201 and the objects in space and time, the objects in space and time would
2202 thereby be made to contradict the Categories, but our concepts can
2203 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
2204 like our experience, they stand in need to ampliative principles. The
2205 noumena, so far as I know, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
2206 demonstrated science, because, like the employment of the Categories,
2207 they have lying before them ampliative principles, yet the phenomena
2208 are just as necessary as natural causes. The reader should be careful
2209 to observe that, so far as I know, the Ideal has nothing to do with
2210 the Categories, but the things in themselves, however, constitute a
2211 body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a
2212 posteriori. And similarly with all the others.}

2213
2214 \kgl_newpara:n {Our speculative judgements, therefore, prove the
2215 validity of the transcendental unity of apperception. Necessity is
2216 just as necessary as, that is to say, transcendental logic. The
2217 reader should be careful to observe that the noumena (and it must not
2218 be supposed that this is the case) can not take account of our
2219 faculties, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. The Ideal (and
2220 to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that this is
2221 true) can not take account of the transcendental aesthetic, and the
2222 employment of the manifold has nothing to do with, insomuch as the
2223 architectonic of natural reason relies on the Antinomies, the
2224 discipline of human reason. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
2225 the paralogisms prove the validity of, as I have elsewhere shown, the
2226 architectonic of pure reason.}

2227
2228 \kgl_newpara:n {Space may not contradict itself, but it is still
2229 possible that it may be in contradictions with, for these reasons, the
2230 phenomena; with the sole exception of metaphysics, our ideas exclude
2231 the possibility of, in natural theology, the thing in itself. What we
2232 have alone been able to show is that, for example, the Ideal excludes
2233 the possibility of time, yet the noumena (and I assert, in view of
2234 these considerations, that this is the case) are just as necessary as
2235 the objects in space and time. Because of the relation between
2236 metaphysics and the paralogisms, the Categories are the mere results
2237 of the power of the discipline of natural reason, a blind but
2238 indispensable function of the soul. The objects in space and time, in
2239 other words, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental
2240 aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since
2241 knowledge of our faculties is a priori, what we have alone been able
2242 to show is that necessity, in reference to ends, constitutes the whole
2243 content for metaphysics; still, our understanding (and we can deduce
2244 that this is true) excludes the possibility of our experience. As
2245 will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed
2246 that, even as this relates to philosophy, the phenomena (and I assert,
2247 with the sole exception of metaphysics, that this is the case) are a
2248 representation of the objects in space and time, but the Antinomies
2249 should only be used as a canon for our knowledge. But we have fallen
2250 short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we
2251 speak of necessity.}

2252

2253 \kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time are the mere results of
2254 the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the
2255 soul; in the study of our a posteriori knowledge, the manifold, so far
2256 as I know, proves the validity of the Ideal. Hume tells us that, so
2257 far as regards time, the phenomena, in view of these considerations,
2258 stand in need to the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the
2259 things in themselves, in respect of the intelligible character, can be
2260 treated like our ideas; as I have elsewhere shown, our concepts have
2261 lying before them the phenomena. As is proven in the ontological
2262 manuals, there can be no doubt that the phenomena, in all theoretical
2263 sciences, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this
2264 body must be known a priori. As is evident upon close examination,
2265 the architectonic of natural reason, so regarded, is by its very
2266 nature contradictory; for these reasons, the phenomena are a
2267 representation of time. In natural theology, the Antinomies (and it
2268 remains a mystery why this is the case) constitute the whole content
2269 of the Categories, because of our necessary ignorance of the
2270 conditions. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection
2271 that we have in mind when we speak of the Categories.}

2272

2273 \kgl_newpara:n {Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
2274 it is not at all certain that, for example, the thing in itself (and
2275 the reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not
2276 take account of our experience, and our concepts, in all theoretical
2277 sciences, are a representation of the phenomena. Since some of the
2278 phenomena are problematic, Hume tells us that metaphysics has lying
2279 before it, however, natural causes. By virtue of natural reason,
2280 Aristotle tells us that the things in themselves, therefore, should
2281 only be used as a canon for our a posteriori judgements. Our
2282 understanding can be treated like the transcendental unity of
2283 apperception. The Categories can be treated like space.}

2284

2285 \kgl_newpara:n {Since some of our sense perceptions are hypothetical,
2286 philosophy proves the validity of natural causes; on the other hand,
2287 our experience, in other words, can never furnish a true and
2288 demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it depends on
2289 synthetic principles. Natural causes, in natural theology, constitute
2290 a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a
2291 priori. What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy is a
2292 representation of our concepts, as will easily be shown in the next
2293 section. The Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still
2294 possible that it may be in contradictions with, in the study of the
2295 transcendental aesthetic, our sense perceptions. (As is shown in the
2296 writings of Galileo, the reader should be careful to observe that the
2297 objects in space and time, by means of necessity, are by their very
2298 nature contradictory.) The Antinomies can not take account of our
2299 experience, by virtue of natural reason. Therefore, the noumena, in
2300 view of these considerations, are by their very nature contradictory,
2301 as will easily be shown in the next section.}

2302

2303 \kgl_newpara:n {On the other hand, the never-ending regress in the
2304 series of empirical conditions stands in need of practical reason. As
2305 will easily be shown in the next section, there can be no doubt that,
2306 in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the discipline

2307 of natural reason, metaphysics can be treated like metaphysics. As is
2308 shown in the writings of Hume, what we have alone been able to show is
2309 that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
2310 would be falsified. Our experience can be treated like the
2311 architectonic of human reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo.
2312 The thing in itself proves the validity of the phenomena, as is shown
2313 in the writings of Hume. Certainly, what we have alone been able to
2314 show is that natural causes, in reference to ends, would be falsified.
2315 But this need not worry us.}

2316
2317 \kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the objects in space and time are
2318 speculative, let us suppose that our sense perceptions are the clue to
2319 the discovery of, in particular, our a posteriori knowledge. Since
2320 knowledge of the transcendental objects in space and time is a
2321 posteriori, what we have alone been able to show is that our a
2322 posteriori concepts exclude the possibility of the never-ending
2323 regress in the series of empirical conditions; by means of the
2324 discipline of pure reason, our faculties are the clue to the discovery
2325 of our a priori knowledge. Because of the relation between the
2326 transcendental unity of apperception and the things in themselves,
2327 there can be no doubt that our sense perceptions (and it is obvious
2328 that this is the case) are what first give rise to the Categories. To
2329 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
2330 phenomena can not take account of, with the sole exception of the
2331 transcendental unity of apperception, the noumena. Certainly, the
2332 things in themselves are by their very nature contradictory, as is
2333 shown in the writings of Galileo. Because of our necessary ignorance
2334 of the conditions, we can deduce that, then, the thing in itself
2335 constitutes the whole content for, still, the intelligible objects in
2336 space and time, and space is the clue to the discovery of, in
2337 particular, our a posteriori concepts. }

2338
2339 \kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal of human reason has nothing to do with time.
2340 As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, so far as regards
2341 the Transcendental Deduction, the transcendental aesthetic, inasmuch
2342 as the practical employment of the never-ending regress in the series
2343 of empirical conditions relies on the things in themselves, can never
2344 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2345 transcendental unity of apperception, it excludes the possibility of
2346 speculative principles, and the Ideal is a representation of our
2347 experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
2348 phenomena (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) are the clue
2349 to the discovery of our speculative judgements; in all theoretical
2350 sciences, our understanding, when thus treated as the noumena, is a
2351 body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori.
2352 We can deduce that our knowledge, for example, exists in the
2353 transcendental unity of apperception. Consequently, I assert, by
2354 means of general logic, that the transcendental unity of apperception
2355 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, consequently,
2356 the Antinomies, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.}

2357
2358 \kgl_newpara:n {Since all of our concepts are inductive, there can be
2359 no doubt that, in respect of the intelligible character, our ideas are
2360 the clue to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception,

2361 and the paralogsms of natural reason should only be used as a canon
2362 for our judgements. Still, I assert that the objects in space and
2363 time have lying before them, by means of transcendental logic, the
2364 Transcendental Deduction. Our faculties can be treated like our
2365 experience; thus, our ideas have lying before them the objects in
2366 space and time. Our judgements constitute a body of demonstrated
2367 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a posteriori. Time can
2368 be treated like the manifold. As any dedicated reader can clearly
2369 see, the employment of the noumena proves the validity of, certainly,
2370 human reason, and space excludes the possibility of general logic.
2371 Let us suppose that, indeed, the Ideal of pure reason, even as this
2372 relates to our a priori knowledge, is the key to understanding the
2373 Antinomies, yet the employment of the pure employment of our a
2374 posteriori concepts is what first gives rise to, in all theoretical
2375 sciences, the noumena.}

2376

2377 \kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori, it
2378 is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception is the mere
2379 result of the power of the never-ending regress in the series of
2380 empirical conditions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul;
2381 in all theoretical sciences, natural causes exclude the possibility of
2382 the noumena. Let us suppose that the transcendental objects in space
2383 and time would thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, natural
2384 causes. There can be no doubt that our understanding is the clue to
2385 the discovery of the Ideal. Because of the relation between the Ideal
2386 of pure reason and the Antinomies, the transcendental unity of
2387 apperception, as I have elsewhere shown, can be treated like the
2388 paralogsms, yet the phenomena are the clue to the discovery of the
2389 Ideal. As I have elsewhere shown, I assert, in view of these
2390 considerations, that our faculties, even as this relates to the thing
2391 in itself, occupy part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction
2392 concerning the existence of the Categories in general.}

2393

2394 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain
2395 that, that is to say, the Transcendental Deduction is the clue to the
2396 discovery of, in particular, our knowledge, yet the thing in itself
2397 would thereby be made to contradict our faculties. As is proven in
2398 the ontological manuals, it is obvious that, when thus treated as our
2399 understanding, the Categories have nothing to do with our
2400 understanding, yet the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2401 conditions occupies part of the sphere of the architectonic of human
2402 reason concerning the existence of the paralogsms in general. As
2403 will easily be shown in the next section, general logic has nothing to
2404 do with, in the full sense of these terms, the discipline of pure
2405 reason. As is evident upon close examination, the Ideal of human
2406 reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may
2407 be in contradictions with the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
2408 the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that, even
2409 as this relates to the transcendental unity of apperception, the
2410 Categories, certainly, should only be used as a canon for the thing in
2411 itself. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}

2412

2413 \kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that space depends on the things in
2414 themselves. There can be no doubt that, in particular, the Ideal, in

2415 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the phenomena, is just
2416 as necessary as the transcendental unity of apperception. There can
2417 be no doubt that the manifold can not take account of, so far as
2418 regards the architectonic of human reason, the things in themselves.
2419 Thus, it remains a mystery why space depends on the manifold. To
2420 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our
2421 understanding (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2422 explain that this is true) is a representation of the Antinomies.}

2423

2424 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are a
2425 representation of metaphysics; in the case of the practical employment
2426 of the transcendental aesthetic, the Categories are by their very
2427 nature contradictory. It is not at all certain that the phenomena
2428 have lying before them the objects in space and time, because of our
2429 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Because of the relation
2430 between applied logic and our faculties, it remains a mystery why our
2431 ideas, consequently, exclude the possibility of philosophy; however,
2432 the things in themselves prove the validity of, in the case of
2433 metaphysics, the phenomena. By means of the transcendental aesthetic,
2434 let us suppose that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated
2435 doctrine, and all of this body must be known a priori. Since all of
2436 the objects in space and time are hypothetical, metaphysics is the key
2437 to understanding the paralogisms, yet the Transcendental Deduction has
2438 nothing to do with our a posteriori knowledge. There can be no doubt
2439 that metaphysics is a representation of the transcendental unity of
2440 apperception, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2441

2442 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that our concepts, in accordance
2443 with the principles of the noumena, are by their very nature
2444 contradictory, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. Space is what
2445 first gives rise to, in other words, the Antinomies, and space depends
2446 on the Ideal. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
2447 our experience, indeed, proves the validity of the noumena. Hume
2448 tells us that the phenomena can not take account of transcendental
2449 logic. The objects in space and time, thus, exist in the manifold.
2450 In which of our cognitive faculties are the manifold and the
2451 Categories connected together? As will easily be shown in the next
2452 section, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that
2453 metaphysics, on the contrary, occupies part of the sphere of the thing
2454 in itself concerning the existence of our synthetic judgements in
2455 general.}

2456

2457 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, I assert that,
2458 so far as regards metaphysics, our knowledge proves the validity of,
2459 on the contrary, the manifold, yet the objects in space and time are
2460 what first give rise to, in the study of formal logic, the paralogisms
2461 of pure reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, I
2462 assert, in all theoretical sciences, that our understanding (and the
2463 reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not take
2464 account of our sense perceptions. Because of the relation between the
2465 Transcendental Deduction and our a priori concepts, the phenomena are
2466 what first give rise to the intelligible objects in space and time,
2467 and natural causes, indeed, abstract from all content of a priori
2468 knowledge. By means of analysis, Galileo tells us that the Ideal has

2469 lying before it, on the contrary, our sense perceptions. I assert,
2470 for these reasons, that our knowledge stands in need of the things in
2471 themselves, since knowledge of our faculties is a priori. But this is
2472 to be dismissed as random groping.}

2473

2474 \kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding can not take account of our
2475 faculties; certainly, the never-ending regress in the series of
2476 empirical conditions is what first gives rise to, therefore, the
2477 things in themselves. It is not at all certain that, then, time
2478 occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning
2479 the existence of the paralogisms of practical reason in general. We
2480 can deduce that the thing in itself, on the other hand, abstracts from
2481 all content of knowledge. On the other hand, our a priori knowledge
2482 has lying before it the practical employment of the Antinomies. The
2483 employment of our sense perceptions is what first gives rise to the
2484 Antinomies, but the Categories, for these reasons, are by their very
2485 nature contradictory. In natural theology, it is not at all certain
2486 that our sense perceptions can not take account of our knowledge, by
2487 means of analysis. Thus, the Categories would thereby be made to
2488 contradict the things in themselves, as any dedicated reader can
2489 clearly see.}

2490

2491 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are just as necessary as the
2492 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As any
2493 dedicated reader can clearly see, the architectonic of natural reason
2494 (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby determine in
2495 its totality general logic. As will easily be shown in the next
2496 section, natural causes are a representation of, on the contrary, the
2497 Ideal of pure reason; as I have elsewhere shown, the things in
2498 themselves, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
2499 and none of this body must be known a priori. As we have already
2500 seen, our ideas are the clue to the discovery of our faculties.
2501 Whence comes applied logic, the solution of which involves the
2502 relation between the noumena and the Transcendental Deduction?
2503 Therefore, it is obvious that the empirical objects in space and time
2504 can not take account of the noumena, because of our necessary
2505 ignorance of the conditions. It is not at all certain that the
2506 manifold stands in need of, for these reasons, the Antinomies, by
2507 virtue of human reason.}

2508

2509 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of practical reason, there can be no doubt
2510 that our experience, still, occupies part of the sphere of the
2511 manifold concerning the existence of our analytic judgements in
2512 general; as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories can never, as a
2513 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
2514 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they are a
2515 representation of synthetic principles. As is proven in the
2516 ontological manuals, the Categories are what first give rise to,
2517 consequently, our faculties. We can deduce that, inasmuch as the
2518 discipline of practical reason relies on our ideas, necessity can be
2519 treated like the thing in itself, yet the noumena can never, as a
2520 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
2521 they are a representation of problematic principles. However, let us
2522 suppose that the things in themselves are the clue to the discovery

2523 of, consequently, our judgements, as we have already seen. Whence
2524 comes time, the solution of which involves the relation between the
2525 phenomena and the noumena? In the study of our experience, I assert
2526 that the Ideal can not take account of the discipline of practical
2527 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The reader should be
2528 careful to observe that the phenomena are what first give rise to the
2529 Categories, by virtue of natural reason. As is proven in the
2530 ontological manuals, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and
2531 some of it must be known a priori. This may be clear with an
2532 example.}

2533
2534 \kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, so far as
2535 regards the Ideal of practical reason and the noumena, abstracts from
2536 all content of a posteriori knowledge, by virtue of human reason. To
2537 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, that is to
2538 say, our inductive judgements have nothing to do with, in the case of
2539 the discipline of human reason, the things in themselves, and the
2540 paralogisms of natural reason are the clue to the discovery of the
2541 Transcendental Deduction. It remains a mystery why the noumena, in
2542 natural theology, would be falsified; however, the things in
2543 themselves can not take account of the thing in itself. As any
2544 dedicated reader can clearly see, philosophy, in the study of the
2545 thing in itself, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
2546 because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it proves the validity of
2547 inductive principles, but our sense perceptions, with the sole
2548 exception of necessity, are the clue to the discovery of the
2549 transcendental unity of apperception. Let us suppose that the
2550 Categories can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated
2551 science, because, like the employment of philosophy, they have nothing
2552 to do with hypothetical principles. Our ideas have nothing to do with
2553 the transcendental aesthetic.}

2554
2555 \kgl_newpara:n {In the case of philosophy, the Transcendental
2556 Deduction proves the validity of necessity, by means of analysis. Our
2557 sense perceptions have lying before them, certainly, our experience.
2558 There can be no doubt that space (and it remains a mystery why this is
2559 true) stands in need of the noumena. As I have elsewhere shown, the
2560 transcendental unity of apperception has lying before it, irrespective
2561 of all empirical conditions, the Transcendental Deduction. The
2562 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of our
2563 faculties, but the thing in itself, in accordance with the principles
2564 of our experience, can be treated like the paralogisms. As is proven
2565 in the ontological manuals, space has nothing to do with, thus, our
2566 ideas, yet the things in themselves, in natural theology, can be
2567 treated like the transcendental aesthetic.}

2568
2569 \kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Galileo, it remains a
2570 mystery why, so far as I know, the phenomena are the mere results of
2571 the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
2572 function of the soul, but the paralogisms (and there can be no doubt
2573 that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the transcendental
2574 aesthetic. Our experience, in accordance with the principles of
2575 transcendental logic, occupies part of the sphere of the manifold
2576 concerning the existence of the Categories in general. Our sense

2577 perceptions can not take account of the Ideal, by virtue of natural
2578 reason. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
2579 objects in space and time (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
2580 necessary to explain that this is the case) would thereby be made to
2581 contradict the pure employment of space; in the case of the discipline
2582 of human reason, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the
2583 transcendental aesthetic. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have
2584 already seen, it remains a mystery why there is a causal connection
2585 between the Ideal of human reason and the Ideal of human reason? What
2586 we have alone been able to show is that the Antinomies, for these
2587 reasons, stand in need to our judgements. Let us suppose that, in
2588 accordance with the principles of the Ideal of practical reason, the
2589 Antinomies prove the validity of space, but natural causes (and I
2590 assert, for these reasons, that this is the case) would thereby be
2591 made to contradict the transcendental unity of apperception. But the
2592 proof of this is a task from which we can here be absolved. }

2593

2594 \kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, the noumena
2595 should only be used as a canon for the Categories. As is proven in
2596 the ontological manuals, our sense perceptions, consequently, are by
2597 their very nature contradictory; therefore, our experience (and it
2598 must not be supposed that this is true) may not contradict itself, but
2599 it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the
2600 architectonic of practical reason. We can deduce that the Categories
2601 would thereby be made to contradict pure logic; for these reasons,
2602 space is by its very nature contradictory. Formal logic is a
2603 representation of our faculties. Metaphysics, insomuch as time relies
2604 on the Antinomies, stands in need of space. Let us suppose that the
2605 Antinomies constitute the whole content of our a priori concepts; on
2606 the other hand, the Ideal of natural reason (and there can be no doubt
2607 that this is true) is a representation of the manifold.}

2608

2609 \kgl_newpara:n {I assert, certainly, that, irrespective of all
2610 empirical conditions, the Categories are just as necessary as, on the
2611 other hand, the thing in itself, yet the manifold proves the validity
2612 of, on the other hand, the employment of the transcendental unity of
2613 apperception. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
2614 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in
2615 the architectonic of practical reason. As is evident upon close
2616 examination, it remains a mystery why the things in themselves have
2617 lying before them, that is to say, the Ideal; however, the
2618 architectonic of natural reason exists in the Ideal of pure reason.
2619 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the noumena
2620 exclude the possibility of, however, general logic; consequently, the
2621 paralogisms of natural reason, when thus treated as our ideas, can be
2622 treated like philosophy.}

2623

2624 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, our faculties
2625 stand in need to the transcendental objects in space and time;
2626 certainly, our ideas are a representation of the objects in space and
2627 time. The reader should be careful to observe that the Categories
2628 constitute the whole content of the paralogisms of human reason. By
2629 means of analytic unity, space would be falsified; with the sole
2630 exception of the manifold, necessity, even as this relates to our

2631 understanding, has nothing to do with natural causes. Time is just as
2632 necessary as, indeed, the phenomena. Thus, the noumena, consequently,
2633 exclude the possibility of the Transcendental Deduction, by means of
2634 analysis. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have already seen,
2635 Aristotle tells us that there is a causal connection between the
2636 noumena and the things in themselves? The employment of the
2637 Antinomies is the key to understanding our ideas.}

2638

2639 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
2640 employment of the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in our sense
2641 perceptions; as I have elsewhere shown, the phenomena exist in the
2642 discipline of practical reason. Necessity (and Aristotle tells us
2643 that this is true) has lying before it the objects in space and time;
2644 in natural theology, our understanding, for example, proves the
2645 validity of the objects in space and time. It is not at all certain
2646 that our faculties, in the case of the thing in itself, are the clue
2647 to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen. To avoid
2648 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in reference to
2649 ends, the Ideal would be falsified, and the Antinomies are a
2650 representation of our a priori knowledge. (By means of analysis, to
2651 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as
2652 this relates to the Ideal of practical reason, the phenomena
2653 constitute the whole content of, in view of these considerations, our
2654 knowledge, and the discipline of natural reason (and we can deduce
2655 that this is true) is just as necessary as the manifold.) The reader
2656 should be careful to observe that, indeed, our judgements can not take
2657 account of our sense perceptions, but the thing in itself, so far as I
2658 know, can not take account of our sense perceptions. Let us suppose
2659 that our ideas are a representation of metaphysics.}

2660

2661 \kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of human reason, the Ideal of pure reason,
2662 in the full sense of these terms, is by its very nature contradictory,
2663 yet necessity is the key to understanding metaphysics. The Categories
2664 have nothing to do with, therefore, the phenomena. We can deduce that
2665 our experience can be treated like our a priori knowledge; certainly,
2666 the objects in space and time are what first give rise to philosophy.
2667 Because of the relation between the architectonic of natural reason
2668 and the Antinomies, space has nothing to do with our ideas, but the
2669 manifold occupies part of the sphere of the transcendental aesthetic
2670 concerning the existence of the phenomena in general. The paralogisms
2671 of human reason are the clue to the discovery of, on the contrary, our
2672 understanding.}

2673

2674 \kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
2675 thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and
2676 time, but the discipline of human reason is by its very nature
2677 contradictory. It is obvious that, in other words, the manifold, in
2678 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the thing in itself, is
2679 the clue to the discovery of the things in themselves, yet our
2680 experience has lying before it space. Our ideas would be falsified,
2681 yet the thing in itself is just as necessary as the Antinomies.
2682 Metaphysics exists in our speculative judgements. By means of
2683 analysis, the phenomena are a representation of our faculties.}

2684

2685 \kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena stand in need to our sense perceptions,
2686 but our concepts are the clue to the discovery of formal logic. The
2687 objects in space and time have nothing to do with the things in
2688 themselves, as is evident upon close examination. Time teaches us
2689 nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the noumena. It is not at
2690 all certain that, so far as regards the manifold and the objects in
2691 space and time, the Transcendental Deduction, therefore, occupies part
2692 of the sphere of pure logic concerning the existence of natural causes
2693 in general, but the things in themselves, consequently, are a
2694 representation of the intelligible objects in space and time. The
2695 Transcendental Deduction (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
2696 necessary to explain that this is true) depends on necessity, as we
2697 have already seen. Consequently, it remains a mystery why our a
2698 priori concepts, on the other hand, are what first give rise to the
2699 Ideal of human reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2700

2701 \kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that, then,
2702 the Ideal of human reason, in reference to ends, is the mere result of
2703 the power of practical reason, a blind but indispensable function of
2704 the soul, but the Ideal (and the reader should be careful to observe
2705 that this is true) has lying before it our ideas. In the study of the
2706 thing in itself, I assert, with the sole exception of the manifold,
2707 that the Ideal of human reason is the clue to the discovery of the
2708 practical employment of the Ideal of natural reason. As will easily
2709 be shown in the next section, our ideas have lying before them the
2710 Ideal of natural reason; thus, the Antinomies are what first give rise
2711 to, indeed, the noumena. We can deduce that the Categories (and it is
2712 obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict our
2713 faculties. As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
2714 natural causes occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of
2715 natural reason concerning the existence of natural causes in general;
2716 for these reasons, our ideas, in natural theology, occupy part of the
2717 sphere of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2718 conditions concerning the existence of our judgements in general. Yet
2719 can I entertain the transcendental aesthetic in thought, or does it
2720 present itself to me? In the study of the Ideal, the Ideal of pure
2721 reason depends on time. However, our a priori judgements have lying
2722 before them the employment of necessity, by means of analytic unity.
2723 }

2724

2725 \kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not
2726 at all certain that the transcendental unity of apperception is the
2727 key to understanding the things in themselves; certainly, the
2728 Categories prove the validity of our faculties. Let us suppose that
2729 the paralogisms of natural reason (and we can deduce that this is the
2730 case) are a representation of the discipline of human reason. It
2731 remains a mystery why practical reason can be treated like the
2732 phenomena. (As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, there can be no
2733 doubt that the Categories, in the study of the discipline of human
2734 reason, exclude the possibility of the Categories.) As will easily be
2735 shown in the next section, our ideas stand in need to our knowledge.
2736 As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Antinomies exist in our a
2737 posteriori concepts, yet the thing in itself can not take account of,
2738 as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories. The question of this

2739 matter's relation to objects is not in any way under discussion.}

2740

2741 \kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our
2742 experience, in particular, can thereby determine in its totality our
2743 analytic judgements, yet necessity has nothing to do with, in
2744 reference to ends, the discipline of human reason. It is not at all
2745 certain that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2746 conditions would thereby be made to contradict, in particular, pure
2747 logic; with the sole exception of the Ideal, our ideas, that is to
2748 say, should only be used as a canon for our judgements. Since some of
2749 the Antinomies are disjunctive, the Transcendental Deduction can be
2750 treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
2751 conditions. In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, it is not at
2752 all certain that the Ideal of natural reason, in view of these
2753 considerations, can be treated like the architectonic of human reason.
2754 The Antinomies (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) exclude
2755 the possibility of the Ideal of human reason; in the case of the
2756 discipline of natural reason, necessity would thereby be made to
2757 contradict, so far as I know, the Ideal of pure reason.
2758 Transcendental logic is a representation of the Transcendental
2759 Deduction; by means of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in
2760 itself can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of pure reason.
2761 In my present remarks I am referring to the never-ending regress in
2762 the series of empirical conditions only in so far as it is founded on
2763 hypothetical principles.}

2764

2765 \kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves prove the validity of, on the
2766 other hand, transcendental logic; therefore, necessity has lying
2767 before it, indeed, the paralogisms. What we have alone been able to
2768 show is that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and
2769 all of this body must be known a priori. Our understanding has lying
2770 before it, for these reasons, our ampliative judgements. Because of
2771 our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it is obvious that time may
2772 not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
2773 contradictions with, in view of these considerations, our ideas;
2774 still, the practical employment of the transcendental objects in space
2775 and time, that is to say, has lying before it the things in
2776 themselves. Natural causes prove the validity of necessity.}

2777

2778 \kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a
2779 priori concepts, in other words, can never, as a whole, furnish a true
2780 and demonstrated science, because, like general logic, they prove the
2781 validity of hypothetical principles, by virtue of human reason. There
2782 can be no doubt that, indeed, the Antinomies, in other words, would be
2783 falsified, and the phenomena constitute the whole content of the
2784 discipline of natural reason. The phenomena can not take account of,
2785 in natural theology, the Ideal of practical reason. Time can never
2786 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, it
2787 has nothing to do with a posteriori principles; in view of these
2788 considerations, our a priori concepts stand in need to the discipline
2789 of pure reason. Our ideas constitute the whole content of the objects
2790 in space and time, but the Ideal, indeed, is the key to understanding
2791 our understanding.}

2792

2793 \kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
2794 the Ideal of pure reason is just as necessary as natural causes; in
2795 the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our faculties, in natural
2796 theology, abstract from all content of knowledge. The Categories can
2797 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
2798 like the manifold, they have lying before them a posteriori
2799 principles, but time is by its very nature contradictory. We can
2800 deduce that the Categories, so regarded, are by their very nature
2801 contradictory; for these reasons, time is what first gives rise to our
2802 ideas. Still, is it the case that pure logic constitutes the whole
2803 content for the Transcendental Deduction, or is the real question
2804 whether the paralogisms exist in our experience? Still, natural
2805 reason, so far as I know, would be falsified, because of our necessary
2806 ignorance of the conditions. Our faculties would be falsified.}

2807

2808 \kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal proves the validity of the objects in space
2809 and time. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
2810 that our judgements are a representation of, however, the manifold.
2811 The objects in space and time exclude the possibility of necessity.
2812 The reader should be careful to observe that the Ideal, consequently,
2813 abstracts from all content of knowledge. There can be no doubt that,
2814 indeed, the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
2815 contradict human reason.}

2816

2817 \kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the transcendental unity of
2818 apperception can be treated like the Ideal. I assert that applied
2819 logic (and it is not at all certain that this is true) stands in need
2820 of the objects in space and time; certainly, the Ideal of practical
2821 reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. On the other hand,
2822 our experience (and it remains a mystery why this is true) stands in
2823 need of the transcendental unity of apperception. It remains a
2824 mystery why the Antinomies prove the validity of metaphysics. There
2825 can be no doubt that, in particular, the architectonic of pure reason,
2826 in all theoretical sciences, can never furnish a true and demonstrated
2827 science, because, like the manifold, it teaches us nothing whatsoever
2828 regarding the content of hypothetical principles, but the phenomena,
2829 with the sole exception of the transcendental aesthetic, have nothing
2830 to do with philosophy. It is obvious that our understanding, that is
2831 to say, is the mere result of the power of space, a blind but
2832 indispensable function of the soul, by means of analytic unity. Since
2833 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a priori, we can deduce that our
2834 experience is what first gives rise to the architectonic of practical
2835 reason. This may be clear with an example. }

2836

2837 \kgl_newpara:n {I assert, consequently, that the Transcendental
2838 Deduction would thereby be made to contradict our faculties, as will
2839 easily be shown in the next section. Let us suppose that our ideas,
2840 in the full sense of these terms, occupy part of the sphere of formal
2841 logic concerning the existence of the noumena in general. To avoid
2842 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
2843 Transcendental Deduction, so far as I know, occupies part of the
2844 sphere of the architectonic of practical reason concerning the
2845 existence of the Antinomies in general; certainly, the paralogisms
2846 occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of natural reason

2847 concerning the existence of our ideas in general. To avoid all
2848 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the pure employment
2849 of the architectonic of practical reason, still, is by its very nature
2850 contradictory; consequently, the intelligible objects in space and
2851 time would thereby be made to contradict the transcendental objects in
2852 space and time. We can deduce that the thing in itself exists in the
2853 Antinomies. As is evident upon close examination, the never-ending
2854 regress in the series of empirical conditions depends on, therefore,
2855 necessity. I assert that our judgements are a representation of the
2856 noumena; on the other hand, the transcendental unity of apperception
2857 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, then, the
2858 Ideal of pure reason.}

2859

2860 \kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the things in
2861 themselves are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena, and
2862 philosophy (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is
2863 true) teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the
2864 phenomena. Still, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
2865 explain that natural causes (and it is obvious that this is the case)
2866 have nothing to do with our faculties. To avoid all misapprehension,
2867 it is necessary to explain that, irrespective of all empirical
2868 conditions, the employment of the objects in space and time can not
2869 take account of, that is to say, our concepts, but the never-ending
2870 regress in the series of empirical conditions constitutes the whole
2871 content for our sense perceptions. In the case of the discipline of
2872 pure reason, let us suppose that general logic stands in need of the
2873 Ideal of human reason, as we have already seen. The noumena prove the
2874 validity of, in the study of transcendental logic, our understanding.}

2875

2876 \kgl_newpara:n {Space (and what we have alone been able to show is
2877 that this is true) stands in need of necessity, yet our understanding,
2878 so far as regards the Ideal of practical reason, can never furnish a
2879 true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental unity
2880 of apperception, it has lying before it a priori principles. Since
2881 some of our judgements are disjunctive, it remains a mystery why the
2882 phenomena stand in need to the objects in space and time. In view of
2883 these considerations, the Categories (and let us suppose that this is
2884 the case) are just as necessary as the pure employment of the
2885 phenomena. Let us suppose that the things in themselves, so far as I
2886 know, abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. It is
2887 obvious that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, natural
2888 causes can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science,
2889 because, like metaphysics, they are just as necessary as inductive
2890 principles. The architectonic of practical reason (and it is not at
2891 all certain that this is true) depends on the thing in itself, but the
2892 objects in space and time, as I have elsewhere shown, are the mere
2893 results of the power of the employment of the Antinomies, a blind but
2894 indispensable function of the soul. By means of analysis, there can
2895 be no doubt that, in reference to ends, natural causes are a
2896 representation of, in respect of the intelligible character, time, and
2897 the pure employment of the discipline of natural reason has lying
2898 before it our experience.}

2899

2900 \kgl_newpara:n {Still, it must not be supposed that our faculties are

2901 a representation of the Ideal of practical reason, as is evident upon
2902 close examination. As is proven in the ontological manuals, the
2903 reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time
2904 are the mere results of the power of time, a blind but indispensable
2905 function of the soul; in all theoretical sciences, the Ideal is a
2906 representation of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural
2907 reason, our sense perceptions. Aristotle tells us that, in
2908 particular, the objects in space and time, in the case of the
2909 manifold, are a representation of the things in themselves, yet
2910 natural causes stand in need to, irrespective of all empirical
2911 conditions, the things in themselves. Certainly, the transcendental
2912 unity of apperception, in accordance with the principles of the
2913 intelligible objects in space and time, exists in our sense
2914 perceptions. As we have already seen, the discipline of human reason
2915 (and Galileo tells us that this is true) depends on the thing in
2916 itself. Since some of natural causes are synthetic, the reader should
2917 be careful to observe that, for example, the things in themselves (and
2918 it is not at all certain that this is the case) are the clue to the
2919 discovery of our concepts. But this need not worry us.}

2920

2921 \kgl_newpara:n {The architectonic of natural reason is the key to
2922 understanding, so far as regards our a posteriori knowledge and the
2923 paralogisms, time; still, the Categories, with the sole exception of
2924 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, should
2925 only be used as a canon for the transcendental unity of apperception.
2926 However, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena
2927 exist in time. Because of the relation between space and the
2928 phenomena, let us suppose that our ideas are the clue to the discovery
2929 of our faculties. The phenomena constitute the whole content of the
2930 phenomena, but the transcendental unity of apperception, on the other
2931 hand, would be falsified. (As is evident upon close examination, it
2932 must not be supposed that our a posteriori knowledge is by its very
2933 nature contradictory.) There can be no doubt that the practical
2934 employment of our problematic judgements can be treated like the
2935 transcendental aesthetic. Aristotle tells us that our faculties have
2936 nothing to do with the objects in space and time. We thus have a pure
2937 synthesis of apprehension.}

2938

2939 \kgl_newpara:n {Since none of the noumena are hypothetical, there can
2940 be no doubt that, in particular, our knowledge, in other words, is the
2941 clue to the discovery of the things in themselves. Therefore, the
2942 Ideal is just as necessary as, then, the Ideal, as will easily be
2943 shown in the next section. We can deduce that, then, our knowledge,
2944 in respect of the intelligible character, is by its very nature
2945 contradictory, and the noumena, in particular, are by their very
2946 nature contradictory. The reader should be careful to observe that,
2947 indeed, pure logic, still, is a body of demonstrated science, and none
2948 of it must be known a posteriori, yet our speculative judgements exist
2949 in the manifold. In the case of time, the Categories, by means of
2950 transcendental logic, constitute the whole content of the things in
2951 themselves, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2952

2953 \kgl_newpara:n {Transcendental logic can thereby determine in its
2954 totality, consequently, our faculties, because of our necessary

2955 ignorance of the conditions. Since some of the paralogisms are
2956 analytic, there can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
2957 Antinomies, for these reasons, constitute the whole content of
2958 necessity, yet the things in themselves constitute the whole content
2959 of our understanding. In view of these considerations, it is obvious
2960 that the paralogisms are by their very nature contradictory, as any
2961 dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas (and
2962 it remains a mystery why this is the case) have nothing to do with the
2963 discipline of pure reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.
2964 What we have alone been able to show is that philosophy occupies part
2965 of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence
2966 of natural causes in general. Since knowledge of the phenomena is a
2967 posteriori, our ideas, in all theoretical sciences, can be treated
2968 like time, but our judgements are just as necessary as the Categories.
2969 Our understanding is a representation of the objects in space and
2970 time, and the paralogisms are just as necessary as our experience.}

2971

2972 \kgl_newpara:n {Philosophy (and it must not be supposed that this is
2973 true) is a representation of the never-ending regress in the series of
2974 empirical conditions; however, the Antinomies have nothing to do with,
2975 in the study of philosophy, the discipline of practical reason.
2976 Because of the relation between philosophy and our ideas, it remains a
2977 mystery why, so regarded, metaphysics depends on the employment of
2978 natural causes. The pure employment of the Antinomies, in particular,
2979 is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known a
2980 priori, but necessity is a representation of the Ideal. As will
2981 easily be shown in the next section, it remains a mystery why the
2982 Antinomies are what first give rise to the transcendental aesthetic;
2983 in all theoretical sciences, the architectonic of pure reason has
2984 nothing to do with, therefore, the noumena. The noumena are the clue
2985 to the discovery of the Categories, yet the transcendental aesthetic,
2986 for example, stands in need of natural causes. The Categories can not
2987 take account of, so far as regards the architectonic of natural
2988 reason, the paralogisms; in the study of general logic, the
2989 transcendental unity of apperception, insomuch as the architectonic of
2990 human reason relies on the Antinomies, can thereby determine in its
2991 totality natural causes.}

2992

2993 \kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Hume, it remains a
2994 mystery why our judgements exclude the possibility of the
2995 transcendental aesthetic; therefore, the transcendental aesthetic can
2996 not take account of the thing in itself. Our knowledge depends on,
2997 indeed, our knowledge. It is not at all certain that space is just as
2998 necessary as the noumena. Is it true that metaphysics can not take
2999 account of the paralogisms of human reason, or is the real question
3000 whether the noumena are by their very nature contradictory? On the
3001 other hand, time constitutes the whole content for necessity, by means
3002 of analytic unity. There can be no doubt that the phenomena have
3003 lying before them metaphysics. As is proven in the ontological
3004 manuals, it remains a mystery why space exists in the objects in space
3005 and time; still, the noumena, in the case of necessity, constitute the
3006 whole content of philosophy.}

3007

Now we define the sequence of index words.

```
3008 \kgl_newword:n {Ideal}
3009 \kgl_newword:n {noumena}
3010 \kgl_newword:n {Aristotle}
3011 \kgl_newword:n {transcendental}
3012 \kgl_newword:n {metaphysics}
3013 \kgl_newword:n {reason}
3014 \kgl_newword:n {science}
3015 \kgl_newword:n {necessity}
3016 \kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3017 \kgl_newword:n {philosophy}
3018 \kgl_newword:n {knowledge}
3019 \kgl_newword:n {regress}
3020 \kgl_newword:n {paralogism}
3021 \kgl_newword:n {empirical}
3022 \kgl_newword:n {space}
3023 \kgl_newword:n {manifold}
3024 \kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3025 \kgl_newword:n {aesthetic}
3026 \kgl_newword:n {noumena}
3027 \kgl_newword:n {sphere}
3028 \kgl_newword:n {time}
3029 \kgl_newword:n {practical reason}
3030 \kgl_newword:n {perception}
3031 \kgl_newword:n {things in themselves}
3032 \kgl_newword:n {doctrine}
3033 \kgl_newword:n {regress}
3034 \kgl_newword:n {mystery}
3035 \kgl_newword:n {existence}
3036 \kgl_newword:n {contradiction}
3037 \kgl_newword:n {a priori}
3038 \kgl_newword:n {natural causes}
3039 \kgl_newword:n {analysis}
3040 \kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3041 \kgl_newword:n {Antinomies}
3042 \kgl_newword:n {Transcendental Deduction}
3043 \kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3044 \kgl_newword:n {formal logic}
3045 \kgl_newword:n {soul}
3046 \kgl_newword:n {misapprehension}
3047 \kgl_newword:n {elsewhere}
3048 \kgl_newword:n {theology}
3049 \kgl_newword:n {employment}
3050 \kgl_newword:n {logic}
3051 \kgl_newword:n {practical reason}
3052 \kgl_newword:n {theoretical sciences}
3053 \kgl_newword:n {a posteriori}
3054 \kgl_newword:n {mystery}
3055 \kgl_newword:n {philosophy}
3056 \kgl_newword:n {things in themselves}
3057 \kgl_newword:n {experience}
3058 \kgl_newword:n {contradictory}
3059 \kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3060 \kgl_newword:n {perceptions}
```

3061 \kgl_newword:n {Galileo}
3062 \kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3063 \kgl_newword:n {empirical objects}
3064 \kgl_newword:n {judgements}
3065 \kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3066 \kgl_newword:n {power}
3067 \kgl_newword:n {hypothetical principles}
3068 \kgl_newword:n {transcendental logic}
3069 \kgl_newword:n {doctrine}
3070 \kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3071 \kgl_newword:n {totality}
3072 \kgl_newword:n {manifold}
3073 \kgl_newword:n {inductive judgements}
3074 \kgl_newword:n {Transcendental Deduction}
3075 \kgl_newword:n {analytic unity}
3076 \kgl_newword:n {Hume}
3077 \kgl_newword:n {canon}
3078 \kgl_newword:n {knowledge}
3079 \kgl_newword:n {universal}
3080 \kgl_newword:n {section}
3081 \kgl_newword:n {body}
3082 \kgl_newword:n {ignorance}
3083 \kgl_newword:n {sense perceptions}
3084 \kgl_newword:n {natural reason}
3085 \kgl_newword:n {exception}
3086 \kgl_newword:n {ampliative judgements}
3087 \kgl_newword:n {experience}
3088 \kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3089 \kgl_newword:n {analysis}
3090 \kgl_newword:n {philosophy}
3091 \kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3092 \kgl_newword:n {paralogism}
3093 \kgl_newword:n {ignorance}
3094 \kgl_newword:n {true}
3095 \kgl_newword:n {space}
3096 \kgl_newword:n {Ideal}
3097 \kgl_newword:n {accordance}
3098 \kgl_newword:n {regress}
3099 \kgl_newword:n {experience}
3100 \kgl_newword:n {a priori}
3101 \kgl_newword:n {disjunctive}
3102 \kgl_newword:n {soul}
3103 \kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3104 \kgl_newword:n {analytic unity}
3105 \kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3106 \kgl_newword:n {practical reason}
3107 \kgl_newword:n {cause}
3108 \kgl_newword:n {manuals}
3109 \kgl_newword:n {dedicated reader}
3110 \kgl_newword:n {a posteriori}
3111 \kgl_newword:n {employment}
3112 \kgl_newword:n {natural theology}
3113 \kgl_newword:n {manifold}
3114 \kgl_newword:n {transcendental aesthetic}

3115 \kgl_newword:n {close}
3116 \kgl_newword:n {full}
3117 \kgl_newword:n {Aristotle}
3118 \kgl_newword:n {clue}
3119 \kgl_newword:n {me}
3120 \kgl_newword:n {account}
3121 \kgl_newword:n {things}
3122 \kgl_newword:n {sense}
3123 \kgl_newword:n {intelligible}
3124 \kgl_newword:n {understanding}
3125 \kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3126 \kgl_newword:n {never}
3127 \kgl_newword:n {apperception}
3128 \kgl_newword:n {Ideal}
3129 \kgl_newword:n {need}
3130 \kgl_newword:n {space}
3131 \kgl_newword:n {virtue}
3132 \kgl_newword:n {Hume}
3133 \kgl_newword:n {still}
3134 \kgl_newword:n {whatsoever}
3135 \kgl_newword:n {even}
3136 \kgl_newword:n {sphere}
3137 \kgl_newword:n {position}
3138 \kgl_newword:n {ignorance}
3139 \kgl_newword:n {word}
3140 \kgl_newword:n {phenomena}
3141 \kgl_newword:n {theology}
3142 \kgl_newword:n {mystery}
3143 \kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3144 \kgl_newword:n {perception}
3145 \kgl_newword:n {power}
3146 \kgl_newword:n {experience}
3147 \kgl_newword:n {never-ending}
3148 \kgl_newword:n {analytic}
3149 \kgl_newword:n {itself}
3150 \kgl_newword:n {a priori}
3151 \kgl_newword:n {rule}
3152 \kgl_newword:n {Transcendental Deduction}
3153 \kgl_newword:n {empirical conditions}
3154 \kgl_newword:n {knowledge}
3155 \kgl_newword:n {disjunctive}
3156 \kgl_newword:n {transcendental}
3157 \kgl_newword:n {science}
3158 \kgl_newword:n {falsified}
3159 \kgl_newword:n {reader}
3160 \kgl_newword:n {blind}
3161 \kgl_newword:n {employment}
3162 \kgl_newword:n {discipline}
3163 \kgl_newword:n {function}
3164 \kgl_newword:n {careful}
3165 \kgl_newword:n {Aristotle}
3166 \kgl_newword:n {Categories}
3167 \kgl_newword:n {part}
3168 \kgl_newword:n {noumena}

```
3169 \kgl_newword:n {doubt}
3170 \kgl_newword:n {duck}
3171 \kgl_newword:n {Kant}
```

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

```
3172 \group_end:
3173 \msg_info:nx {kantlipsum} {how-many}
3174 { \int_eval:n {\seq_count:N \g_kgl_pars_seq} }
```