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I. Transcendental Illusion

We have already entitled dialectic in general a logic of illusion.¹ This does not mean a doctrine of probability; for probability is truth, known however on insufficient grounds, and the knowledge of which, though thus imperfect, is not on that account deceptive; and such doctrine, accordingly, is not to be separated from the analytic part of logic. Still less justificaton have we for regarding appearance and illusion as being identical. For truth or illusion is not in the object, in so far as it is intuited, but in the judgment about it, in so far as it is thought. It is therefore correct to say that the senses do not err—not because they always judge rightly but because they do not judge at all. Truth and error, therefore, and consequently also illusion as leading to error, are only to be found in the judgment, i.e. only in the relation of the object to our understanding. In any knowledge which completely accords with the laws of understanding there is no error. In a representation of the senses—as containing no judgment whatsoever—there is also no error. No natural force can of itself deviate from its own laws. Thus neither the understanding by itself (uninfluenced by another cause), nor the senses by themselves, would fall into error. The former would not, since, if it acts only according to its own laws, the effect (the judgment) must necessarily be in conformity with these laws; conformity with the laws

¹ [Schein.]
of the understanding is the formal element in all truth. In the
senses there is no judgment whatsoever, neither a true
nor a false judgment. Now since we have no source of know-
ledge besides these two, it follows that error is brought about
solely by the unobserved influence of sensibility on the un-
derstanding, through which it happens that the subjective grounds
of the judgment enter into union with the objective grounds
and make these latter deviate from their true function, —just
as a body in motion would always of itself continue in a
straight line in the same direction, but if influenced by another
force acting in another direction starts off into curvilinear
motion. In order to distinguish the specific action of under-
standing from the force which is intermixed with it, it is neces-
sary to regard the erroneous judgment as the diagonal between
two forces — forces which determine the judgment in different
directions that enclose, as it were, an angle — and to resolve
this composite action into the simple actions of the under-
standing and of the sensibility. In the case of pure a priori
judgments this is a task which fails to be discharged by tran-
scendental reflection, through which, as we have already shown,
every representation is assigned its place in the corresponding
faculty of knowledge, and by which the influence of the one
upon the other is therefore likewise distinguished.

We are not here concerned with empirical (e.g. optical)
ilusion, which occurs in the empirical employment of rules of
understanding that are otherwise correct, and through which
the faculty of judgment is misled by the influence of imagina-
tion; we are concerned only with transcendental illusion, which
exerts its influence on principles that are in no wise intended for
use in experience, in which case we should at least have had a
criterion of their correctness. In defiance of all the warnings of
criticism, it carries us altogether beyond the empirical employ-
ment of categories and puts us off with a merely deceptive exten-
sion of pure understanding. We shall entitle the principles whose
application is confined entirely within the limits of possible

Sensibility, when subordinated to understanding, as the object
upon which the latter exercises its function, is the source of real
modes of knowledge. But the same sensibility, in so far as it in-
fluences the operation of understanding, and determines it to make
judgments, is the ground of error.

standes besteht aber das Formale aller Wahrheit. In den Sinnen
ist gar kein Urteil, weder ein wahres, noch falsches. Weil
wir nun außer diesen beiden Erkenntnisquellen keine an-
dere haben, so folgt: daß der Irrtum nur durch den unbe-
merkten Einfluß der Sensibilität auf den Verstand bewirkt
werde, wodurch es geschieht, daß die subjektiven Gründe
des Urteils mit den objektiven zusammenfließen, und diese
von ihrer Bestimmung abweichend machen, so wie ein be-
wegter Körper zwar für sich jederzeit die gerade Linie in
derselben Richtung halten würde, die aber, wenn eine an-
dere Kraft nach einer andern Richtung zugleich auf ihn ein-
fähre, in krummlinige Bewegung ausschlägt. Um die eigen-
tümliche Handlung des Verstandes von der Kraft, die sich
mit einmengt, zu unterscheiden, wird es daher nötig sein,
das irregre Urteil als die Diagonale zwischen zwei Kräften
anzusehen, die das Urteil nach zwei verschiedenen Rich-
tungen bestimmen, die gleichsam einen Winkel einschließen,
und jene zusammengesetzte Wirkung in die einfache des
Verstandes und der Sensibilität aufzulösen, welches in rei-
nen Urteilen a priori durch transcendental Überlegung ge-
schehen muß, wodurch (wie schon angezeigt worden) jeder
Vorstellung ihre Stelle in der ihr angemessen Erkenntnis-
kraft angewiesen, mithin auch der Einfluß der letzteren auf
jene unterschieden wird.

Unser Geschäfte ist hier nicht, vom empirischen Scheine
(z. B. dem optischen) zu handeln, der sich bei dem empiri-
rischen Gebrauche sonst richtiger Verstandesregeln vorfin-
det, und durch welchen die Urteilskraft, durch den Einfluß
der Einbildung verleitet wird, sondern wir haben es mit dem trans-
zendentalen Scheine allein zu tun, der auf Grund-
sätze einflußt, deren Gebrauch nicht einmal auf Erfahrung
angelegt ist, als in welchem Falle wir doch wenigstens einen
Probierstein ihrer Richtigkeit haben würden, sondern der
uns selbst, wider alle Warnungen der Kritik, gänzlich über
den empirischen Gebrauch der Kategorien wegführt und
uns mit dem Blendwerk einer Erweiterung des reinen
Verstandes hinhält. Wir wollen die Grundsätze, deren An-
wendung sich ganz und gar in den Schranken | möglicher
Erfahrung hält, im manente, diejenigen aber, welche diese

* Die Sensibilität, dem Verstande untergelegt, als das Objekt, worauf
dieser seine Funktion anwendet, ist der Quell resser Erkenntnisse. Eben
dieselbe aber, so fern sie auf die Verständeshandlung selbst einflußt,
und ihn zum Urteilen bestimmt, ist der Grund des Irrtums.
experience, immanent; and those, on the other hand, which
profess to pass beyond these limits, transcendent. In the case
of the latter, I am not referring to the transcendent em-
ployment or misusement of the categories, which is merely an
error of the faculty of judgment when it is not duly curbed by
criticism, and therefore does not pay sufficient attention to the
bounds of the territory within which alone free play is allowed
to pure understanding. I mean actual principles which incite
us to tear down all those boundary-fences and to seize posses-
sion of an entirely new domain which recognises no limits of
demarcation. Thus transcendent and transcendent are not
interchangeable terms. The principles of pure understanding,
which we have set out above, allow only of empirical and not
of transcendental employment, that is, employment extend-
ing beyond the limits of experience. A principle, on the other
hand, which takes away these limits, or even commands us
actually to transgress them, is called transcendent. If our
criticism can succeed in disclosing the illusion in these alleged
principles, then those principles which are of merely empirical
employment may be called, in opposition to the others, im-
manent principles of pure understanding.

Logical illusion, which consists in the mere imitation
of the form of reason (the illusion of formal fallacies), arises
entirely from lack of attention to the logical rule. As soon
as attention is brought to bear on the case that is before us,
the illusion completely disappears. Transcendental illusion,
on the other hand, does not cease even after it has been de-
tected and its invalidity clearly revealed by transcendental
criticism (e.g. the illusion in the proposition: the world must
have a beginning in time). The cause of this is that there are
fundamental rules and maxims for the employment of our
reason (subjectively regarded as a faculty of human know-
ledge), and that these have all the appearance of being ob-
jective principles. We therefore take the subjective necessity
of a connection of our concepts, which is to the advantage of
the understanding, for an objective necessity in the deter-
mination of things in themselves. This is an illusion which
can no more be prevented than we can prevent the sea
appearing higher at the horizon than at the shore, since we see
it through higher light rays; or to cite a still better example,

Grenzen überfliegen sollen, transzendent Grundsätze
nennen. Ich verstehe aber unter diesen nicht den transzen-
denten Gebrauch oder Mißbrauch der Kategorien, wel-
cher ein bloßer Fehler der nicht gehört durch Kritik ge-
zügelten Urteilskraft ist, die auf die Grenze des Bodens,
worauf allein dem reinen Verstande sein Spiel erlaubt ist,
nicht genug Acht hat; sondern wirkliche Grundsätze, die
uns zumuten, alle jene Grenzfälle niederzureißen und sich
einen ganz neuen Boden, der überall keine Demarkation er-
kennt, anzuzeilen. Daher sind transcendental und
transzendent nicht einerlei. Die Grundsätze des reinen
Verstandes, die wir oben vortragen, sollen bloß von empiri-
cischem und nicht von transzendentalen, d. i. über die Erfah-
rungsgrenze hinausreichendem Gebrauche sein. Ein Grund-
satz aber, der diese Schranken wegnimmt, ja gar sie zu überschreiten gebietet, heißt transzendent. Kann unsere Kri-
tik dahin gelangen, den Schein dieser angemessenen Grundsätze
aufzudecken, so werden jene Grundsätze des bloßempirischen
Gebrauchs, im Gegensatz mit den letztern, immanente
Grundsätze des reinen Verstandes genannt werden können.

Der logische Schein, der in der bloßen Nachahmung der
Vernunftform besteht (der Schein der Trugschlüsse), ent-
springt lediglich aus einem Mangel der Achtsamkeit auf die
logische Regel. So bald daher diese auf den vorliegenden
Fall geschart wird, so verschwindet er ganzlich. Der tran-
szendentale Schein dagegen hört gleichwohl nicht auf, ob
man ihn schon aufgedeckt und seine Nichtigkeit durch die
transzendentalen Kritik deutlich eingesehen hat. (Z. B. der
Schein in dem Satze: die Welt muß der Zeit nach einen An-
fang haben.) Die Ursache hievon ist diese: daß in unserer
Vernunft (subjektiv als ein menschliches Erkenntnisver-
mögen betrachtet) Grundregeln und Maximen ihres Ge-
brauchs liegen, welche gänzlich das Ansehen objektiver
Grundsätze haben, und wodurch es geschieht, daß die subjek-
tive Notwendigkeit einer gewissen Verknüpfung unserer
Begriffe, zu Gunsten des Verstandes, für eine objektive Not-
wendigkeit, der Bestimmung der Dinge an sich selbst, gehal-
ten wird. Eine Illusion, die gar nicht zu vermeiden ist, so
wenig als wir es vermeiden können, daß uns das Meer in
der Mitte nicht höher scheine, wie an dem Ufer, weil wir
jene durch höherer Lichtstrahlen als diese sehen, oder, noch

1 A: ja gar gebietet, sie zu überschreiten; 2 Akad.-Ausz.: dieses.
than the astronomer can prevent the moon from appearing larger at its rising, although he is not deceived by this illusion.

The transcendental dialectic will therefore content itself with exposing the illusion of transcendent judgments, and at the same time taking precautions that we be not deceived by it. That the illusion should, like logical illusion, actually disappear and cease to be an illusion, is something which transcendental dialectic can never be in a position to achieve. For here we have to do with a natural and inevitable illusion, which rests on subjective principles, and foists them upon us as objective; whereas logical dialectic in its exposure of deceptive inferences has to do merely with an error in the following out of principles, or with an illusion artificially created in imitation of such inferences. There exists, then, a natural and unavoidable dialectic of pure reason—not one in which a bungler might entangle himself through lack of knowledge, or one which some sophist has artificially invented to confuse thinking people, but one inseparable from human reason, and which, even after its deceptiveness has been exposed, will not cease to play tricks with reason and continually entrap it into momentary aberrations ever and again calling for correction.

II

PURE REASON AS THE SEAT OF TRANSCENDENTAL ILLUSION

A

Reason in general

All our knowledge starts with the senses, proceeds from thence to understanding, and ends with reason, beyond which there is no higher faculty to be found in us for elaborating the matter of intuition and bringing it under the highest unity of thought. Now that I have to give an explanation of this highest faculty of knowledge, I find myself in some difficulty. Reason, like understanding, can be employed in a merely formal, that is, logical manner, whereby it abstracts from all content of knowledge. But it is also capable of a real use, since it contains within itself the source of certain concepts and principles,

VON DER VERNUNFT ÜBERHAUPT

mehr, so wenig selbst der Astronom verhindern kann, daß ihm der Mond im Aufgange nicht größer scheine, ob er gleich durch diesen Schein nicht betrogen wird.

Die transcendente Dialektik wird also sich damit begeben, den Schein transzendenter Urteile aufzudecken, und zugleich zu verhüten, daß er nicht betriege; daß er aber auch (wie der logische Schein) sogar verschwinde, und ein Schein zu sein aushöre, das kann sie niemals bewerkstelligen. Denn wir haben es mit einer natürlichen und unvermeidlichen Illusion zu tun, die selbst auf subjektiven Grundsätzen beruht, und sie als objektive unterscheidet, anstatt daß die logische Dialektik in Auflösung der Trugschlüsse es nur mit einem Fehler, in Befolgung der Grundsätze, oder mit einem gekünstelten Scheine, in Nachahmung derselben, zu tun hat. Es gibt also eine natürliche und unvermeidliche Dialektik der reinen Vernunft, nicht eine, in die sich etwa ein Stümper, durch Mangel an Kenntnissen, selbst verwickelt, oder die irgend ein Sophist, um vernünftige Leute zu verwirren, künstlich eronnen hat, sondern die der menschlichen Vernunft unhinterdreilich anhängt, und selbst, nachdem wir ihr Blendwerk aufgedeckt haben, dennoch nicht aufhören wird, ihr vorzugehen, und sie unablässig in augenblickliche Versirungen zu stoßen, die jederzeit gehoben zu werden bedürfen.

II VON DER REINEN VERNUNFT ALS DEM SITZE DES TRANSCENDENTALEN SCHEINS

A VON DER VERNUNFT ÜBERHAUPT

which it does not borrow either from the senses or from the understanding. The former faculty has long since been defined by logicians as the faculty of making mediate inferences (in distinction from immediate inferences, consequentiae immediatiae); but the nature of the other faculty, which itself gives birth to concepts, is not to be understood from this definition. Now since we are here presented with a division of reason into a logical and a transcendental faculty, we are constrained to seek for a higher concept of this source of knowledge which includes both concepts as subordinate to itself. Following the analogy of concepts of understanding, we may expect that the logical concept will provide the key to the transcendental, and that the table of the functions of the former will at once give us the genealogical tree of the concepts of reason.

In the first part of our transcendental logic we treated the understanding as being the faculty of rules; reason we shall here distinguish from understanding by entitling it the faculty of principles.

The term 'principle' is ambiguous, and commonly signifies any knowledge which can be used as a principle, although in itself, and as regards its proper origin, it is no principle. Every universal proposition, even one derived from experience, through induction, can serve as major premis in a syllogism; but it is not therefore itself a principle. The mathematical axioms (e.g. that there can only be one straight line between two points) are instances of universal a priori knowledge, and are therefore rightly called principles, relatively to the cases which can be subsumed under them. But I cannot therefore say that I apprehend this property of straight lines in general and in itself, from principles; I apprehend it only in pure intuition.

Knowledge from principles is, therefore, that knowledge alone in which I apprehend the particular in the universal through concepts. Thus every syllogism is a mode of deducing knowledge from a principle. For the major premis always gives a concept through which everything that is subsumed under the concept as under a condition is known from the concept according to a principle. Now since any universal knowledge can serve as major premis in a syllogism, and since the understanding presents us with universal a priori propositions
of this kind, they can also be called principles in respect of
their possible employment.

But if we consider them in themselves in relation to their
origin, these fundamental propositions of pure understanding
are anything rather than knowledge based on concepts. For
they would not even be possible \textit{a priori}, if we were not sup-
ported by pure intuition (in mathematics), or by conditions
of a possible experience in general. That everything that happens
has a cause cannot be inferred merely from the concept of
happening in general; on the contrary, it is this fundamental
proposition which shows how in regard to that which happens
we are in a position to obtain in experience any concept what-
soever that is really determinate.

The understanding can, then, never supply any synthetic
modes of knowledge derived from concepts; and it is such
modes of knowledge that are properly, without qualification,\footnote{1 [schlachkin.]}
to be entitled \textit{'principles'}. All universal propositions, however,
may be spoken of as \textit{'principles'} in a comparative sense.

It has long been wished—and sometimes perhaps (who
knows when?) may be fulfilled—that instead of the endless
multiplicity of civil laws we should be able to fall back on their
general principles. For it is in these alone that we can hope to
find the secret of what we are wont to call the simplifying of
legislation. In this domain, however, the laws are only limita-
tions imposed upon our freedom in order that such freedom
may completely harmonise with itself; hence they are directed
to something which is entirely our own work, and of which
we ourselves, through these concepts, can be the cause. But that
objects in themselves, the very nature of things, should stand
under principles, and should be determined according to mere
concepts, is a demand which, if not impossible, is at least quite
contrary to common sense.\footnote{2 [sehr Widersinnliches.]}
But however that may be (it is a
question which we still have to discuss), it is now at least
evident that knowledge derived from principles which are
genuinely such is something quite different from knowledge
obtained merely through the understanding. The latter may,
indeed, also take the form of a principle and thus be prior to
some other knowledge, but in itself, so far as it is syn-

\textbf{TRANSZENDENTALE DIALEKTIK.}

so können diese denn auch,
in Ansehung ihres möglichen Gebrauchs, Prinzipien ge-
nannt werden.

Betrachten wir aber diese Grundsätze des reinen Ver-
standes an sich selbst ihrem Ursprunge nach, so sind sie
nichts weniger als Erkenntnisse aus Begriffen. Denn sie wür-
den auch nicht einmal a priori möglich sein, wenn wir nicht
die reine Anschauung (in der Mathematik), oder Bedingun-
gen einer möglichen Erfahrung überhaupt herbei zögern.
Daß alles, was geschieht, eine Ursache habe, kann gar nicht
aus dem Begriffe dessen, was überhaupt geschieht, geschlos-
sen werden; vielmehr zeigt der Grundsatz, wie man aller-
erst von dem, was geschieht, einen bestimmten Erfahrungs-
begriiff bekomme könne.

Synthetische Erkenntnisse aus Begriffen kann der Ver-
stand also gar nicht verschaffen, und diese sind es \textit{eigent-
lich}, welche ich schlechthin Prinzipien nenne: indessen, daß
alle allgemeine Sätze überhaupt komparative Prinzipien
heißen können.

Es ist ein alter Wunsch, der, wer weiß wie spät, vielleicht
einmal in Erfüllung gehen wird: daß man doch einmal, statt
der endlosen Mangelhaftigkeit bürgerlicher Gesetze, ihre
Prinzipien aufsuchen möge; denn darin kann allein das Ge-
heimnis bestehen, die Gesetzgebung, wie man sagt, zu sim-
plifizieren. Aber die Gesetze sind hier auch nur Einschrän-
kungen unserer Freiheit auf Bedingungen, unter denen sie
durchgehängt mit sich selbst zusammenstimmt; mithin gehen
sie auf etwas, was gänzlich unser eigen Werk ist, und wovon
wir durch jene Begriffe selbst die Ursache sein können. Wie
aber Gegenstände an sich selbst, wie \textit{die Natur der Dinge}
unter Prinzipi stehe und nach bloßen Begriffen bestimmt
werden solle, ist, wo nicht etwas Unmögliches, wenigstens
doch sehr Widersinnisches in seiner Forderung. Es mag aber
hiemit bewandt sein, wie es wolle (denn darüber haben wir
die Untersuchung noch vor uns), so erhellet wenigstens dar-
aus: daß Erkenntnis aus Prinzipien (an sich selbst) ganz
etwas andres sei, als bloße Verstendeserkenntnis, die zwar
auch andern Erkenntnissen in der Form eines Prinzips vor-
gehen kann, an sich selbst aber (so fern sie synthetisch ist)
The Logical Employment of Reason

A distinction is commonly made between what is immediately known and what is merely inferred. That in a figure which is bounded by three straight lines there are three angles, is known immediately; but that the sum of these angles is equal to two right angles, is merely inferred. Since we have constantly to make use of inference, and so end by becoming completely accustomed to it, we no longer take notice of this distinction, and frequently, as in the so-called deceptions of the senses, treat as being immediately perceived what has really only been inferred. In every process of reasoning there is a fundamental proposition, and another, namely the conclusion, which is drawn from it, and finally, the inference (logical sequence) by which the truth of the latter is inseparably connected with the truth of the former. If the inferred judgment is already so contained in the earlier judgment that it may be derived from it without the mediation of a third representation, the inference is called immediate (consequentia immediata)—I should prefer to entitle it inference of the understanding. But if besides the knowledge contained in the primary proposition still another judg-
ment is needed to yield the conclusion, it is to be entitled an inference of the reason. In the proposition: "All men are mortal," there are already contained the propositions: "some men are mortal," "some mortal beings are men," "nothing that is not mortal is a man"; and these are therefore immediate conclusions from it. On the other hand, the proposition: "All learned beings are mortal," is not contained in the fundamental judgment (for the concept of learned beings does not occur in it at all), and it can only be inferred from it by means of a mediating judgment.

In every syllogism I first think a rule (the major premise) through the understanding. Secondly, I subsume something known under the condition of the rule by means of judgment (the minor premise). Finally, what is thereby known I determine through the predicate of the rule, and so a priori through reason (the conclusion). The relation, therefore, which the major premise, as the rule, represents between what is known and its condition is the ground of the different kinds of syllogism. Consequently, syllogisms, like judgments, are of three kinds, according to the different ways in which, in the understanding, they express the relation of what is known; they are either categorical, hypothetical, or disjunctive.

If, as generally happens, the judgment that forms the conclusion is set as a problem—to see whether it does not follow from judgments already given, and through which a quite different object is thought—I look in the understanding for the assertion of this conclusion, to discover whether it is not there found to stand under certain conditions according to a universal rule. If I find such a condition, and if the object of the conclusion can be subsumed under the given condition, then the conclusion is deduced from the rule, which is also valid for other objects of knowledge. From this we see that in inference reason endeavours to reduce the varied and manifold knowledge obtained through the understanding to the smallest number of principles (universal conditions) and thereby to achieve in it the highest possible unity.

---

1 [Ermüfungsschluss, here distinguished from Verstandsschluss, is Kant's usual term for 'syllogism', and is so translated in other passages as, e.g., in the next paragraph.]

2 [Urteilskräft.]
The Pure Employment of Reason

Can we isolate reason, and is it, so regarded, an independent source of concepts and judgments which spring from it alone, and by means of which it relates to objects; or is it a merely subordinate faculty, for imposing on given modes of knowledge a certain form, called logical—a faculty through which what is known by means of the understanding is determined in its interrelations, lower rules being brought under higher (namely, those the condition of which includes in its own sphere the condition of the lower), as far as this can be done through [processes of] comparison? This is the question with which we are now provisionally occupying ourselves. As a matter of fact, multiplicity of rules and unity of principles is a demand of reason, for the purpose of bringing the understanding into thoroughgoing accordance with itself, just as the understanding brings the manifold of intuition under concepts and thereby connects the manifold. But such a principle does not prescribe any law for objects, and does not contain any general ground of the possibility of knowing or of determining objects as such; it is merely a subjective law for the orderly management of the possessions of our understanding, that by comparison of its concepts it may reduce them to the smallest possible number; it does not justify us in demanding from the objects such uniformity as will minister to the convenience and extension of our understanding; and we may not, therefore, ascribe to the maxim any objective validity. In a word, the question is, does reason in itself, that is, does pure reason, contain a priori synthetic principles and rules, and in what may these principles consist?

The formal and logical procedure of reason in syllogisms gives us sufficient guidance as to the ground on which the transcendental principle of pure reason in its synthetic knowledge will rest.

In the first place, reason in the syllogism does not concern itself with intuitions, with a view to bringing them under rules (as the understanding does with its categories), but with con-

1 [Reading, with Erdmann, \textit{jemess for jemess.}]
cepts and judgments. Accordingly, even if pure reason does
concern itself with objects, it has no immediate relation to
these and the intuition of them, but only to the understand-
ing and its judgments—which deal at first hand with the senses
and their intuition for the purpose of determining their object.
The unity of reason is therefore not the unity of a possible
experience, but is essentially different from such unity, which
is that of understanding. That everything which happens has
a cause, is not a principle known and prescribed by reason.
That principle makes the unity of experience possible, and
borrows nothing from reason, which, apart from this relation
to possible experience, could never, from mere concepts, have
imposed any such synthetic unity.

Secondly, reason, in its logical employment, seeks to dis-
cover the universal condition of its judgment (the conclusion),
and the syllogism is itself nothing but a judgment made by
means of the subsumption of its condition under a universal
rule (the major premiss). Now since this rule is itself subject
to the same requirement of reason, and the condition of the
condition must therefore be sought (by means of a prosyllogism)
whenever practicable, obviously the principle peculiar to reason
in general, in its logical employment, is:—to find for the con-
ditioned knowledge obtained through the understanding the
unconditioned whereby its unity is brought to completion.

But this logical maxim can only become a principle of
pure reason through our assuming that if the conditioned is
given, the whole series of conditions, subordinated to one
another—a series which is therefore itself unconditioned—is
likewise given, that is, is contained in the object and its
connection.

Such a principle of pure reason is obviously synthetic;
the conditioned is analytically related to some condition but
not to the unconditioned. From the principle there must also
follow various synthetic propositions, of which pure under-
standing—inasmuch as it has to deal only with objects of a
possible experience, the knowledge and synthesis of which
is always conditioned—knows nothing. The unconditioned, if its
actuality be granted, is especially to be considered in respect
of all the determinations which distinguish it from whatever

1 [Reading, with 4th edition, wird for kann.]
is conditioned, and thereby must yield material for many synthetic a priori propositions.

The principles\textsuperscript{1} arising from this supreme principle\textsuperscript{2} of pure reason will, however, be transcendental in relation to all appearances, i.e. there can never be any adequate empirical employment of the principle. It will therefore be entirely different from all principles of understanding, the employment of which is wholly immanent, inasmuch as they have as their theme\textsuperscript{3} only the possibility of experience. Take the principle, that the series of conditions (whether in the synthesis of appearances, or even in the thinking of things in general) extends to the unconditioned. Does it, or does it not, have objective applicability? What are its implications as regards the empirical employment of understanding? Or is there no such objectively valid principle of reason, but only a logical precept, to advance towards completeness by an ascent to ever higher conditions and so to give to our knowledge the greatest possible unity of reason? Can it be that this requirement of reason has been wrongly treated in being viewed as a transcendental principle of pure reason, and that we have been overhasty in postulating such an unbounded completeness of the series of conditions in the objects themselves? In that case, what other misunderstandings and delusions may have crept into the syllogisms, whose major premise (perhaps rather an assumption than a postulate) is derived from pure reason, and which proceed from experience upwards to its conditions? To answer these questions will be our task in the Transcendental Dialectic, which we shall now endeavour to develop from its deeply concealed sources in human reason. We shall divide the Dialectic into two books, the first on the transcendental concepts of pure reason, the second on its transcendental and dialectical inferences.

\textsuperscript{1} [Grundsätze.]  \textsuperscript{2} [Prinzip.]  \textsuperscript{3} [zu ihrem Thema.]

VON DEN BEGRIFFEN DER REINEN VERNUNFT

und muß dadurch Stoff zu manchen synthetischen Sätzen a priori geben.

Die aus diesem obersten Prinzip der reinen Vernunft entspringende Grundsätze werden aber in Ansehung aller Erscheinungen transzendental sein, d.i. es wird kein ihm adäquater empirischer Gebrauch von demselben jemals gemacht werden können. Er wird sich also von allen Grundsätzen des Verstandes (dersen Gebrauch völlig immanent ist, indem sie nur die Möglichkeit der Erfahrung zu ihrem Thema haben) gänzlich unterscheiden. Ob nun jener Grundsatz: daß sich die Reihe der Bedingungen (in der Synthesis der Erscheinungen, oder auch des Denkens der Dinge überhaupt) bis zum Unbedingten erstreckte, seine objektive Richtigkeit habe, oder nicht; welche Folgerungen daraus auf den empirischen Verstandesgebrauch fließen, oder ob es vielmehr überall keinen dergleichen objektivgültigen Vernunftszusatz gebe, sondern eine bloß logische Vorschrift, sich, im Aufsteigen zu immer höheren Bedingungen, der Vollständigkeit derselben zu nähern und dadurch die höchste uns mögliche Vernunftseinstimmung in unsere Erkenntnis zu bringen; ob, sage ich, dieses Bedürfnis der Vernunft durch einen Mißverstand für einen transcendentalen Grundsatz der reinen Vernunft gehalten worden, der eine solche unbeschränkte Vollständigkeit überreiter Weise von der Reihe der Bedingungen in den Gegenständen selbst postuliert; was aber auch in diesem Falle für Mißdeutungen und Verblendungen in die Vernunftsschlüsse, deren Oberursache aus reiner Vernunft genommen worden (und der vielleicht mehr Petition als Postulat ist), und die von der Erfahrung aufwärts zu ihren Bedingungen steigen, einschließlich mögen: das wird unser Geschäfte in der transcendentalen Dialektik sein, welche wir jetzt aus ihren Quellen, die tief in der menschlichen Vernunft verborgen sind, entwickeln wollen. Wir werden sie in zwei Hauptstücke teilen, deren ersteres\textsuperscript{4} von den transzendenten Begriffen der reinen Vernunft, das zweite\textsuperscript{5} von transcendentalen und dialektischen Vernunftschlüssen derselben handeln soll.

\textsuperscript{1} A: ersteres.  \textsuperscript{2} A: oder zweites.

\[B 366, 367 \mid A 309, 310\]
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BOOK I

THE CONCEPTS OF PURE REASON

Whatever we may have to decide as to the possibility of the concepts derived from pure reason, it is at least true that they are not to be obtained by mere reflection but only by inference. Concepts of understanding are also thought a priori antecedently to experience and for the sake of experience, but they contain nothing more than the unity of reflection upon appearances, in so far as these appearances must necessarily belong to a possible empirical consciousness. Through them alone is knowledge and the determination of an object possible. They first provide the material required for making inferences, and they are not preceded by any a priori concepts of objects from which they could be inferred. On the other hand, their objective reality is founded solely on the fact that, since they constitute the intellectual form of all experience, it must always be possible to show their application in experience.

The title 'concept of reason' already gives a preliminary indication that we are dealing with something which does not allow of being confined within experience, since it concerns a knowledge of which any empirical knowledge (perhaps even the whole of possible experience or of its empirical synthesis) is only a part. No actual experience has ever been completely adequate to it, yet to it every actual experience belongs. Concepts of reason enable us to conceive, concepts of understanding to understand—(as employed in reference to) perceptions. If the concepts of reason contain the unconditioned, they are concerned with something to which all experience is subor-
dinate, but which is never itself an object of experience—something to which reason leads in its inferences from experience, and in accordance with which it estimates and gauges the degree of its empirical employment, but which is never itself a member of the empirical synthesis. If, none the less, these concepts possess objective validity, they may be called conceptus ratiocinati (rightly inferred concepts); if, however, they have no such validity, they have surreptitiously obtained recognition through having at least an illusory appearance of being inferences, and may be called conceptus ratiocinantes (pseudo-rational concepts). But since this can be established only in the chapter on the dialectical inferences of pure reason, we are not yet in a position to deal with it. Meantime, just as we have entitled the pure concepts of understanding categories, so we shall give a new name to the concepts of pure reason, calling them transcendental ideas. This title we shall now explain and justify.

FIRST BOOK OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL DIALECTIC

Section 1

THE IDEAS IN GENERAL

Despite the great wealth of our languages, the thinker often finds himself at a loss for the expression which exactly fits his concept, and for want of which he is unable to be really intelligible to others or even to himself. To coin new words is to advance a claim to legislation in language that seldom succeeds; and before we have recourse to this desperate expedient it is advisable to look about in a dead and learned language, to see whether the concept and its appropriate expression are not already there provided. Even if the old-time usage of a term should have become somewhat uncertain through the carelessness of those who introduced it, it is always better to hold fast to the meaning which distinctively belongs to it (even though it remain doubtful whether it was originally used in precisely this sense) than to defeat our purpose by making ourselves unintelligible.
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For this reason, if there be only a single word the established meaning of which exactly agrees with a certain concept, then, since it is of great importance that this concept be distinguished from related concepts, it is advisable to economise in the use of the word and not to employ it, merely for the sake of variety, as a synonym for some other expression, but carefully to keep to its own proper meaning. Otherwise it may easily happen that the expression ceasing to engage the attention in one specific sense, and being lost in the multitude of other words of very different meaning, the thought also is lost which it alone could have preserved.

Plato made use of the expression 'idea' in such a way as quite evidently to have meant by it something which not only can never be borrowed from the senses but far surpasses even the concepts of understanding (with which Aristotle occupied himself), inasmuch as in experience nothing is ever to be met with that is coincident with it. For Plato ideas are archetypes of the things themselves, and not, in the manner of the categories, merely keys to possible experiences. In his view they have issued from highest reason, and from that source have come to be shared in by human reason, which, however, is now no longer in its original state, but is constrained laboriously to recall, by a process of reminiscence (which is named philosophy), the old ideas, now very much obscured. I shall not engage here in any literary enquiry into the meaning which this illustrious philosopher attached to the expression. I need only remark that it is by no means unusual, upon comparing the thoughts which an author has expressed in regard to his subject, whether in ordinary conversation or in writing, to find that we understand him better than he has understood himself. As he has not sufficiently determined his concept, he has sometimes spoken, or even thought, in opposition to his own intention.

Plato very well realised that our faculty of knowledge feels a much higher need than merely to spell out appearances according to a synthetic unity, in order to be able to read them as experience. He knew that our reason naturally exalts itself to modes of knowledge which so far transcend the bounds of experience that no given empirical object can ever coincide

1 [damit Kongruierendes.]
2 [Kongruieren.]
with them, but which must none the less be recognised as having their own reality, and which are by no means mere fictions of the brain.

Plato found the chief instances of his ideas in the field of the practical, that is, in what rests upon freedom, which in its turn rests upon modes of knowledge that are a peculiar product of reason. Whoever would derive the concepts of virtue from experience and make (as many have actually done) what at best can only serve as an example in an imperfect kind of exposition, into a pattern from which to derive knowledge, would make of virtue something which changes according to time and circumstance, an ambiguous monstrosity not admitting of the formation of any rule. On the contrary, as we are well aware, if anyone is held up as a pattern of virtue, the true original with which we compare the alleged pattern and by which alone we judge of its value is to be found only in our minds. This original is the idea of virtue, in respect of which the possible objects of experience may serve as examples (proofs that the concept of reason commands is to a certain degree practicable), but not as archetype. That no one of us will ever act in a way which is adequate to what is contained in the pure idea of virtue is far from proving this thought to be in any respect chimerical. For it is only by means of this idea that any judgment as to moral worth or its opposite is possible; and it therefore serves as an indispensable foundation for every approach to moral perfection—however the obstacles in human nature, to the degree of which there are no assignable limits, may keep us far removed from its complete achievement.

The Republic of Plato has become proverbial as a striking example of a supposedly visionary perfection, such as can exist...
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only in the brain of the idle thinker; and Brucker\(^1\) has ridiculed the philosopher for asserting that a prince can rule well only in so far as he participates in the ideas. We should, however, be better advised to follow up this thought, and, where the great philosopher leaves us without help, to place it, through fresh efforts, in a proper light, rather than to set it aside as useless on the very sorry and harmful pretext of impracticability.

A constitution allowing the greatest possible human freedom in accordance with laws by which the freedom of each is made to be consistent with that of all others—I do not speak of the greatest happiness, for this will follow of itself—is at any rate a necessary idea, which must be taken as fundamental not only in first projecting a constitution but in all its laws. For at the start we are required to abstract from the actually existing hindrances, which, it may be, do not arise unavoidably out of human nature, but rather are due to a quite remediable cause, the neglect of the pure ideas in the making of the laws. Nothing, indeed, can be more injurious, or more unworthy of a philosopher, than the vulgar appeal to so-called adverse experience. Such experience would never have existed at all, if at the proper time those institutions had been established in accordance with ideas, and if ideas had not been displaced by crude conceptions which, just because they have been derived from experience, have nullified all good intentions. The more legislation and government are brought into harmony with the above idea, the rarer would punishments become, and it is therefore quite rational to maintain, as Plato does, that in a perfect state no punishments whatsoever would be required. This perfect state may never, indeed, come into being; none the less this does not affect the rightfulness of the idea, which, in order to bring the legal organisation of mankind ever nearer to its greatest possible perfection, advances this maximum as an archetype. For what the highest degree may be at which mankind may have to come to a stand, and how great a gulf may still have to be left between the idea and its realisation, are questions which no one can, or ought to, answer. For the issue depends on freedom; and it is in the power of freedom to pass beyond any and every specified limit.

\(^1\) [Johann Jakob Brucker (1696–1770). The reference is probably to vol. I pp. 726-7 of his Historia Critica Philosophica (pub. 1743-4).]
But it is not only where human reason exhibits genuine causality, and where ideas are operative causes (of actions and their objects), namely, in the moral sphere, but also in regard to nature itself, that Plato rightly discerns clear proofs of an origin from ideas. A plant, an animal, the orderly arrangement of the cosmos—presumably therefore the entire natural world—clearly show that they are possible only according to ideas, and that though no single creature in the conditions of its individual existence coincides with the idea of what is most perfect in its kind—just as little as does any human being with the idea of humanity, which he yet carries in his soul as the archetype of his actions—these ideas are none the less completely determined in the Supreme Understanding, each as an individual and each as unchangeable, and are the original causes of things. But only the totality of things, in their interconnection as constituting the universe, is completely adequate to the idea. If we set aside the exaggerations in Plato’s methods of expression, the philosopher’s spiritual flight from the etypical mode of reflecting upon¹ the physical world-order to the architectonic ordering of it according to ends, that is, according to ideas, is an enterprise which calls for respect and imitation. It is, however, in regard to the principles of morality, legislation, and religion, where the experience, in this case of the good, is itself made possible only by the ideas—incomplete as their empirical expression must always remain—that Plato’s teaching exhibits its quite peculiar merits. When it fails to obtain recognition, this is due to its having been judged in accordance with precisely those empirical rules, the invalidity of which, regarded as principles, it has itself demonstrated. For whereas, so far as nature is concerned, experience supplies the rules and is the source of truth, in respect of the moral laws it is, alas, the mother of illusion! Nothing is more reprehensible than to derive the laws prescribing what ought to be done from what is done, or to impose upon them the limits by which the latter is circumscribed.

¹ [von der kopenlichen Betrachtung.]

Aber nicht bloß in demjenigen, wobei die menschliche Vernunft wahrhafte Kausalität zeigt, und wo Ideen wirksende Ursachen (der Handlungen und ihrer Gegenstände) werden, nämlich im Sittlichen, sondern auch in Ansehung der Natur selbst, sieht Plato mit Recht deutliche Beweise ihres Ursprungs aus Ideen. Ein Gewächs, ein Tier; die regelmäßige Anordnung des Weltschopfes (vermutlich also auch die ganze Naturordnung) zeigen deutlich, daß sie nur nach Ideen möglich sein; daß zwar kein einzelnes Geschöpf, unter den einzelnen Bedingungen seines Daseins, mit der Idee des Vollkommensten seiner Art kongruiere (so wenig wie der Mensch mit der Idee der Menschheit, die er sogar selbst als das Urbild seiner Handlungen in seiner Seele trägt), daß gleichwohl jene Ideen im höchsten Verstande einzeln, unveränderlich, durchgängig bestimmt, und die ursprünglichen Ursachen der Dinge sind, und nur das Ganze ihrer Verbindung im Weltall einzig und allein jener Idee völlig adäquat sei. Wenn man das Übertriebene des Ausdrucks absondert, so ist der Geistesschwung des Philosophen, von der kopenlichen Betrachtung des Physischen der Weltordnung zu der architektonischen Verknüpfung derselben nach Zwecken, d. i. nach Ideen, hinauszusteuern, eine Bemühung, die Achtung und Nachfolge verdient; in Ansehung derjenigen aber, was die Prinzipien der Sittlichkeit, der Gesetzgebung und der Religion betrifft, wo die Ideen die Erfahrung selbst (des Guten) allersetz möglich machen, obzwar niemals darin völlig ausgedrückt werden können, ein ganz eigentümliches Verdienst, welches man nur darum nicht erkennt, weil man es durch eben die empirischen Regeln beurteilt, deren Gültigkeit, als Prinzipien, eben durch sie hat ausgehoben werden sollen. Denn in Betracht der Natur gibt uns Erfahrung die Regel an die Hand und ist der Quell der Wahrheit; in Ansehung der sittlichen Gesetze aber ist Erfahrung (leider!) die Mutter des Scheins, und es ist höchst verwerflich, die Gesetze über das, was ich tun soll, von demjenigen herzunehmen, oder dadurch einschränken zu wollen, was getan wird.

Statt aller dieser Betrachtungen, deren gehörige Ausführung in der Tat die eigentümliche Würde der Philosophie ausmacht, beschäftigen wir uns jetzt mit einer nicht so

¹ Akad.-Ausz.: spielt.
torious task, namely, to level the ground, and to render it sufficiently secure for moral edifices of these majestic dimensions. For this ground has been honeycombed by subterranean workings which reason, in its confident but fruitless search for hidden treasures, has carried out in all directions, and which threaten the security of the superstructures. Our present duty is to obtain insight into the transcendental employment of pure reason, its principles and ideas, that we may be in a position to determine and estimate its influence and true value.

Yet, before closing these introductory remarks, I beseech those who have the interests of philosophy at heart (which is more than is the case with most people) that, if they find themselves convinced by these and the following considerations, they be careful to preserve the expression 'idea' in its original meaning, that it may not become one of those expressions which are commonly used to indicate any and every species of representation, in a happy-go-lucky confusion, to the consequent detriment of science. There is no lack of terms suitable for each kind of representation, that we should thus needlessly encroach upon the province of any one of them. Their serial arrangement in general (repraesentatio). Subordinate to it stands representation with consciousness (perception). A perception which relates solely to the subject as the modification of its state in sensation, an objective perception is knowledge (cognitio). This is either intuition or concept (intuitus vel conceptus). The former relates immediately to the object and is single, the latter refers to it mediatly by means of a feature which several things may have in common. The concept is either an empirical or a pure concept. The pure concept, in so far as it has its origin in the understanding alone (not in the pure image of sensibility), is called a notion. A concept formed from notions and transcending the possibility of experience is an idea or concept of reason. Anyone who has familiarized himself with these distinctions must find it intolerable to hear the representation of the colour, red, called an idea. It ought not even to be called a concept of understanding, a notion.
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Section 2

THE TRANSCENDENTAL IDEAS

The Transcendental Analytic has shown us how the mere logical form of our knowledge may in itself contain original pure a priori concepts, which represent objects prior to all experience, or, speaking more correctly, indicate the synthetic unity which alone makes possible an empirical knowledge of objects. The form of judgments (converted into a concept of the synthesis of intuitions) yielded categories which direct all employment of understanding in experience. Similarly, we may presume that the form of syllogisms, when applied to the synthetic unity of intuitions under the direction of the categories, will contain the origin of special a priori concepts, which we may call pure concepts of reason, or transcendental ideas, and which will determine according to principles how understanding is to be employed in dealing with experience in its totality. 2

The function of reason in its inferences consists in the universality of knowledge [which it yields] according to concepts, the syllogism being itself a judgment which is determined a priori in the whole extent of its conditions. The proposition, ‘Caius is mortal’, I could indeed derive from experience by means of the understanding alone. But I am in pursuit of a concept (in this case, the concept ‘man’) that contains the condition under which the predicate (general term for what is asserted) of this judgment is given; and after I have subsumed the predicate under this condition taken in its whole extension (‘All men are mortal’), I proceed, in accordance therewith, to determine the knowledge of my object (‘Caius is mortal’).

Accordingly, in the conclusion of a syllogism we restrict a

\[1\] The reader will bear in mind that the German term here translated ‘syllogism’ is ‘Vernunftsschlüsse.’

\[2\] [im Ganzen der gesamten Erfahrung.]

\[3\] [Reading, with Adickes, besteht for bestand.]
predicate to a certain object, after having first thought it in the major premise in its whole extension under a given condition. This complete quantity of the extension in relation to such a condition is called universality (universalitas). In the synthesis of intuitions we have corresponding to this the allness (universalitas) or totality of the conditions. The transcendental concept of reason is, therefore, none other than the concept of the totality of the conditions for any given conditioned. Now since it is the unconditioned alone which makes possible the totality of conditions, and, conversely, the totality of conditions is always itself unconditioned, a pure concept of reason can in general be explained by the concept of the unconditioned, conceived as containing a ground of the synthesis of the conditioned.

The number of pure concepts of reason will be equal to the number of kinds of relation which the understanding represents to itself by means of the categories. We have therefore to seek for an unconditioned, first, of the categorical synthesis in a subject; secondly, of the hypothetical synthesis of the members of a series; thirdly, of the disjunctive synthesis of the parts in a system.

There is thus precisely the same number of kinds of syllogism, each of which advances through prosyllogisms to the unconditioned: first, to the subject which is never itself a predicate; secondly, to the presupposition which itself presupposes nothing further; thirdly, to such an aggregate of the members of the division of a concept as requires nothing further to complete the division. The pure concepts of reason — of totality in the synthesis of conditions — are thus at least necessary as setting us the task of extending the unity of understanding, where possible, up to the unconditioned, and are grounded in the nature of human reason. These transcendental concepts may, however, be without any suitable corresponding employment in concreto, and may therefore have no other utility than that of so directing the understanding that, while it is extended to the uttermost, it is also at the same time brought into complete consistency with itself.

But while we are here speaking of the totality of conditions and of the unconditioned, as being equivalent titles for all concepts of reason, we again come upon an expression


| So viel Arten des Verhältnisses es nun gibt, die der Verstand vermittelst der Kategorien sich vorstellt, so vielerlei reine Vernunftbegriffe wird es auch geben, und es wird also erstlich ein Unbedingtes der kategorischen Synthese in einem Subjekt, zweitens der hypothetischen Synthese der Glieder einer Reihe, drittens der disjunktiven Synthese der Teile in einem System zu suchen sein.

Es gibt nämlich eben so viel Arten von Vernunftschluss, deren jede durch Prosyllogismen zum Unbedingten fortschreitet, die eine zum Subjekt, welches selbst nicht mehr Prädicat ist, die andre zur Voraussetzung, der nichts weiter voraussetzt, und die dritte zu einem Aggregat der Glieder der Einteilung, zu welchen nichts weiter erforderlich ist, um die Einteilung eines Begriffs zu vollenden. Daher sind die reinen Vernunftbegriffe von der Totalität in der Synthese der Bedingungen wenigstens als Aufgaben, um die Einheit des Verstandes, wo möglich, bis zum Unbedingten fortzusetzen, notwendig und in der Natur der menschlichen Vernunft gegründet, es mag auch übrigens diesen transcendentalen Begriffen an einem ihnen angemessenen Gebrauch in concreto fehlen, und sie mithin keinen andern Nutzen haben, als den Verstand in die Richtung zu bringen, darin sein Gebrauch, indem er aufs äußerste erweitert, zugleich mit sich selbst durchgehends einstimmig gemacht wird.

Indem wir aber hier von der Totalität der Bedingungen und dem Unbedingten, als dem gemeinschaftlichen Titel aller Vernunftbegriffe reden, so stoßen wir wiederum auf
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with which we cannot dispense, and which yet, owing to an ambiguity that attaches to it through long-standing misuse, we also cannot with safety employ. The word 'absolute' is one of the few words which in their original meaning were adapted to a concept that no other word in the same language exactly suits. Consequently its loss, or what amounts to the same thing, looseness in its employment, must carry with it the loss of the concept itself. And since, in this case, the concept is one to which reason devotes much of its attention, it cannot be relinquished without greatly harming all transcendental philosophy. The word 'absolute' is now often used merely to indicate that something is true of a thing considered in itself, and therefore of its inward nature. In this sense the absolutely possible would mean that which in itself (interne) is possible—which is, in fact, the least that can be said of an object. On the other hand, the word is also sometimes used to indicate that something is valid in all respects, without limitation, e.g. absolute despotism, and in this sense the absolutely possible would mean what is in every relation (in all respects)\(^1\) possible—which is the most that can be said of the possibility of a thing. Now frequently we find these two meanings combined. For example, what is internally impossible is impossible in any relation, and therefore absolutely impossible. But in most cases the two meanings are infinitely far apart, and I can in no wise conclude that because something is in itself possible, it is therefore also possible in every relation, and so absolutely possible. Indeed, as I shall subsequently show, absolute necessity is by no means always dependent on inner necessity, and must not, therefore, be treated as synonymous with it. If the opposite of something is internally impossible, this opposite is, of course, impossible in all respects, and the thing itself is therefore absolutely necessary. But I cannot reverse the reasoning so as to conclude that if something is absolutely necessary its opposite is internally impossible, i.e. that the absolute necessity of things is an inner necessity. For this inner necessity is in certain cases a quite empty expression to which we cannot attach any concept whatsoever, whereas the concept of the necessity of a thing in all relations (to everything possible) involves certain quite special determinations.

\(^1\) [With Erdmann, bracketing in all Absicht.]

[Page 317]

\[\text{B 381}\]

\[\text{A 335}\]

\[\text{B 382}\]
Since the loss of a concept that is of great importance for speculative science can never be a matter of indifference to the philosopher, I trust that the fixing and careful preservation of the expression, on which the concept depends, will likewise be not indifferent to him.

A 326

It is, then, in this wider sense that I shall use the word 'absolute', opposing it to what is valid only comparatively, that is, in some particular respect. For while the latter is restricted by conditions, the former is valid without restriction. Now the transcendental concept of reason is directed always solely towards absolute totality in the synthesis of conditions, and never terminates save in what is absolutely, that is, in all relations, unconditioned. For pure reason leaves everything to the understanding—the understanding [alone] applying immediately to the objects of intuition, or rather to their synthesis in the imagination. Reason concerns itself exclusively with absolute totality in the employment of the concepts of the understanding, and endeavours to carry the synthetic unity, which is thought in the category, up to the completely unconditioned. We may call this unity of appearances the unity of reason, and that expressed by the category the unity of understanding. Reason accordingly occupies itself solely with the employment of understanding, not indeed in so far as the latter contains the ground of possible experience (for the concept of the absolute totality of conditions is not applicable in any experience, since no experience is unconditioned), but solely in order to prescribe to the understanding its direction towards a certain unity of which it has itself no concept, and in such manner as to unite all the acts of the understanding, in respect of every object, into an absolute whole. The objective employment of the pure concepts of reason is, therefore, always transcendental, while that of the pure concepts of understanding must, in accordance with their nature, and inasmuch as their application is solely to possible experience, be always immanent.

I understand by idea a necessary concept of reason to which no corresponding object can be given in sense-experience. Thus the pure concepts of reason, now under consideration, are transcendental ideas. They are concepts of pure

3 [kongruierender.]

B 384

Weil nun der Verlust eines Begriffs von großer Anwendung in der spekulativen Weltweisheit dem Philosophen niemals gleichgültig sein kann, so hoffe ich, es werde ihm die Bestimmung und sorgfältige Aufbewahrung des Ausdrucks, an dem der Begriff hängt, auch nicht gleichgültig sein.

In dieser erweiterten Bedeutung werde ich mich denn des Worts: absolut, bedienen, und es dem bloß komparativ oder in besonderer Rücksicht Gültigen entgegen setzen; denn dieses letztere ist auf Bedingungen restringiert, jenes aber gilt ohne Restriktion.

Nun geht der transcendente Vernunftbegriff jederzeit nur auf die absolute Totalität in der Synthese der Bedingungen, und endigt niemals, als bei dem schlechthin, d. i. in jeder Beziehung, Unbedingten. Denn die reinen Vernunftüberläßt alles dem Verstande, der sich zunächst auf die Gegenstände der Anschauung oder vielmehr deren Synthese in der Einbildungskraft bezieht. Jene behält sich allein die absolute Totalität im Gebrauche der Verstandesbegriffe vor, und sucht die synthetische Einheit, welche in der Kategorie gedacht wird, bis zum Schlechthinunbedingten hinauszuführen. Man kann daher diese die Vernunftinheit der Erscheinungen, so wie jene, welche die Kategorie ausdrückt, Verstandeinsheit nennen. So bezieht sich demnach die Vernunft nur auf den Verstandesgebrauch, und zwar nicht so fern dieser den Grund möglicher Erfahrung enthält (denn die absolute Totalität der Bedingungen ist kein in einer Erfahrung brauchbarer Begriff, weil keine Erfahrung unbedingt ist), sondern um ihm die Richtung auf eine gewisse Einheit vorzuschreiben, von der der Verstand keinen Begriff hat, und die darauf hinaus geht, alle Verstandeshandlungen, in Ansehung eines jeden Gegenstandes, in ein absolutes Ganze zusammen zu fassen. Daher ist der objektive Gebrauch der reinen Vernunftbegriffe jederzeit transzendent, indessen daß der von den reinen Verstandesbegriffen, seiner Natur nach, jederzeit immanent sein muß, indem er sich bloß auf mögliche Erfahrung einschränkt.

Ich verstehe unter der Idee einen notwendigen Vernunftbegriff, der kein kongruierender Gegenstand in den Sinnen gegeben werden kann. Also sind unsere jetzt erwogenen reinen Vernunftbegriffe transcendente Ideen. Sie sind Be-
reason, in that they view all knowledge gained in experience as being determined through an absolute totality of conditions. They are not arbitrarily invented; they are imposed by the very nature of reason itself, and therefore stand in necessary relation to the whole employment of understanding. Finally, they are transcendental and overstep the limits of all experience; no object adequate to the transcendental idea can ever be found within experience. If I speak of an idea, then as regards its object, viewed as an object of pure understanding, I am saying a great deal, but as regards its relation to the subject, that is, in respect of its actuality under empirical conditions, I am for the same reason saying very little, in that, as being the concept of a maximum, it can never be correspondingly given in concreto. Since in the merely speculative employment of reason the latter [namely, to determine the actuality of the idea under empirical conditions] is indeed our whole purpose, and since the approximation to a concept, which yet is never actually reached, puts us in no better position than if the concept were entirely abortive, we say of such a concept—it is only an idea. The absolute whole of all appearances—we might thus say—is only an idea; since we can never represent it in image, it remains a problem to which there is no solution. But since, on the other hand, in the practical employment of understanding, our sole concern is with the carrying out of rules, the idea of practical reason can always be given actually in concreto, although only in part; it is, indeed, the indispensable condition of all practical employment of reason. The practice of it is always limited and defective, but is not confined within determinable boundaries, and is therefore always under the influence of the concept of an absolute completeness. The practical idea is, therefore, always in the highest degree fruitful, and in its relation to our actual activities is indispensably necessary. Reason is here, indeed, exercising causality, as actually bringing about that which its concept contains; and of such wisdom we cannot, therefore, say disparagingly it is only an idea. On the contrary, just because it is the idea of the necessary unity of all possible ends, it must as an original, and at least restrictive condition, serve as standard in all that bears on the practical.

Although we must say of the transcendental concepts of
reason that they are only ideas, this is not by any means to be taken as signifying that they are superfluous and void. For even if they cannot determine any object, they may yet, in a fundamental and unobserved fashion, be of service to the understanding as a can for its extended and consistent employment. The understanding does not thereby obtain more knowledge of any object than it would have by means of its own concepts, but for the acquiring of such knowledge it receives better and more extensive guidance. Further—what we need here no more than mention—concepts of reason may perhaps make possible a transition from the concepts of nature to the practical concepts, and in that way may give support to the moral ideas themselves, bringing them into connection with the speculative knowledge of reason. As to all this, we must await explanation in the sequel.

In accordance with our plan we leave aside the practical ideas, and consider reason only in its speculative, or rather, restricting ourselves still further, only in its transcendental employment. Here we must follow the path that we have taken in the deduction of the categories; we must consider the logical form of knowledge through reason, to see whether perhaps reason may not thereby be likewise a source of concepts which enable us to regard objects in themselves as determined synthetically a priori, in relation to one or other of the functions of reason.

A 390  Reason, considered as the faculty of a certain logical form of knowledge, is the faculty of inferring, i.e., judging mediately (by the subsumption of the condition of a possible judgment under the condition of a given judgment). The given judgment is the universal rule (major premise). The subsumption of the condition of another possible judgment under the condition of the rule is the minor premise. The actual judgment which applies the assertion of the rule to the subsumed case is the conclusion. The rule states something universally, subject to a certain condition. The condition of the rule is found to be fulfilled in an actual case. What has been asserted to be universally valid under that condition is therefore to be regarded as valid also in the actual case, which involves that condition. It is very evident, therefore, that reason arrives at

1 [Reading, with 4th edition, su for in.]

Unserer Absicht gemäß setzen wir aber hier die praktischen Ideen bei Seite, und betrachten daher die Vernunft nur im spekulativen, und in diesem noch enger, nämlich nur im transcendentalen Gebrauch. Hier müssen wir nun denselben Weg einschlagen, den wir oben bei der Deduktion der Kategorien nahmen; nämlich, die logische Form der Vernunftserkenntnis erwägen, und sehen, ob nicht etwa die Vernunft dadurch auch ein Quell von Begriffen werde, Objekte an sich selbst, als synthetisch a priori bestimmt, in Ansehung einer oder der andern Funktion der Vernunft, anzusehen.

Vernunft, als Vermögen einer gewissen logischen Form der Erkenntnis betrachtet, ist das Vermögen zu schließen, d. i. mittelbar (durch die Subsumtion der Bedingung eines möglichen Urteils unter die Bedingung eines gegebenen) zu urteilen. Das gegebene Urteil ist die allgemeine Regel (Obersatz, maior). Die Subsumtion der Bedingung eines andern möglichen Urteils unter die Bedingung der Regel ist der Untersatz (minor). Das wirkliche Urteil, welches die Assertion der Regel in dem subsumierten Falle aussagt, ist der Schlußsatz (conclusio). Die Regel nämlich sagt etwas allgemein unter einer gewissen Bedingung. Nun findet in einem vorkommenden Falle die Bedingung der Regel statt. Also wird das, was unter jener Bedingung allgemein galt, auch in dem vorkommenden Falle (der diese Bedingung bei sich führt) als gültig angesehen. Man sieht leicht, daß die
knowledge by means of acts of the understanding which constitute a series of conditions. Thus if I arrive at the proposition that all bodies are alterable, only by beginning with the more remote knowledge (in which the concept of body does not occur, but which nevertheless contains the condition of that concept), namely, that everything composite is alterable; if I then proceed from this to a proposition which is less remote and stands under the condition of the last-named proposition, namely, that bodies are composite; and if from this I finally pass to a third proposition, which connects the more remote knowledge (alterable) with the knowledge actually before me, and so conclude that bodies are alterable—by this procedure I have arrived at knowledge (a conclusion) by means of a series of conditions (the premisses). Now every series the exponent of which is given (in categorical or hypothetical judgment) can be continued; consequently this same activity of reason leads to *ratioicinatio polysyllogistica*, which is a series of inferences that can be prolonged indefinitely on the side either of the conditions (*per prosyllogismos*) or of the conditioned (*per episyllogismos*).

But we soon become aware that the chain or series of prosyllogisms, that is, of inferred knowledge on the side of the grounds or conditions of a given knowledge, in other words, of the *ascending* series of syllogisms, must stand in a different relation to the faculty of reason from that of the *descending* series, that is, of the advance of reason in the direction of the conditioned, by means of episyllogisms. For since in the former case the knowledge (*conclusio*) is given only as conditioned, we cannot arrive at it by means of reason otherwise than on the assumption that all the members of the series on the side of the conditions are given (totality in the series of the premisses); only on this assumption is the judgment before us possible *a priori*: whereas on the side of the conditioned, in respect of consequences, we only think a series *in process of becoming*, not one already presupposed or given *in its completeness*, and therefore an advance that is merely potential. If, therefore, knowledge be viewed as conditioned, reason is constrained to regard the series of conditions in the ascending line as completed and as given in their totality. But if the same knowledge

---

1. [Reading, with Erdmann, *welche* for *welches.*]
is viewed as a condition of yet other knowledge, and this knowledge as constituting a series of consequences in a descending line, reason can be quite indifferent as to how far this advance extends a parte posteriori, and whether a totality of the series is possible at all. For it does not need such a series in order to be able to draw its conclusion, this being already sufficiently determined and secured by its grounds a parte priori. The series of premises on the side of the conditions may have a first member, as its highest condition, or it may have no such member, in which case it is without limits a parte priori. But however this may be, and even admitting that we can never succeed in comprehending a totality of conditions, the series must none the less contain such a totality, and the entire series must be unconditionally true if the conditioned, which is regarded as a consequence resulting from it, is to be counted as true. This is a requirement of reason, which announces its knowledge as being determined a priori and as necessary, either in itself, in which case it needs no grounds, or, if it be derivative, as a member of a series of grounds, which itself, as a series, is unconditionally true.

FIRST BOOK OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL DIALECTIC

Section 3

SYSTEM OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL IDEAS

We are not at present concerned with logical dialectic, which abstracts from all the content of knowledge and confines itself to exposing the fallacies concealed in the form of syllogisms, but with a transcendental dialectic which has to contain, completely a priori, the origin of certain modes of knowledge derived from pure reason as well as of certain inferred concepts, the object of which can never be given empirically and which therefore lie entirely outside [the sphere of] the faculty of pure understanding. From the natural relation which the transcendental employment of our knowledge, alike in inferences and in judgments, must bear to its logical
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zuliehng als Bedingung anderer Erkenntnisse ange[sehen wird, die unter einander eine Reihe von Folgerungen in absteigender Linie aus- machen, so kann die Vernunft ganz gleichgiiltig sein, wie weit dieser Fortgang sich a parte posteriori erstrecke, und ob gar überall Totalität dieser Reihe möglich sei; weil sie einer dergleichen Reihe zu der vor ihr liegenden Konklusion nicht bedarf, indem diese durch ihre Gründe a parte priori schon hinreichend bestimmt und gesichert ist. Es mag nun sein, daß auf der Seite der Bedingungen die Reihe der Prämissen ein Erstes habe, als oberste Bedingung, oder nicht, und also a parte priori ohne Grenzen: so muß sie doch Totalität der Bedingung enthalten, gesetzt, daß wir niemals dahin gelangen könnten, sie zu fassen, und die ganze Reihe muß unbedingt wahr sein, wenn das Bedingte, welches als eine daraus entspringende Folgerung angesehen wird, als wahr gelten soll. Dieses ist eine Forderung der Vernunft; die ihr Erkenntnis als a priori bestimmt und als notwendig an- kündigt, entweder an sich selbst, und dann bedarf es keiner Gründe, oder, wenn es abgeleitet ist, als ein Glied einer Reihe von Gründen, die selbst unbedingter Weise wahr ist.
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We are not at present concerned with logical dialectic, which abstracts from all the content of knowledge and confines itself to exposing the fallacies concealed in the form of syllogisms, but with a transcendental dialectic which has to contain, completely a priori, the origin of certain modes of knowledge derived from pure reason as well as of certain inferred concepts, the object of which can never be given empirically and which therefore lie entirely outside [the sphere of] the faculty of pure understanding. From the natural relation which the transcendental employment of our knowledge, alike in inferences and in judgments, must bear to its logical
employment, we have gathered that there can be only three kinds of dialectical inference, corresponding to the three kinds of inference through which reason can arrive at knowledge by means of principles, and that in all these its business is to ascend from the conditioned synthesis, to which understanding always remains restricted, to the unconditioned, which understanding can never reach.

The relations which are to be universally found in all our representations are (1) relation to the subject; (2) relation to objects, either as appearances or as objects of thought in general. If we combine the subdivision with the main division, all relation of representations, of which we can form either a concept or an idea, is then threefold: (1) the relation to the subject; (2) the relation to the manifold of the object in the field of appearance; (3) the relation to all things in general.

Now all pure concepts in general are concerned with the synthetic unity of representations, but [those of them which are] concepts of pure reason (transcendental ideas) are concerned with the unconditioned synthetic unity of all conditions in general. All transcendental ideas can therefore be arranged in three classes, the first containing the absolute (unconditioned) unity of the thinking subject, the second the absolute unity of the series of conditions of appearance, the third the absolute unity of the condition of all objects of thought in general.¹

The thinking subject is the object of psychology, the sumtotal of all appearances (the world) is the object of cosmology, and the thing which contains the highest condition of the possibility of all that can be thought (the being of all beings) is the object of theology. Pure reason thus furnishes the idea for a transcendental doctrine of the soul (psychologia rationalis), for a transcendental science of the world (cosmologia rationalis), and, finally, for a transcendental knowledge of God (theologia transcendentalis). The understanding is not in a position to yield even the mere project of any one of these sciences, not even though it be supported by the highest logical employment of reason, that is, by all the conceivable inferences through which we seek to advance from one of its objects (appearance) to all others, up to the most remote

¹ [Following Erdmann, in italicising überhaupt.]

² [der Gegenstand.]

³ [das Ding.]
members of the empirical synthesis; each of these sciences is an altogether pure and genuine product, or problem, of pure reason.

In what precise modes the pure concepts of reason come under these three headings of all transcendental ideas will be fully explained in the next chapter. They follow the guiding-thread of the categories. For pure reason never relates directly to objects, but to the concepts which understanding frames in regard to objects. Similarly it is only by the process of completing our argument that it can be shown how reason, simply by the synthetic employment of that very function of which it makes use in categorical syllogisms, is necessarily brought to the concept of the absolute unity of the thinking subject, how the logical procedure used in hypothetical syllogisms leads to the idea of the completely unconditioned in a series of given conditions, and finally how the mere form of the disjunctive syllogism must necessarily involve the highest concept of reason, that of a being of all beings—a thought which, at first sight, seems utterly paradoxical.

No objective deduction, such as we have been able to give of the categories, is, strictly speaking, possible in the case of these transcendental ideas. Just because they are only ideas they have, in fact, no relation to any object that could be given as coinciding with them. We can, indeed, undertake a subjective derivation of them from the nature of our reason; and this has been provided in the present chapter.

As is easily seen, what pure reason alone has in view is the absolute totality of the synthesis on the side of the conditions (whether of inherence, of dependence, or of concurrence); it is not concerned with absolute completeness on the side of the conditioned. For the former alone is required in order to presuppose the whole series of the conditions, and to present it a priori to the understanding. Once we are given a complete (and unconditioned) condition, no concept of reason is required for the continuation of the series; for every step in the forward direction from the condition to the conditioned is carried through by the understanding itself.

---

1 [Reading, with Erdmann, *Vernunftschlüsse die Idee vom der Ideen die

2 [Reading, with Mellin, *Ableitung für Anleitung*]
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transcendental ideas thus serve only for ascending, in the series of conditions, to the unconditioned, that is, to principles. As regards the descending to the conditioned, reason does indeed, make a very extensive logical employment of the laws of understanding, but no kind of transcendental employment; and if we form an idea of the absolute totality of such a synthesis (of the progressus), as, for instance, of the whole series of all future alterations in the world, this is a creation of the mind (ens rationis) which is only arbitrarily thought, and not a necessary presupposition of reason. For the possibility of the conditioned presupposes the totality of its conditions, but not of its consequences. Such a concept is not, therefore, one of the transcendental ideas; and it is with these alone that we have here to deal.

Finally, we also discern that a certain connection and unity is evident among the transcendental ideas themselves, and that by means of them pure reason combines all its modes of knowledge into a system. The advance from the knowledge of oneself (the soul) to the knowledge of the world, and by means of this to the original being, is so natural that it seems to resemble the logical advance of reason from premises to conclusion. Whether this is due to a concealed relationship of the same kind as subsists between the logical and the transcendental procedure, is one of the questions that await answer.

* [Note added in and edition.] Metaphysics has as the proper object of its enquiries three ideas only: God, freedom, and immortality — so related that the second concept, when combined with the first, should lead to the third as a necessary conclusion. Any other matters with which this science may deal serve merely as a means of arriving at these ideas and of establishing their reality. It does not need the ideas for the purposes of natural science, but in order to pass beyond nature. Insight into them would render theology and morals, and, through the union of these two, likewise religion, and therewith the highest ends of our existence, entirely and exclusively dependent on the faculty of speculative reason. In a systematic representation of the ideas, the order cited, the synthetic, would be the most suitable; but in the investigation which must necessarily precede it the analytic, or reverse order, is better adapted to the purpose of completing our great project, as enabling us to start from what is immediately given us in experience—advancing from the doctrine of the soul, to the doctrine of the world, and thence to the knowledge of God.

* Die Metaphysik hat zum eigentlichen Zwecke ihrer Nachforschung nur drei Ideen: Gott, Freiheit und Unsterblichkeit, so daß der zweite Begriff, mit dem ersten verbunden, auf dem dritten, als einen notwendigen Schlübfall, fahren soll. Alles, womit sich diese Wissenschaft sonst beschäftigt, diene bloß zum Mittel, um zu diesen Ideen und ihrer Realität zu gelangen. Sie bedarf sie nicht zum Behuf der Naturwissenschaften, sondern um über die Natur hinaus zu kommen. Die Einsicht in dieselben würde Theologie, Moral, und, durch beide Verbindung, Religion, mithin die höchsten Zwecke unseres Daseins, bloß vom spekulativen Ver- nunftvermögen und sonst von nichts anderem abhängig machen. In einer systematischen Vorstellung jener Ideen würde die angeführte Ordnung, als die synthetische, die schließlichste sein; aber in der Bearbeitung, die vor ihr notwendig vorzugehen muß, wird die analytische, welche diese Ordnung umkehrt, dem Zwecke angemessen sein, um, indem wir von demjenigen, was uns Erfahrung unmittelbar an die Hand gibt, der Seelenlehre, zur Weltlehre, und von da bis zur Erkenntnis Gottes fortzugehen, unseren großen Entwurf zu vollenden.\footnote{Zusatz von B.}
A 338 in the course of these enquiries. Indeed, we have already, in a preliminary manner, obtained an answer to the question, B 396 since in treating of the transcendental concepts of reason, which, in philosophical theory, are commonly confused with others, and not properly distinguished even from concepts of understanding, we have been able to rescue them from their ambiguous position, to determine their origin, and at the same time, in so doing, to fix their precise number (to which we can never add), presenting them in a systematic connection, and so marking out and enclosing a special field for pure reason.

TRANSZENDENTALE DIALEKTIK

Untersuchungen allererst erwartet muß. Wir haben vorläufig unserm Zweck schon erreicht, da wir die transzendenten Begriffe der Vernunft, die sich sonst gewöhnlich in der Theorie der Philosophen unter andere mischen, ohne daß diese sie einmal von Verstandesbegriffen gehörig unterscheiden, aus dieser zweideutigen Lage haben herausziehen, ihren Ursprung, und dadurch zugleich ihre bestimmte Zahl, über die es gar keine mehr geben kann, angeben und sie in einem systematischen Zusammenhange haben vorstellen können, wodurch ein besonderes Feld für die reine Vernunft abgesteckt und eingeschränkt wird.
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BOOK II

THE DIALECTICAL INFERENCES OF PURE REASON

Although a purely transcendental idea is, in accordance with the original laws of reason, a quite necessary product of reason, its object, it may yet be said, is something of which we have no concept. For in respect of an object which is adequate to the demands of reason, it is not, in fact, possible that we should ever be able to form a concept of the understanding, that is, a concept that allows of being exhibited and intuited in a possible experience. But we should be better advised and less likely to be misunderstood if we said that although we cannot have any knowledge of the object which corresponds to an idea, we yet have a problematic concept of it.

The transcendent (subjective) reality of the pure concepts of reason depends on our having been led to such ideas by a necessary syllogism. There will therefore be syllogisms which contain no empirical premises, and by means of which we conclude from something which we know to something else of which we have no concept, and to which, owing to an inevitable illusion, we yet ascribe objective reality. These conclusions are, then, rather to be called pseudo-rational than rational, although in view of their origin they may well lay claim to the latter title, since they are not fictitious and have not arisen fortuitously, but have sprung from the very nature of reason. They are sophistifications not of men but of pure reason itself. Even the wisest of men cannot free himself from them. After long effort he perhaps succeeds in guarding himself against

Man kann sagen, der Gegenstand einer bloßen transzendentalen Idee sei etwas, wovon man keinen Begriff hat, obgleich diese Idee ganz notwendig in der Vernunft nach ihren ursprünglichen Gesetzen erzeugt worden. Denn in der Tat ist auch von einem Gegenstande, der der Forderung der Vernunft adäquat sein soll, kein Verstehensbegriff möglich, d. i. ein solcher, welcher in einer möglichen Erfahrung gezeigt und anschaulich gemacht werden kann. Besser würde man sich doch, und mit weniger Gefahr des Mißerständnisses, ausdrücken, wenn man sagte: daß wir vom Objekt, welches einer Idee korrespondiert, keine Kenntnis, obzwar einen problematischen Begriff, haben können.

Nun beruht wenigstens die transzendentale (subjektive) Realität der reinen Vernunftbegriffe darauf, daß wir durch einen notwendigen Vernunftschluß auf solche Ideen gebracht werden. Also wird es Vernunftschlüsse geben, die keine empirische Prämissen enthalten, und vermittelst deren wir von etwas, das wir kennen, auf etwas anderes schließen, wovon wir doch keinen Begriff haben, und dem wir gleichwohl, durch einen unvermeidlichen Schein, objektive Realität geben. Dergleichen Schlüsse sind in Ansehung ihres Resultats also eher vernünftelnde, als Vernunftschlüsse zu nennen; wiewohl sie, ihrer Veranlassung wegen, wohl den letzten Namen führen können, weil sie doch nicht erdacht, oder zufällig entstanden, sondern aus der Natur der Vernunft entsprungen sind. Es sind Sophistikationen, nicht der Menschen, sondern der reinen Vernunft selbst, von denen selbst der Weiseste unter allen Menschen sich nicht losmachen, und vielleicht zwar nach vieler Bemühung den Irr-
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actual error; but he will never be able to free himself from the illusion, which unconsciously mocks and torments him.

There are, then, only three kinds of dialectical syllogisms —just so many as there are ideas in which their conclusions result. In the first kind of syllogism I conclude from the transcendental concept of the subject, which contains nothing manifold, the absolute unity of this subject itself, of which, however, even in so doing, I possess no concept whatsoever. This dialectical inference I shall entitle the transcendental paralogism. The second kind of pseudo-rational inference is directed to the transcendental concept of the absolute totality of the series of conditions for any given appearance. From the fact that my concept of the unconditioned synthetic unity of the series, as thought in a certain way, is always self-contradictory, I conclude that there is really a unity of the opposite kind, although of it also I have no concept. The position of reason in these dialectical inferences I shall entitle the antinomy of pure reason. Finally, in the third kind of pseudo-rational inference, from the totality of the conditions under which objects in general, in so far as they can be given me, have to be thought, I conclude to the absolute synthetic unity of all conditions of the possibility of things in general, i.e., from things which I do not know through the merely transcendental concept of them I infer an ens entium, which I know even less through any transcendental concept, and of the unconditioned necessity of which I can form no concept whatsoever. This dialectical syllogism I shall entitle the ideal of pure reason.

SECOND BOOK OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL DIALECTIC

CHAPTER I

THE PARALOGISMS OF PURE REASON

A logical paralogism is a syllogism which is fallacious in form, be its content what it may. A transcendental paralogism is one in which there is a transcendental ground, constraining us to draw a formally invalid conclusion. Such a fallacy is

1 [Reading, with the 4th edition, transcendental for transcendent.]
therefore grounded in the nature of human reason, and gives rise to an illusion which cannot be avoided, although it may, indeed, be rendered harmless.

We now come to a concept which was not included in the general list of transcendental concepts but which must yet be counted as belonging to that list, without, however, in the least altering it or declaring it defective. This is the concept of, if the term be preferred, the judgment, ‘I think’. As is easily seen, this is the vehicle of all concepts, and therefore also of transcendental concepts, and so is always included in the conceiving of these latter, and is itself transcendental. But it can have no special designation, because it serves only to introduce all our thought, as belonging to consciousness. Meanwhile, however free it be of empirical admixture (impressions of the senses), it yet enables us to distinguish, through the nature of our faculty of representation, two kinds of objects. ‘I’, as thinking, am an object of inner sense, and am called ‘soul’. That which is an object of the outer senses is called ‘body’. Accordingly the expression ‘I’, as a thinking being, signifies the object of that psychology which may be entitled the ‘rational doctrine of the soul’, inasmuch as I am not here seeking to learn in regard to the soul anything more than can be inferred, independently of all experience (which determines me more specifically and in concreto), from this concept ‘I’, so far as it is present in all thought.

The rational doctrine of the soul is really an undertaking of this kind; for if in this science the least empirical element of my thought, or any special perception of my inner state, were intermingled with the grounds of knowledge, it would no longer be a rational but an empirical doctrine of the soul. Thus we have here what professes to be a science built upon the single proposition ‘I think’. Whether this claim be well or ill grounded, we may, very fittingly, in accordance with the nature of a transcendental philosophy, proceed to investigate. The reader must not object that this proposition, which expresses the perception of the self, contains an inner experience, and that the rational doctrine of the soul founded upon it is never pure and is therefore to that extent based upon an empirical principle. For this inner perception is nothing more than the mere apperception ‘I think’, by which even trans-
scendental concepts are made possible; what we assert in them is 'I think substance, cause', etc. For inner experience in general and its possibility, or perception in general and its relation to other perception, in which no special distinction or empirical determination is given, is not to be regarded as empirical knowledge but as knowledge of the empirical in general, and has to be reckoned with the investigation of the possibility of any and every experience, which is certainly a transcendental enquiry. The least object of perception (for example, even pleasure or displeasure), if added to the universal representation of self-consciousness, would at once transform rational psychology into empirical psychology.

'I think' is, therefore, the sole text of rational psychology, and from it the whole of its teaching has to be developed. Obviously, if this thought is to be related to an object (myself), it can contain none but transcendental predicates of that object, since the least empirical predicate would destroy the rational purity of the science and its independence of all experience.

All that is here required is that we follow the guidance of the categories, with this difference only, that since our starting-point is a given thing, 'I' as thinking being, we begin with the category of substance, whereby a thing in itself is represented, and so proceed backwards through the series, without, however, otherwise changing the order adopted in the table of the categories. The topic of the rational doctrine of the soul, from which everything else that it contains must be derived, is accordingly as follows:

1. The soul is substance.

As regards its quality it is simple.

As regards the different times in which it exists, it is numerically identical, that is, unity (not plurality).

---

[Von den Paralogismen]

s zendental Begriffe möglich macht, in welchen es heißt: Ich denke die Substanz, die Ursache etc. Denn innere Erfahrung überhaupt und deren Möglichkeit, oder Wahrnehmung überhaupt und deren Verhältnis zu anderer Wahrnehmung, ohne daß irgend ein besonderer Unterschied derselben und Bestimmung empirisch gegeben ist, kann nicht als empirische Erkenntnis, sondern muß als Erkenntnis des Empirischen überhaupt angesehen werden, und gehört zur Untersuchung der Möglichkeit einer jeden Erfahrung, welche allerdings transzendental ist. Das mindeste Objekt der Wahrnehmung (z. B. nur Lust oder Unlust), welche zu der allgemeinen Vorstellung des Selbstbewußtseins hinzu käme, würde die rationale Psychologie sogleich in eine empirische verwandeln.

Ich denke, ist also der alleinige Text der rationalen Psychologie, aus welchem sie ihre ganze Weisheit auswickeln soll. Man sieht leicht, daß dieser Gedanke, wenn er auf einen Gegenstand (mich selbst) bezogen werden soll, nichts anders, als transzendentalen Prädikate desselben, enthalten könne; weil das mindeste empirische Prädikat die rationale Reinigkeit, und Unabhängigkeit der Wissenschaft von aller Erfahrung, verderben würde.

Wir werden aber hier bloß dem Leitfaden der Kategorien zu folgen haben, nur, da hier zuerst ein Ding, Ich, als denkendes Wesen, gegeben worden, so werden wir zwar die obige Ordnung der Kategorien unter einander, wie sie in ihrer Tafel vorgestellt ist, nicht verändern, aber doch hier von der Kategorie der Substanz anfangen, dadurch ein Ding an sich selbst vorgestellt wird, und so ihrer Reihe rückwärts nachgehen. Die Topik der rationalen Seelenlehre, woraus alles übrige, was sie nur enthalten mag, abgeleitet werden muß, ist demnach folgende:

1. Die Seele ist Substanz

2. Ihrer Qualität nach einfach

3. Den verschiedenen Zeiten nach, in welchen sie da ist, numerisch-identisch, d. i. Einheit (nicht Vielheit)
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4.

It is in relation to possible objects in space.*

All the concepts of pure psychology arise from these elements, simply by way of combination, without admission of any other principle. This substance, merely as object of inner sense, gives the concept of immateriality; as simple substance, that of incorruptibility; its identity, as intellectual substance, personality; all these three together, spirituality; while the relation to objects in space gives commercium with bodies, and so leads us to represent the thinking substance as the principle of life in matter, that is, as soul (anima), and as the ground of animality. This last, in turn, as limited by spirituality, gives the concept of immortality.

In connection with these concepts we have four paralogisms of a transcendental psychology—which is wrongly regarded as a science of pure reason—concerning the nature of our thinking being. We can assign no other basis for this teaching than the simple, and in itself completely empty, representation I; and we cannot even say that this is a concept, but only that it is a bare consciousness which accompanies all concepts. Through this I or he or it (the thing) which thinks, nothing further is represented than a transcendental subject of the thoughts = X. It is known only through the thoughts which are its predicates, and of it, apart from them, we cannot have any concept whatsoever, but can only revolve in a perpetual circle, since any judgment upon it has always already made use of its representation. And the reason why this inconvenience is inseparably bound up with it, is that consciousness in itself is not a representation distinguishing a particular object, but a form

* The reader who has difficulty in guessing the psychological meaning of these expressions taken in their transcendental abstractness, and in discovering why the last-mentioned attribute of the soul belongs to the category of existence, will find the terms sufficiently explained and justified in the sequel. Further, I have to apologise for the Latin expressions which, contrary to good taste, have usurped the place of their German equivalents, both in this section and in the work as a whole. My excuse is that I have preferred to lose somewhat in elegance of language rather than to increase, in however minor a degree, the reader’s difficulties.

4.

zu möglichen Gegenständen im Raume*

* Aus diesen Elementen entspringen alle Begriffe der reifen Seelenlehre, lediglich durch die Zusammensetzung, ohne im mindesten ein anderes Princip zu erkennen. Diese Substanz, bloß als Gegenstand des inneren Sinnes, gibt den Begriff der Immaterialität; als einfache Substanz, der Inkorruptibilität; die Identität derselben, als intellektueller Substanz, gibt die Personalität; alle diese drei Stücke zusammen die Spiritualität; das Verhältnis zu den Gegenständen im Raume gibt das Commerzium mit Körpern; mithin stellet sie die denkende Substanz, als das Princip des Lebens in der Materie, d. i. sie als Seele (anima) und als den Grund der Animalität vor; diese durch die Spiritualität eingeschränkt, Immortalität.

Hierauf beziehen sich nun vier Paralogismus einer transzendentalen Seelenlehre, welche fälschlich für eine Wissenschaft der reifen Vernunft, von der Natur unseres denken- den Wesens, gehalten wird. Zum Grunde derselben können wir aber nichts anderes legen, als die einfache und für sich selbst an Inhalt gänzlich leere Vorstellung: Ich, von der man nicht einmal sagen kann, daß sie ein Begriffsei, sondern ein bloßes Bewußtsein, das alle Begriffe begleitet. Durch dieses Ich, oder Er, oder Es (das Ding), welches denkt, wird nun nichts weiter, als ein transzendentales Subjekt der Gedanken vorgestellt = x, welches nur durch die Gedanken, die seine Prädikate sind, erkannt wird, und von denen, abgesehen, niemals den mindesten Begriff haben können; um welches wir uns daher in einem beständigen Zirkel herumdrehen, indem wir uns seiner Vorstellung jederzeit schon bedienen müssen, um irgend etwas von ihm zu erzielen; eine Unbequemlichkeit, die davon nicht zu trennen ist, weil das Bewußtsein an sich nicht sowohl eine Vorstellung ist, die ein besonderes Objekt unterscheidet, sondern eine Form

* Der Leser, der aus diesen Ausdrücken, in ihrer transzendentalen Abgesogenheit, nicht so leicht den psychologischen Sinn derselben, und warum das letzte Attribut der Seele zur Kategorie der Existenz gehört, erraten wird, wird sie in dem Folgenden hinreichend erklärt und gerechtfertigt finden. Übrigens habe ich wegen der lateinischen Ausdrücke, die statt der gleichbedeutenden deutschen, wider den Geschmack der guten Schreibart, eingeflochten sind, sowohl bei diesem Abschnitt, als auch in Anzeihung des ganzen Werkes, zur Entschuldigung anführen, daß ich lieber etwas der Zierlichkeit der Sprache habe entfernen, als den Schuldgebrauch durch die mindeste Unverständlichkeits erschweren wollen.
of representation in general, that is, of representation in so far as it is to be entitled knowledge; for it is only of knowledge that I can say that I am thereby thinking something.

It must, on first thoughts, seem strange that the condition under which alone I think, and which is therefore merely a property of myself as subject, should likewise be valid for everything that thinks, and that on a seemingly empirical proposition we can presume to base an apodeictic and universal judgment, namely, that that which thinks must, in all cases, be constituted as the voice of self-consciousness declares it to be constituted in my own self. The reason is this: we must assign to things, necessarily and a priori, all the properties that constitute the conditions under which alone we think them. Now I cannot have any representation whatsoever of a thinking being, through any outer experience, but only through self-consciousness. Objects of this kind are, therefore, nothing more than the transference of this consciousness of mine to other things, which in this way alone can be represented as thinking beings. The proposition, 'I think', is, however, here taken only problematically, not in so far as it may contain perception of an existent (the Cartesian cogito, ergo sum), but in respect of its mere possibility, in order to see what properties applicable to its subject (be that subject actually existent or not) may follow from so simple a proposition.

If our knowledge of thinking beings in general, by means of pure reason, were based on more than the cogito, if we likewise made use of observations concerning the play of our thoughts and the natural laws of the thinking self to be derived from these thoughts, there would arise an empirical psychology, which would be a kind of physiology of inner sense, capable perhaps of explaining the appearances of inner sense, but never of revealing such properties as do not in any way belong to possible experience (e.g. the properties of the simple), nor of yielding any apodeictic knowledge regarding the nature of thinking beings in general. It would not, therefore, be a rational psychology.

Since the proposition 'I think' (taken problematically) contains the form of each and every judgment of the understanding and accompanies all categories as their vehicle, it is evident that the inferences from it admit only of a transcendental derselben überhaupt, so fern sie Erkenntnis genannt werden soll; denn von der allein kann ich sagen, daß ich dadurch irgend etwas denke.

Es muß aber gleich anfangs befremdlich scheinen, daß die Bedingung, unter der ich überhaupt denke, und die mit-

hing bloß eine Beschaffenheit meines Subjekts ist, zugleich

für alles, was denkt, gültig sein solle, und daß wir auf einen empirisch scheinenden Satz ein apodiktisches und allgemeines Urteil zu gründen uns anmaßen können, nämlich: daß alles, was denkt, so beschaffen se1, als der Ausspruch des Selbstbewußtseins es an mir aus sagt. Die Urache aber hier von liegt darin, daß wir den Dingen a priori all die Eigenschaf11 notwendig beilegen müssen, die die Bedingungen ausmachen, unter welchen wir sie allein denken. Nun kann ich von einem denkenden Wesen durch keine äußere Erfah-

rung, sondern bloß durch das Selbstbewußtsein die min-

deste Vorstellung haben. Also sind dergleichen Gegenstände nichts weiter, als die Übertragung dieses meines Bewußt-

seins auf andere Dinge, welche nur dadurch als denkende Wesen vorgestellt werden. Der Satz: Ich denke, wird aber hiebei nur problematisch genommen; nicht so fern er eine Wahrnehmung von einem Dasein enthalten mag (das kartes-

sianische cogito, ergo sum), sondern seiner bloßen Mög-

lichkeit nach, um zu sehen, welche Eigenschaften aus diesem so einfachen Satze auf das Subjekt desselben (es mag dergle-

ichen nun existieren oder nicht) fließen mögen.

Läge unserer reinen Vernunftkenntnis von denkenden Wesen überhaupt mehr, als das Cogito, zum Grunde; würden wir die Beobachtungen, über das Spiel unserer Gedan-

ken und die daraus zu schöpfende Naturgesetze des denken-

den Selbst, auch zu Hülfe nehmen: so würde eine empirische Psychologie entspringen, welche eine Art der Physiologie des inneren Sinnes sein würde, und vielleicht die Erschei-
nungen desselben zu erklären, niemals aber dazu dienen könnte, solche Eigenschaften, die gar nicht zur möglichen Erfahrung gehören (als die des Einfachen), zu eröffnen, noch von denkenden Wesen überhaupt etwas, das ihre Na-

tur betrifft, apodiktisch zu lehren; sie wäre also keine rationale Psychologie.

| Da nun der Satz: Ich denke (problematisch genom-

men), die Form eines jeden Verstandesurteils überhaupt ent-

hält, und alle Kategorien als ihr Vehikel begleitet: so ist klar, daß die Schlüsse aus demselben einen bloß transzen-
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employment of the understanding. And since this employment excludes any admixture of experience, we cannot, after what has been shown above, entertain any favourable anticipations in regard to its methods of procedure. We therefore propose to follow it, with a critical eye, through all the predicaments of pure psychology.

[The Paralogisms of Pure Reason: as in 1st edition.]

FIRST PARALOGISM: OF SUBSTANTIALLITY

That, the representation of which is the absolute subject of our judgments and cannot therefore be employed as determination of another thing, is substance.

I, as a thinking being, am the absolute subject of all my possible judgments, and this representation of myself cannot be employed as predicate of any other thing.

Therefore I, as thinking being (soul), am substance.

Critique of the First Paralogism of Pure Psychology

In the analytical part of the Transcendental Logic we have shown that pure categories, and among them that of substance, have in themselves no objective meaning, save in so far as they rest upon an intuition, and are applied to the manifold of this intuition, as functions of synthetic unity. In the absence of this manifold, they are merely functions of a judgment, without content. I can say of any and every thing that it is substance, in the sense that I distinguish it from mere predicates and determinations of things. Now in all our thought the 'I' is the subject, in which thoughts inhere only as determinations; and this 'I' cannot be employed as the determination of another thing. Everyone must, therefore, necessarily regard himself as substance, and thought as [consisting] only [in] accidents of his being, determinations of his state.

But what use am I to make of this concept of a substance? That I, as a thinking being, persist for myself, and do not in any natural manner either arise or perish, can by no means be

1 ["The Paralogisms of Pure Reason," as here given up to p. 367, were omitted in B. As restated in B, they are given below, pp. 368 to 383.]
deduced from it. Yet there is no other use to which I can put the concept of the substantiability of my thinking subject, and apart from such use I could very well dispense with it.

So far from being able to deduce these properties merely from the pure category of substance, we must, on the contrary, take our start from the permanence of an object given in experience as permanent. For only to such an object can the concept of substance be applied in a manner that is empirically serviceable. In the above proposition, however, we have not taken as our basis any experience; the inference is merely from the concept of the relation which all thought has to the 'I' as the common subject in which it inheres. Nor should we, in resting it upon experience, be able, by any sure observation, to demonstrate such permanence. The 'I' is indeed in all thoughts, but there is not in this representation the least trace of intuition, distinguishing the 'I' from other objects of intuition. Thus we can indeed perceive that this representation is invariably present in all thought, but not that it is an abiding and continuing intuition, wherein the thoughts, as being transitory, give place to one another.

It follows, therefore, that the first syllogism of transcendental psychology, when it puts forward the constant logical subject of thought as being knowledge of the real subject in which the thought inheres, is palming off upon us what is a mere pretence of new insight. We do not have, and cannot have, any knowledge whatsoever of any such subject. Consciousness is, indeed, that which alone makes all representations to be thoughts, and in it, therefore, as the transcendental subject, all our perceptions must be found; but beyond this logical meaning of the 'I', we have no knowledge of the subject in itself, which as substratum underlies this 'I', as it does all thoughts. The proposition, 'The soul is substance', may, however, quite well be allowed to stand, if only it be recognised that this concept [of the soul as substance] does not carry us to a single step further, and so cannot yield us any of the usual deductions of the pseudo-rational doctrine of the soul, as, for instance, the everlasting duration of the human soul in all changes and even in death—if, that is to say, we recognise that this concept signifies a substance only in idea, not in reality.

\[1\] [Reading, with Hartenstein, was for unser.]

\[\text{ERSTER PARALOGISMUS (A)}\]  

\[\text{GENNAN]

\[\text{ben und dass allein kann mir doch der Begriff der Substanti-

ität meines denkenden Subjekts nutzen, ohne welches ich ihn
gar wohl entbehren könnte.}

\[\text{Es fehlt so viel, dass man diese Eigenschaften aus der bloßen}

reinen Kategorie einer Substanz schließen könnte, dass wir

vielmehr die Beharrlichkeit eines gegebenen Gegenstandes aus
der Erfahrung zum Grunde legen müssen, wenn wir auf ihn den

empirisch brauchbaren Begriff von einer Substanz anwenden

wollen. Nun haben wir aber bei unserem Satze keine Erfahrung
zum Grunde gelegt, sondern lediglich aus dem Begriff der Be-
deutung, dem\[1\] alles Denken, auf das Ich, als das gemeinschaft-
liche Subjekt, hat, dem es inhäriert, geschlossen. Wir würden
auch, wenn wir es gleich darauf anlegten, durch keine sichere
Beobachtung eine solche Beharrlichkeit derselben können. Denn

das Ich ist zwar in allen Gedanken; es ist aber mit dieser Vor-
stellung nicht die mindeste Anschauung verbunden, die es von
anderen Gegenständen der Anschauung unterschiede. Man

kann also zwar wahrnehmen, dass diese Vorstellung bei allem
Denken immer wiederum vorkommt, nicht aber, dass es eine
stehende und bleibende Anschauung sei, worin die Gedanken
(als wandelbar) wechseln.

\[\text{Hieraus folgt: dass der erste Vernunftschluss der trans-

cendentalen Psychologie uns nur eine vermeintliche neue Ein-

sicht aufhebt, indem er das beständige logische Subjekt, des Denkens,

vor die Erkenntnis des realen Subjekts der Inhärenz ausgibt,

von welchem wir nicht die mindeste Kenntnis haben, noch

haben können, weil das Bewusstsein das einzige ist, was alle

Vorstellungen zu Gedanken macht, und worin in allen un-

csere Wahrnehmungen, als dem transcendentalen Subjekte, müs-

sen angetroffen werden; und wir, außer dieser logischen Bedeu-

tung des Ich, keine Kenntnis von dem Subjekte an sich selbst

haben, was diesem, so wie allen Gedanken, als Substratum zum

Grunde liegt. Indessen kann man den Satz: die Seele ist

Substans, gar wohl gelten lassen, wenn man sich nur be-

schiedet: dass unser dieser\[1\] Begriff nicht im mindesten weiter

führe, oder irgend eine von dem gewöhnlichen Folgerungen der

vermuthenden Seelenlehre, als z. B. die immerwährende Dauer
derselben bei allen Veränderungen und selbst dem Tode des

Menschen kehren könne, dass er also nur eine Substans in der

Idee, aber nicht in der Realität bezeichnet.]

\[1\] Akad.-Ausz.: \text{\textdagger}. \[2\] Akad.-Ausz.: \text{\textdagger} dieser unserv.
SECOND PARALOGISM: OF SIMPLICITY

That, the action of which can never be regarded as the concurrence of several things acting, is simple. Now the soul, or the thinking 'I', is such a being. Therefore, etc.

Critique of the Second Paralogism of Transcendental Psychology

This is the Achilles of all dialectical inferences in the pure doctrine of the soul. It is no mere sophistical play, contrived by a dogmatist in order to impart to his assertions a superficial plausibility, but an inference which appears to withstand even the keenest scrutiny and the most scrupulously exact investigation. It is as follows.

Every composite substance is an aggregate of several substances, and the action of a composite, or whatever inheres in it as thus composite, is an aggregate of several actions or accidents, distributed among the plurality of the substances. Now an effect which arises from the concurrence of many acting substances is indeed possible, namely, when this effect is external only (as, for instance, the motion of a body is the combined motion of all its parts). But with thoughts, as internal accidents belonging to a thinking being, it is different. For suppose it be the composite that thinks: then every part of it would be a part of the thought, and only all of them taken together would contain the whole thought. But this cannot consistently be maintained. For representations (for instance, the single words of a verse), distributed among different beings, never make up a whole thought (a verse), and it is therefore impossible that a thought should inhere in what is essentially composite. It is therefore possible only in a single substance, which, not being an aggregate of many, is absolutely simple. *

The so-called nervus probandi of this argument lies in the proposition, that if a multiplicity of representations are to form a single representation, they must be contained in the

* This proof can very easily be given the customary syllogistic correctness of form. But for my purpose it is sufficient to have made clear, though in popular fashion, the bare ground of proof.
absolute unity of the thinking subject. No one, however, can prove this proposition from concepts. For how should he set about the task of achieving this? The proposition, 'A thought can only be the effect of the absolute unity of the thinking being', cannot be treated as analytic. For the unity of the thought, which consists of many representations, is collective, and as far as mere concepts can show, may relate just as well to the collective unity of different substances acting together (as the motion of a body is the composite motion of all its parts) as to the absolute unity of the subject. Consequently, the necessity of presupposing, in the case of a composite thought, a simple substance, cannot be demonstrated in accordance with the principle of identity. Nor will anyone venture to assert that the proposition allows of being known synthetically and completely a priori from mere concepts—not, at least, if he understands the ground of the possibility of a priori synthetic propositions, as above explained.

It is likewise impossible to derive this necessary unity of the subject, as a condition of the possibility of every thought, from experience. For experience yields us no knowledge of necessity, apart even from the fact that the concept of absolute unity is quite outside its province. Whence then are we to derive this proposition upon which the whole psychological syllogism depends?

It is obvious that, if I wish to represent to myself a thinking being, I must put myself in his place, and thus substitute, as it were, my own subject for the object I am seeking to consider (which does not occur in any other kind of investigation), and that we demand the absolute unity of the subject of a thought, only because otherwise we could not say, 'I think' (the manifold in one representation). For although the whole of the thought could be divided and distributed among many subjects, the subjective 'I' can never be thus divided and distributed, and it is this 'I' that we presuppose in all thinking.

Here again, as in the former paralogism, the formal proposition of apperception, 'I think', remains the sole ground to which rational psychology can appeal when it thus ventures upon an extension of its knowledge. This proposition, however, is not itself an experience, but the form of apperception, aussumachen. Diesen Satz aber kann niemand aus Begrif-
fen beweisen. Denn, wie wollte er es wohl anfangen, um dieses zu leisten? Der Satz: Ein Gedanke kann nur die Wirkung der absoluten Einheit des denkenden Wesens sein, kann nicht als analytisch behandelt werden. Denn die Einheit der Gedanken, der aus vielen Vorstellungen besteht, ist kollektiv und kann sich, den bloßen Begriffen nach, eben sowohl auf die kollektive Einheit der daran mitwirkenden Substanzen bezogen (wie die Bewegung eines Körpers die zusammengesetzte Bewegung aller Teile desselben ist), als auf die absolute Einheit des Subjekts. Nach der Regel der Identität kann also die Notwendigkeit der Voraussetzung einer einfachen Substanz, bei einem zusammengesetzten Gedanken, nicht eingesehen werden. Daß aber eben derselbe Satz synthetisch und völlig a priori aus lauter Begrif-
fen erkannt werden solle, das wird sich niemand so veran-
schworren trauen, der den Grund der Möglichkeit synthetischer Sätze a priori, so wie wir ihn oben dargelegt haben, einzieht.

Nun ist es aber auch unmöglich, diese notwendige Einheit des Subjekts, als die Bedingung der Möglichkeit eines jeden Gedankens, aus der Erfahrung abszuleiten. Denn diese gibt keine Notwendigkeit zu erkennen, geschweige, daß der Begriff der absoluten Einheit weit über ihre Sphäre ist. Woher nehmen wir denn diesen Satz, worauf sich der ganze psychologische Ver-
numftschiß stützen?

Es ist offenbar: daß, wenn man sich ein denkendes Wesen vor-
stellen will, man sich selbst an seine Stelle setzen, und also dem Objekte, welches man erwägen wollte, sein eigenes Subjekt unter-
schrieben müsse (welches in keiner anderen Art der Nachfor-
schung des Falles ist), und daß wir nur darum absolute Einheit des Subjekts zu einem Gedanken erfordern, weil sonst nicht ge-
sagt werden könnte: Ich denke (das Mannigfaltige in einer Vorstellung). Denn abgesehen das Ganze des Gedankens geteilt und unter viele Subjekte verteilt werden könnte, so kann doch das subjektive Ich nicht geteilt und verteilt werden, und dieses setzen wir doch bei allem Denken voraus.

Also bleibt eben so hier, wie im vorigen Paralogism, der formale Satz der Apperception: Ich denke, der ganze Grund, auf welchen die rationale Psychologie die Erweiterung ihrer Erkenntnisse wart, welcher Satz zwar freilich keine Erfahrung ist, sondern die Form der Apperception, die jeder Erfahrung
which belongs to and precedes every experience; and as such it must always be taken only in relation to some possible knowledge, as a merely subjective condition of that knowledge. We have no right to transform it into a condition of the possibility of a knowledge of objects, that is, into a concept of thinking being in general. For we are not in a position to represent such being to ourselves save by putting ourselves, with the formula of our consciousness, in the place of every other intelligent being.

Nor is the simplicity of myself (as soul) really inferred from the proposition, 'I think'; it is already involved in every thought. The proposition, 'I am simple', must be regarded as an immediate expression of apperception, just as what is referred to as the Cartesian inference, cogito, ergo sum, is really a tautology, since the cogito (sum cogitans) asserts my existence immediately. 'I am simple' means nothing more than that this representation, 'I', does not contain in itself the least manifoldness and that it is absolute (although merely logical) unity.

Thus the renowned psychological proof is founded merely on the indivisible unity of a representation, which governs only the verb in its relation to a person. It is obvious that in attaching 'I' to our thoughts we designate the subject of inherence only transcendentally, without noting in it any quality whatsoever—in fact, without knowing anything of it either by direct acquaintance or otherwise. It means a something in general (transcendental subject), the representation of which must, no doubt, be simple, if only for the reason that there is nothing determinate in it. Nothing, indeed, can be represented that is simpler than that which is represented through the concept of a mere something. But the simplicity of the representation of a subject is not eo ipso knowledge of the simplicity of the subject itself, for we abstract altogether from its properties when we designate it solely by the entirely empty expression 'I', an expression which I can apply to every thinking subject.

This much, then, is certain, that through the 'I', I always A 356
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1 [Reading, with Erdmann, die for der.]
2 [Reading, with Erdmann, den for dem.]
3 [etwas von ihm zu kennen, oder zu wissen.]
entertain the thought of an absolute, but logical, unity of the subject (simplicity). It does not, however, follow that I thereby know the actual simplicity of my subject. The proposition, 'I am substance', signifies, as we have found, nothing but the pure category, of which I can make no use (empirically) in concreto; and I may therefore legitimately say: 'I am a simple substance', that is, a substance the representation of which never contains a synthesis of the manifold. But this concept, as also the proposition, tells us nothing whatsoever in regard to myself as an object of experience, since the concept of substance is itself used only as a function of synthesis, without any underlying intuition, and therefore without an object. It concerns only the condition of our knowledge; it does not apply to any assignable object. We will test the supposed usefulness of the proposition by an experiment.

Everyone must admit that the assertion of the simple nature of the soul is of value only in so far as I can thereby distinguish this subject from all matter, and so can exempt it from the dissolution to which matter is always liable. This is indeed, strictly speaking, the only use for which the above proposition is intended, and is therefore generally expressed as 'The soul is not corporeal'. If, then, I can show that, although we allow full objective validity—the validity appropriate to a judgment of pure reason derived solely from pure categories—to this cardinal proposition of the rational doctrine of the soul (that is, that everything which thinks is a simple substance), we still cannot make the least use of this proposition in regard to the question of its dissimilarity from or relation to matter, this will be the same as if I had relegated this supposed psychological insight to the field of mere ideas, without any real objective use.

In the Transcendental Aesthetic we have proved, beyond all question, that bodies are mere appearances of our outer sense and not things in themselves. We are therefore justified in saying that our thinking subject is not corporeal; in other words, that, inasmuch as it is represented by us as object of inner sense, it cannot, in so far as it thinks, be an object of outer sense, that is, an appearance in space. This is equivalent to saying that thinking beings, as such, can never be found by us among outer appearances, and that their thoughts, con-
sciousness, desires, etc., cannot be outwardly intuited. All these belong to inner sense. This argument does, in fact, seem to be so natural and so popular that even the commonest understanding appears to have always relied upon it, and thus already, from the earliest times, to have regarded souls as quite different entities from their bodies.

But although extension, impenetrability, cohesion, and motion—in short, everything which outer senses can give us—neither are nor contain thoughts, feeling, desire, or resolution, these never being objects of outer intuition, nevertheless the something which underlies the outer appearances and which so affects our sense that it obtains the representations of space, matter, shape, etc., may yet, when viewed as noumenon (or better, as transcendental object), be at the same time the subject of our thoughts. That the mode in which our outer sense is thereby affected gives us no intuition of representations, will, etc., but only of space and its determinations, proves nothing to the contrary. For this something is not extended, nor is it impenetrable or composite, since all these predicates concern only sensibility and its intuition, in so far as we are affected by certain (to us otherwise unknown) objects. By such statements we are not, however, enabled to know what kind of an object it is, but only to recognize that if it is considered in itself, and therefore apart from any relation to the outer senses, these predicates of outer appearances cannot be assigned to it. On the other hand, the predicates of inner sense, representations and thought, are not inconsistent with its nature. Accordingly, even granting the human soul to be simple in nature, such simplicity by no means suffices to distinguish it from matter, in respect of the substratum of the latter—if, that is to say, we consider matter, as indeed we ought to, as mere appearance.

If matter were a thing in itself, it would, as a composite being, be entirely different from the soul, as a simple being. But matter is mere outer appearance, the substratum of which cannot be known through any predicate that we can assign to it. I can therefore very well admit the possibility that it is in itself simple, although owing to the manner in which it affects our senses it produces in us the intuition of the extended and so of

1 [Reading, with Erdmann, 'sind für sein.']

1 Akad. Aug.: 'sinds.'
the composite. I may further assume that the substance which in relation to our outer sense possesses extension is in itself the possessor of thoughts, and that these thoughts can be means of its own inner sense be consciously represented. In this way, what in one relation is entitled corporeal would in another relation be at the same time a thinking being, whose thoughts we cannot intuit, though we can indeed intuit their signs in the [field of] appearance. Accordingly, the thesis that only souls (as particular kinds of substances) think, would have to be given up; and we should have to fall back on the common expression that men think, that is, that the very same being which, as outer appearance, is extended, is (in itself) internally a subject, and is not composite, but is simple and thinks.

But, without committing ourselves in regard to such hypotheses, we can make this general remark. If I understand by soul a thinking being in itself, the question whether or not it is the same in kind as matter—matter not being a thing in itself, but merely a species of representations in us—is by its very terms illegitimate. For it is obvious that a thing in itself is of a different nature from the determinations which constitute only its state.

If, on the other hand, we compare the thinking 'I' not with matter but with the intelligible that lies at the basis of the outer appearance which we call matter, we have no knowledge whatsoever of the intelligible, and therefore are in no position to say that the soul is in any inward respect different from it.

The simple consciousness is not, therefore, knowledge of the simple nature of the self as subject, such as might enable us to distinguish it from matter, as from a composite being.

If, therefore, in the only case in which this concept can be of service, namely, in the comparison of myself with objects of outer experience, it does not suffice for determining what is specific and distinctive in the nature of the self, then though we may still profess to know that the thinking 'I', the soul (a name for the transcendental object of inner sense), is simple, such a way of speaking has no sort of application to real objects, and therefore cannot in the least extend our knowledge.

1 [mit dem Intelligiblen.]
2 [Following Erdmann, in omitting ista.]
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Thus the whole of rational psychology is involved in the collapse of its main support. Here as little as elsewhere can we hope to extend our knowledge through mere concepts—still less by means of the merely subjective form of all our concepts, consciousness—in the absence of any relation to possible experience. For [as we have thus found], even the fundamental concept of a simple nature is such that it can never be met with in any experience, and such, therefore, that there is no way of attaining to it, as an objectively valid concept.

THIRD PARALOGISM: OF PERSONALITY

That which is conscious of the numerical identity of itself at different times is in so far a person
Now the soul is conscious, etc.
Therefore it is a person.

CRITIQUE OF THE THIRD PARALOGISM OF TRANSCENDENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

If I want to know through experience, the numerical identity of an external object, I shall pay heed to that permanent element in the appearance to which as subject everything else is related as determination, and note its identity throughout the time in which the determinations change. Now I am an object of inner sense, and all time is merely the form of inner sense. Consequently, I refer each and all of my successive determinations to the numerically identical self, and do so throughout time, that is, in the form of the inner intuition of myself. This being so, the personality of the soul has to be regarded not as inferred but as a completely identical proposition of self-consciousness in time; and this, indeed, is why it is valid a priori. For it really says nothing more than that in the whole time in which I am conscious of myself, I am conscious of this time as belonging to the unity of myself, and it comes to the same whether I say that this whole time is in me, as individual unity, or that I am to be found as numerically identical in all this time.

In my own consciousness, therefore, identity of person is unfailingly met with. But if I view myself from the standpoint of another person (as object of his outer intuition), it is this

1 [die Ursache, weisungen.]
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outer observer who first represents me in time, for in the apperception time is represented, strictly speaking, only in me. Although he admits, therefore, the 'I', which accompanies, and indeed with complete identity, all representations at all times in my consciousness, he will draw no inference from this to the objective permanence of myself. For just as the time in which the observer sets me is not the time of my own but of his sensibility, so the identity which is necessarily bound up with my consciousness is not therefore bound up with his, that is, with the consciousness which contains the outer intuition of my subject.

The identity of the consciousness of myself at different times is therefore only a formal condition of my thoughts and their coherence, and in no way proves the numerical identity of my subject. Despite the logical identity of the 'I', such a change may have occurred in it as does not allow of the retention of its identity, and yet we may ascribe to it the same-sounding 'I', which in every different state, even in one involving change of the [thinking] subject, might still retain the thought of the preceding subject and so hand it over to the subsequent subject. ^

Although the dictum of certain ancient schools, that everything in the world is in a flux and nothing is permanent and abiding, cannot be reconciled with the admission of substances, it is not refuted by the unity of self-consciousness.

^ An elastic ball which impinges on another similar ball in a straight line communicates to the latter its whole motion, and therefore its whole state (that is, if we take account only of the positions in space). If, then, in analogy with such bodies, we postulate substances such that the one communicates to the other representations together with the consciousness of them, we can conceive a whole series of substances of which the first transmits its state together with its consciousness to the second, the second its own state with that of the preceding substance to the third, and this in turn the states of all the preceding substances together with its own consciousness and with their consciousness to another. The last substance would then be conscious of all the states of the previously changed substances, as being its own states, because they would have been transferred to it together with the consciousness of them. And yet it would not have been one and the same person in all these states.

[geischlaudende]
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For we are unable from our own consciousness to determine whether, as souls, we are permanent or not. Since we reckon as belonging to our identical self only that of which we are conscious, we must necessarily judge that we are one and the same throughout the whole time of which we are conscious. We cannot, however, claim that this judgment would be valid from the standpoint of an outside observer. For since the only permanent appearance which we encounter in the soul is the representation 'I' that accompanies and connects them all, we are unable to prove that this 'I', a mere thought, may not be in the same state of flux as the other thoughts which, by means of it, are linked up with one another.

It is indeed strange that personality, and its presupposition, permanence, and therefore the substantiality of the soul, should have to be proved at this stage and not earlier. For could we have presupposed these latter [permanence and substantiality], there would follow, not indeed the continuance of consciousness, yet at least the possibility of a continuing consciousness in an abiding subject, and that is already sufficient for personality. For personality does not itself at once cease because its activity is for a time interrupted. This permanence, however, is in no way given prior to that numerical identity of our self which we infer from identical apperception, but on the contrary is inferred first from the numerical identity. (If the argument proceeded aright, the concept of substance, which is applicable only empirically, would first be brought in after such proof of numerical identity.) Now, since this identity of person [presupposing, as it does, numerical identity] in no wise follows from the identity of the 'I' in the consciousness of all the time in which I know myself, we could not, earlier in the argument, have founded upon it the substantiality of the soul.

Meanwhile we may still retain the concept of personality —just as we have retained the concept of substance and of the simple—in so far as it is merely transcendental, that is, concerns the unity of the subject, otherwise unknown to us, in the determinations of which there is a thoroughgoing connection through apperception. Taken in this way, the concept is necessary for practical employment and is sufficient for
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widerlegt. Denn wir selbst können aus unserem Bewußtsein darüber nicht urteilen, ob wir als Seele behandelt sind, oder nicht, weil wir zu unserem identischen Selbst nur dasjenige zählen, dessen wir uns bewußt sein, und so allerdings notwendig urteilen müssen: daß wir in der ganzen Zeit, deren wir uns bewußt sein, eben dieselbe sind. In dem Standpunkte eines Fremden aber können wir dieses darum noch nicht vor gütig erklären, weil, da wir an der Seele keine beharrliche Erscheinung antreffen, als nur die Vorstellung Ich, welche sie alle begleitet und verknüpft, so können wir niemals ausmachen, ob dieses Ich (ein bloßer Gedanke) nicht eben soviel fließe, als die übrige Gedanken, die dadurch an einander gekettet werden.

Es ist aber merkwürdig, daß die Persönlichkeit und deren Voraussetzung, die Beharrlichkeit, mithin die Substantialität der Seele jetzt allererst bewiesen werden muß. Denn könnten wir diese voraussetzen, so würde zwar daraus noch nicht die Fortdauer des Bewußtseins, aber doch die Möglichkeit eines fortwährenden Bewußtseins in einem bleibenden Subjekt folgen, welches zu der Persönlichkeit schon hinreichend ist, die dadurch, daß ihre Wirkung etwa eine Zeit hindurch unterbrochen wird, selbst nicht so fort aufhält. Aber diese Beharrlichkeit ist uns vor der numerischen Identität unserer selbst, die wir aus der identischen Apperception folgern, durch nichts gegeben, sondern wird daraus allererst gefolgert (und auf diese mußte, wenn es recht zugehe, allererst der Begriff der Substanz folgen, der allein empirisch brauchbar ist). Da nun diese Identität der Person aus der Identität des Ich, in dem Bewußtsein aller Zeit, darin ich mich erkenne, keinesweges folgt: so hat auch oben die Substantialität der Seele darauf nicht gegründet werden können.

Indessen kann, so wie der Begriff der Substanz und des Einfachen, eben so auch der Begriff der Persönlichkeit (so fern er bloß transzendental ist, d. i. Einheit des Subjekts, das uns übrigen unbekannt ist, in dessen Bestimmungen aber eine durchgängige Verknüpfung durch Apperception ist) bleiben, und so fern ist dieser Begriff auch zum praktischen Gebrauche nützig und hinreichend,

[Reading, with Adicken, d. i. Einheit des Subjekts betrifft.]

* Akad.-Ausz.: sünde.
such use; but we can never parade it as an extension of our self-knowledge through pure reason, and as exhibiting to us from the mere concept of the identical self an unbroken continuance of the subject. For this concept revolves perpetually in a circle, and does not help us in respect to any question which aims at synthetic knowledge. What matter may be as a thing in itself (transcendental object) is completely unknown to us, though, owing to its being represented as something external, its permanence as appearance can indeed be observed. But if I want to observe the mere `I' in the change of all representations, I have no other correlatum to use in my comparisons except again myself, with the universal conditions of my consciousness. Consequently, I can give none but tautological answers to all questions, in that I substitute my concept and its unity for the properties which belong to myself as object, and so take for granted that which the questioner has desired to know.

**FOURTH PARALOGISM: OF IDEALITY**

*(IN REGARD TO OUTER RELATION)*

That, the existence of which can only be inferred as a cause of given perceptions, has a merely doubtful existence.

Now all outer appearances are of such a nature that their existence is not immediately perceived, and that we can only infer them as the cause of given perceptions.

Therefore the existence of all objects of the outer senses is doubtful. This uncertainty I entitle the ideality of outer appearances, and the doctrine of this ideality is called *idealism*, as distinguished from the counter-assertion of a possible certainty in regard to objects of outer sense, which is called *dualism*.

**Critique of the Fourth Paralogism of Transcendental Psychology**

Let us first examine the premises. We are justified, [it is argued], in maintaining that only what is in ourselves can be perceived immediately, and that my own existence is the sole object of a mere perception. The existence, therefore, of an actual object outside me (if this word `me' be taken in the
intellectual [not in the empirical sense] is never given directly in perception. Perception is a modification of inner sense, and the existence of the outer object can be added to it only in thought, as being its outer cause, and accordingly as being inferred. For the same reason, Descartes was justified in limiting all perception, in the narrowest sense of that term, to the proposition ‘I, as a thinking being, exist.’ Obviously, since what is without is not in me, I cannot encounter it in my apprehension, nor therefore in any perception, which, properly regarded, is merely the determination of apprehension.

I am not, therefore, in a position to perceive external things, but can only infer their existence from my inner perception, taking the inner perception as the effect of which something external is the proximate cause. Now the inference from the given effect to a determinate cause is always uncertain, since the effect may be due to more than one cause. Accordingly, as regards the relation of the perception to its cause, it always remains doubtful whether the cause be internal or external; whether, that is to say, all the so-called outer perceptions are not a mere play of our inner sense, or whether they stand in relation to actual external objects as their cause. At all events, the existence of the latter is only inferred, and is open to all the dangers of inference, whereas the object of inner sense (I myself with all my representations) is immediately perceived, and its existence does not allow of being doubted.

The term ‘idealism’ is not, therefore, to be understood as applying to those who deny the existence of external objects of the senses, but only to those who do not admit that their existence is known through immediate perception, and who therefore conclude that we can never, by way of any possible experience, be completely certain as to their reality.

Before exhibiting our paralogism in all its deceptive illusoriness, I have first to remark that we must necessarily distinguish two types of idealism, the transcendental and the empirical. By transcendental idealism I mean the doctrine that appearances are to be regarded as being, one and all, representations only, not things in themselves, and that time and space are therefore only sensible forms of our intuition, not determinations given as existing by themselves, nor conditions of objects viewed as things in themselves. To this ideal-
ism there is opposed a *transcendental realism* which regards
time and space as something given in themselves, independ-
ently of our sensibility. The transcendental realist thus inter-
prets outer appearances (their reality being taken as granted)
as things-in-themselves, which exist independently of us and of
our sensibility, and which are therefore outside us—the phrase
'outside us' being interpreted in conformity with pure con-
cepts of understanding. It is, in fact, this transcendental realist
who afterwards plays the part of empirical idealist. After
wrongly supposing that objects of the senses, if they are to be
external, must have an existence by themselves, and inde-
pendently of the senses, he finds that, judged from this point
of view, all our sensuous representations are inadequate to
establish their reality.

The transcendental idealist, on the other hand, may be an
empirical realist or, as he is called, a **dualist**; that is, he may
admit the existence of matter without going outside his mere
self-consciousness, or assuming anything more than the cer-
tainty of his representations, that is, the *cogito, ergo sum*. For
he considers this matter and even its inner possibility to be
appearance merely; and appearance, if separated from our
sensibility, is nothing. Matter is with him, therefore, only a
species of representations (intuition), which are called external,
not as standing in relation to objects in *themselves external*,
but because they relate perceptions to the space in which all
things are external to one another, while yet the space itself is
in us.

From the start, we have declared ourselves in favour of
this transcendental idealism; and our doctrine thus removes
all difficulty in the way of accepting the existence of matter
on the unaided testimony of our mere self-consciousness, or of
declaring it to be thereby proved in the same manner as the
existence of myself as a thinking being is proved. There can
be no question that I am conscious of my representations;
these representations and I myself, who have the representa-
tions, therefore exist. External objects (bodies), however, are
mere appearances, and are therefore nothing but a species of
my representations, the objects of which are something only
through these representations. Apart from them they are
nothing. Thus external things exist as well as I myself, and

---

| Der transcendente Idealist kann hingegen ein empiri-
| scher Realist, mitinn, wie man ihn nennt, ein DUALIST sein,
| d. i. die Existens der Materie einräumen, ohne aus dem bloßen
| Selbstbewußtsein hinauszugehen; und etwas mehr, als die Ge-
| wißheit der Vorstellungen in mir, mitinn das cogito, ergo sum,
| anzunehmen. Denn weil er diese Materie und sogar deren
| innere Möglichkeit bloß vor Erscheinung gelten läßt, die, von
| unserer Sinnlichkeit abgelenkt, nichts ist: so ist sie bei ihm
| nur eine Art Vorstellungen (Anschauung), welche äußerlich
| heissen, nicht, als ob sie sich auf an sich selbst äußere
| Gegenstände bezügen, sondern weil sie Wahrnehmungen auf
| den Raum beziehen, in welchem alles äußer einander, er selbst
| der Raum aber in uns ist.

Vor diesen transcendentalen Idealism haben wir uns nun
schon im Anfange erklärt. Also fällt bei unserem Lehrbegriff
alle Bedenklichkeit weg, das Dasein der Materie eben so auf
das Zeugnis; unseres bloßen Selbstbewußtseins ansnehmen
und dadurch vor bewiesen zu erklären, wie das Dasein meiner
selbst als eines denkenden Wesens. Denn ich bin mir doch
meiner Vorstellungen bewußt; also existieren diese und ich
selbst, der ich diese Vorstellungen habe. Nun sind aber äußere
Gegenstände (die Körper) bloß Erscheinungen, mitinn auch
nichts anders, als eine Art meiner Vorstellungen, deren Gegen-
stände nur durch diese Vorstellungen etwas sind, von ihnen
abgesondert aber nichts sein*. Also existieren eben sowohl
äußere Dinge, als ich selbst existiere, und zwar beide auf das

* Akad.-Auss.: »sind«.
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both, indeed, upon the immediate witness of my self-consciousness. The only difference is that the representation of myself, as the thinking subject, belongs to inner sense only, while the representations which mark extended beings belong also to outer sense. In order to arrive at the reality of outer objects I have just as little need to resort to inference as I have in regard to the reality of the object of my inner sense, that is, in regard to the reality of my thoughts. For in both cases alike the objects are nothing but representations, the immediate perception (consciousness) of which is at the same time a sufficient proof of their reality.

The transcendental idealist is, therefore, an empirical realist, and allows to matter, as appearance, a reality which does not permit of being inferred, but is immediately perceived. Transcendental realism, on the other hand, inevitably falls into difficulties, and finds itself obliged to give way to empirical idealism, in that it regards the objects of outer sense as something distinct from the senses themselves, treating mere appearances as self-substantive beings, existing outside us. On such a view as this, however clearly we may be conscious of our representation of these things, it is still far from certain that, if the representation exists, there exists also the object corresponding to it. In our system, on the other hand, these external things, namely matter, are in all their configurations and alterations nothing but mere appearances, that is, representations in us, of the reality of which we are immediately conscious.

Since, so far as I know, all psychologists who adopt empirical idealism are transcendental realists, they have certainly proceeded consistently in ascribing great importance to empirical idealism, as one of the problems in regard to which the human mind is quite at a loss how to proceed. For if we regard outer appearances as representations produced in us by their objects, and if these objects be things existing in themselves outside us, it is indeed impossible to see how we can come to know the existence of the objects otherwise than by inference from the effect to the cause; and this being so, it must always remain doubtful whether the cause in question be in us or outside us. We can indeed admit that something, which

unmittelbare Zeugnis meines Selbstbewußtseins, nur mit dem Unterschiede: daß die Vorstellung meiner selbst, als des denkenden Subjekts, bloß auf den inneren, die Vorstellungen aber, welche ausgedehnte Wesen bezeichnen, auch auf den äußeren Sinn besessen werden. Ich habe in Absicht auf die Wirklichkeit äußerer Gegenstände eben so wenig in die Kriege zu schließen, als in Annehmung der Wirklichkeit des Gegenstandes meines inneren Sinnes (meiner Gedanken), denn sie sind beiderseitig nicht als Vorstellungen, deren unmittelbare Wahrnehmung (Bewußtsein) zugleich ein genugsmater Beweis ihrer Wirklichkeit ist.

Also ist der transcendente Idealism ein empirischer Realist und gesteht der Materie, als Erscheinung, eine Wirklichkeit zu, die nicht geschlossen werden darf, sondern unmittelbar wahrgenommen wird. Dagegen kommt der transcendente Realismus notwendiger in Verlegenheit, und sieht sich genötigt, dem empirischen Idealismus Platz einzuräumen, weil er die Gegenstände äußerer Sinne vor etwas von den Sinnen selbst Unterschiedenes, und bloße Erscheinungen vor selbständige Wesen ansieht, die sich äußer uns befinden; da der sich freilich, bei unserem besten Bewußtsein unserer Vorstellung von diesen Dingen, noch lange nicht gewiß ist, daß, wenn die Vorstellung existiert, auch der ihr entsprechende Gegenstand existiert; dahingegen in unserem System diese äußeren Dinge, die Materie nämlich, in allen ihren Gestalten und Veränderungen, nichts als bloße Erscheinungen, d. i. Vorstellungen in uns sind, deren Wirklichkeit wir uns unmittelbar bewußt werden.

Da nun, so viel ich weiß, alle dem empirischen Idealismus anhängende Psychologen transcendente Realisten sein1, so haben sie freilich ganz konsequent verfahren, dem empirischen Idealismus große Wichtigkeit zuzugestehen, als einem von den Problemen, daraus die menschliche Vernunft sich schließlich zu helfen wisse. Denn in der Tat, wenn man äußere Erscheinungen als Vorstellungen ansieht, die von ihren Gegenständen, als an sich äußer uns befindlichen Dingen, in uns gewirkt werden, so ist nicht abzusehen, wie man dieser ihr. Dessen anders, als durch den Schluß von der Wirkung auf die Ursache, erkennen könne, bei welchem es immer zweideutig bleibt, ob die letztere in uns, oder äußer uns sei. Nun kann man zwar

1 Akad.-Aug.: 1881.
may be (in the transcendental sense) outside us, is the cause of our outer intuitions, but this is not the object of which we are thinking in the representations of matter and of corporeal things; for these are merely appearances, that is, mere kinds of representation, which are never to be met with save in us, and the reality of which depends on immediate consciousness, just as does the consciousness of my own thoughts. The transcendental object is equally unknown in respect to inner and to outer intuition. But it is not of this that we are speaking, but of the empirical object, which is called an external object if it is represented in space, and an inner object if it is represented only in its time-relations. Neither space nor time, however, is to be found save in us.

The expression 'outside us' is thus unavoidably ambiguous in meaning, sometimes signifying what as thing in itself exists apart from us, and sometimes what belongs solely to outer appearance. In order, therefore, to make this concept, in the latter sense—the sense in which the psychological question as to the reality of our outer intuition has to be understood—quite unambiguous, we shall distinguish empirically external objects from those which may be said to be external in the transcendental sense, by explicitly entitling the former 'things which are to be found in space'.

Space and time are indeed a priori representations, which dwell in us as forms of our sensible intuition, before any real object, determining our sense through sensation, has enabled us to represent the object under those sensible relations. But the material or real element, the something which is to be intuited in space, necessarily presupposes perception. Perception exhibits the reality of something in space; and in the absence of perception no power of imagination can invent and produce that something. It is sensation, therefore, that indicates a reality in space or in time, according as it is related to the one or to the other mode of sensible intuition. (Once sensation is given—if referred to an object in general, though not as determining that object, it is entitled perception—thanks to its manifoldness we can picture in imagination many objects which have no empirical place in space or time outside the imagination.)

\[\text{A 374}\]

\[\text{Reading, with Erdmann, or for und.}\]

\[\text{Brackets not in text.}\]
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This admits of no doubt; whether we take pleasure and pain, or the sensations of the outer senses, colours, heat, etc., perception is that whereby the material required to enable us to think objects of sensible intuition must first be given. This perception, therefore (to consider, for the moment, only outer intuitions), represents something real in space. For, in the first place, while space is the representation of a mere possibility of coexistence, perception is the representation of a reality. Secondly, this reality is represented in outer sense, that is, in space. Thirdly, space is itself nothing but mere representation, and therefore nothing in it can count as real save only what is represented in it; and conversely, what is given in it, that is, represented through perception, is also real in it. For if it were not real, that is, immediately given through empirical intuition, it could not be pictured in imagination, since what is real in intuitions cannot be invented a priori.

All outer perception, therefore, yields immediate proof of something real in space, or rather is the real itself. In this sense empirical realism is beyond question; that is, there corresponds to our outer intuitions something real in space. Space itself, with all its appearances, as representations, is, indeed, only in me, but nevertheless the real, that is, the material of all objects of outer intuition, is actually given in this space, independently of all imaginative invention. Also, it is impossible that in this space anything outside us (in the transcendental sense) should be given, space itself being nothing outside our sensibility. Even the most rigid idealist cannot, therefore, require a proof that the object outside us (taking ‘outside’ in the strict [transcendental] sense) corresponds to our perception. For if there be any such object, it could not be

* We must give full credence to this paradoxical but correct proposition, that there is nothing in space save what is represented in it. For space is itself nothing but representation, and whatever is in it must therefore be contained in the representation. Nothing whatsoever is in space, save in so far as it is actually represented in it. It is a proposition which must indeed sound strange, that a thing can exist only in the representation of it, but in this case the objection falls, inasmuch as the things with which we are here concerned are not things in themselves, but appearances only, that is, representations.

1 [wirkliches. In this section, as elsewhere, Kant uses Wirklichkeit and Realität as synonymous terms.]
represented and intuited as outside us, because such representation and intuition presuppose space, and reality in space, being the reality of a mere representation, is nothing other than perception itself. The real of outer appearances is therefore real in perception only, and can be real in no other way.

From perceptions knowledge of objects can be generated, either by mere play of imagination or by way of experience; and in the process there may, no doubt, arise illusory representations to which the objects do not correspond, the deception being attributable sometimes to a delusion of imagination (in dreams) and sometimes to an error of judgment (in so-called sense-deception). To avoid such deceptive illusion, we have to proceed according to the rule: Whatever is connected with a perception according to empirical laws, is actual. But such deception, as well as the provision against it, affects idealism quite as much as dualism, inasmuch as we are concerned only with the form of experience. Empirical idealism, and its mistaken questionings as to the objective reality of our outer perceptions, is already sufficiently refuted, when it has been shown that outer perception yields immediate proof of something actual in space, and that this space, although in itself only a mere form of representations, has objective reality in relation to all outer appearances, which also are nothing else than mere representations; and when it has likewise been shown that in the absence of perception even imagining and dreaming are not possible, and that our outer senses, as regards the data from which experience can arise, have therefore their actual corresponding objects in space.

The dogmatic idealist would be one who denies the existence of matter, the sceptical idealist one who doubts its existence, because holding it to be incapable of proof.¹ The former must base his view on supposed contradictions in the possibility of there being such a thing as matter at all—a view with which we have not yet been called upon to deal. The following section on dialectical inferences, which represents reason as in strife with itself in regard to the concepts which it makes for itself of the possibility of what² belongs to the

¹ [Reading, with Erdmann, as . . . so for sie . . . sie.]
² [Reading, with Hartenstein and Kehrbach, die sie sich . . . dessen macht for die sich . . . dessen.]
connection of experience, will remove this difficulty. The sceptical idealist, however, who merely challenges the ground of our assertion and denounces as insufficiently justified our conviction of the existence of matter, which we thought to base on immediate perception, is a benefactor of human reason in so far as he compels us, even in the smallest advances of ordinary experience, to keep on the watch, lest we consider as a well-earned possession what we perhaps obtain only illegitimately. We are now in a position to appreciate the value of these idealist objections. Unless we mean to contradict ourselves in our commonest assertions, they drive us by main force to view all our perceptions, whether we call them inner or outer, as a consciousness only of what is dependent on our sensibility. They also compel us to view the outer objects of these perceptions not as things in themselves, but only as representations, of which, as of every other representation, we can become immediately conscious, and which are entitled outer because they depend on what we call 'outer sense', whose intuition is space. Space itself, however, is nothing but an inner mode of representation in which certain perceptions are connected with one another.

If we treat outer objects as things in themselves, it is quite impossible to understand how we could arrive at a knowledge of their reality outside us, since we have to rely merely on the representation which is in us. For we cannot be sentient [of what is] outside ourselves, but only [of what is] in us, and the whole of our self-consciousness therefore yields nothing save merely our own determinations. Sceptical idealism thus constrains us to have recourse to the only refuge still open, namely, the ideality of all appearances, a doctrine which has already been established in the Transcendental Aesthetic independently of these consequences, which we could not at that stage foresee. If then we ask, whether it follows that in the doctrine of the soul dualism alone is tenable, we must answer: 'Yes, certainly; but dualism only in the empirical sense'. That is to say, in the connection of experience matter, as substance in the [field of] appearance, is really given to outer sense, just as the thinking 'I', also as substance in the [field of] appearance, is given to inner sense. Further, appearances in both fields¹

¹ [beiderseits.]
must be connected with each other according to the rules which this category introduces into that connection of our outer as well as of our inner perceptions whereby they constitute one experience. If, however, as commonly happens, we seek to extend the concept of dualism, and take it in the transcendental sense, neither it nor the two counter-alternatives—pneumatism on the one hand, materialism on the other—would have any sort of basis, since we should then have misapplied our concepts, taking the difference in the mode of representing objects, which, as regards what they are in themselves, still remain unknown to us, as a difference in the things themselves. Though the 'I', as represented through inner sense in time, and objects in space outside me, are specifically quite distinct appearances, they are not for that reason thought as being different things. Neither the transcendental object which underlies outer appearances nor that which underlies inner intuition, is in itself either matter or a thinking being, but a ground (to us unknown) of the appearances which supply to us the empirical concept of the former as well as of the latter mode of existence.

If then, as this critical argument obviously compels us to do, we hold fast to the rule above established, and do not push our questions beyond the limits within which possible experience can present us with its object, we shall never dream of seeking to inform ourselves about the objects of our senses as they are in themselves, that is, out of all relation to the senses. But if the psychologist takes appearances for things in themselves, and as existing in and by themselves, then whether he be a materialist who admits into his system nothing but matter alone, or a spiritualist who admits only thinking beings (that is, beings with the form of our inner sense), or a dualist who accepts both, he will always, owing to this misunderstanding, be entangled in pseudo-rational speculations as to how that which is not a thing in itself, but only the appearance of a thing in general, can exist by itself.

**Consideration of Pure Psychology as a whole, in view of these Paralogisms**

If we compare the doctrine of the soul as the physiology of inner sense, with the doctrine of the body as a physiology of
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Kategorie in den Zusammenhang unserer äußerer sowohl als innerer Wahrnehmungen zu einer Erfahrung hineinbringt, müssen auch beiderseits Erscheinungen unter sich verknüpft werden. Wollte man aber den Begriff des Dualismus, wie es gewöhnlich geschieht, erweitern und ihn im transcendentalen Verstande nehmen, so hätten wir er, den der äußere, die der Pneumatismus einerseits, der Materialismus andererseits, nicht den mindesten Grund, indem man alsdenn die Bestimmung seiner Begriffe verfehle, die Ver- schiedenheit der Vorstellungswirken von Gegenständen, die uns nach dem, was sie an sich sind, unbekannt bleiben, vor eine Verschiedenheit dieser Dinge selbst hält. Ich, durch den inneren Sinn in der Zeit vorgestellt, und Gegenstände im Raume, außer mir, sind zwar skeptisch' gans unterschiedene Erscheinungen, aber dadurch werden sie nicht als verschiedene Dinge gedacht. Das transcendente Objekt, welches den äußeren Erschei- nungen, imgleichen das, was der innere Anschauung zum Grunde liegt, ist weder Materie, noch ein denkend Wesen an sich selbst, sondern ein uns unbekannter Grund der Erschei- nungen, die den empirischen Begriff von der ersten sowohl als zweiten Art an die Hand geben.

Wenn wir also, wie uns denn die gegenwärtige Kritik augenscheinlich dazu nötigt, der oben festgesetzten Regel treu bleiben, unsere Fragen nicht weiter zu treiben, als nur so weit möglich Erfahrung uns das Objekt dessen an die Hand geben kann: so werden wir es uns nicht einmal einzallen lassen, über die Ge- genstände unserer Sinne nach demjenigen, was sie an sich selbst, d. h. ohne alle Beziehung auf die Sinne sein mögen, Er- kundigung anzustellen. Wenn aber der Psycholog Erscheinun- gen vor Dinge an sich selbst nimmt, so mag er als Materialist ainsig und allein Materie, oder als Spiritualist bloß denkende Wesen (nämlich nach der Form unsers innern Sinnes) oder als Dualist beide, als vor sich existierende Dinge, in seinen Lehnbegriff aufnehmen, so ist er doch immer durch Mißver- stand hingehalten, über die Art zu verschnüren, wie dasjenige an sich selbst existieren möge, was doch kein Ding an sich, sondern nur die Erscheinung eines Dinges überhaupt ist.

[Betrachtung über die Summe der reinen Seelelehre, zu folge diesen Paralogismen]

Wenn wir die Seelelehre, als die Physiologie der inneren Sinnes, mit der Körperlehre, als einer Physiologie der

1 Dieses Wort ist nach der Vorrede zu A (S. XXII) in der vorliegen- den Ausgabe S. 19 zu ändern in 'spezifische'.

2 Akad.-Ausz.: 'des'.
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the object of the outer senses, we find that while in both much
can be learnt empirically, there is yet this notable difference
In the latter science much that is a priori can be synthetically
known from the mere concept of an extended impenetrable
being, but in the former nothing whatsoever that is a priori
can be known synthetically from the concept of a thinking
being. The cause is this. Although both are appearances,
the appearance to outer sense has something fixed or abiding
which supplies a substratum as the basis of its transitory
determinations and therefore a synthetic concept, namely,
that of space and of an appearance in space; whereas time,
which is the sole form of our inner intuition, has nothing
abiding, and therefore yields knowledge only of the change
of determinations, not of any object that can be thereby deter-
mined. For in what we entitle 'soul', everything is in con-
tinual flux and there is nothing abiding except (if we must so
express ourselves) the 'I', which is simple solely because its
representation has no content, and therefore no manifold, and
for this reason seems to represent, or (to use a more correct
term) denote, a simple object. In order that it should be possible,
by pure reason, to obtain knowledge of the nature of a thinking
being in general, this 'I' would have to be an intuition which,
in being presupposed in all thought (prior to all experience),
might as intuition yield a priori synthetic propositions. This
'I' is, however, as little an intuition as it is a concept of any
object; it is the mere form of consciousness, which can accom-
pany the two kinds of representation and which is in a position
to elevate them to the rank of knowledge only in so far as some-
thing else is given in intuition which provides material for a
representation of an object. Thus the whole of rational psy-
chology, as a science surpassing all powers of human reason,
proves abortive, and nothing is left for us but to study our soul
under the guidance of experience, and to confine ourselves
to those questions which do not go beyond the limits within
which a content can be provided for them by possible inner
experience.

But although rational psychology cannot be used to extend
knowledge, and when so employed is entirely made up of
paralogisms, still we cannot deny it a considerable negative
value, if it is taken as nothing more than a critical treatment

Gegenstände äußerer Sinne verglichen: so finden wir, außer
dem, daß in beiden vieles empirisch erkannt werden kann, doch
diesen merkwürdigen Unterschied, daß in der letzteren Wissen-
schaft doch vieles a priori, aus dem bloßen Begriffe eines aus-
gedehnten undurchdringlichen Wesens, in der ersteren aber,
aus dem Begriffe eines denkenden Wesens, gar nichts a priori
synthetisch erkannt werden kann. Die Ursache ist diese. Ob-
gleich beides Erscheinungen sind, so hat doch die Erscheinung
vom äußeren Sinne etwas Stehendes, oder Bleibendes, wel-
ches ein, den wandelbaren Bestimmungen zum Grunde liegen-
des Substratum und mithin einen synthetischen Begriff, näm-
lich den vom Raume und einer Erscheinung in demselben, an
die Hand gibt, anstatt daß die Zeit, welche die einzige Form
unserer inneren Anschauung ist, nichts Bleibendes hat, mithin
nur den Wechsel der Bestimmungen, nicht aber dem bestimm-
baren Gegenstand zu erkennen gibt. Denn, in dem, was wir
Seele nennen, ist alles im kontinuierlichen Flusse und nichts
Bleibendes, außer etwas (wohn man es durchaus will) das darum
so einfache Ich, weil diese Vorstellung keinen Inhalt, mithin
kein Mannigfaltiges hat, weswegen sie auch scheint, ein ein-
faches Objekt vorsusstern, oder, besser gesagt, zu bezeichnen.
Diesen Ich müßte eine Anschauung sein, welche, da sie beim
Denken überhaupt (vor aller Erjahrung) vorausgesetzt würde,
as Anschauung a priori synthetische Sätze lieferte, wenn es
möglich sein sollte, eine reine Vernunfterkennnis von der
Natur eines denkenden Wesens überhaupt zu Stinde zu brin-
gen. Allein dieses Ich ist so wenig Anschauung, als Begriff von
irgend einem Gegenstande, sondern die bloße Form des Be-
wußtseins, welches beiderlei Vorstellungen begleiten, und sie
dadurch zu Erkennnissen erheben kann, so fern nämlich dazu
noch irgend etwas anders in der Anschauung gegeben wird,
welches zu einer Vorstellung von einem Gegenstande Stoff dar-
reicht. Also fällt die ganze rationale Psychologie, als eine, alle
Kräfte der menschlichen Vernunft übersteigende Wissenschaft,
und es bleibt uns nichts übrig, als unsere Seele an dem Leit-
faden der Erjahrung zu studieren und uns in den Schranken
der Fragen zu halten, die nicht weiter gehen, als mögliche innere
Erjahrung ihrem Inhalt darlegen kann.

Ob sie nun aber gleich als erweiternde Erkenntnis keinen
Nutzien hat, sondern als solche aus lauter Paralogismen zusam-
mengesetzt ist, so kann man ihr doch, wenn sie vor nichts mehr,
eine kritische Behandlung unserer dialektischer Schlüsse,
of our dialectical inferences, those that arise from the common and natural reason of men.
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Why do we have resort to a doctrine of the soul founded exclusively on pure principles of reason? Beyond all doubt, chiefly in order to secure our thinking self against the danger of materialism. This is achieved by means of the pure concept of our thinking self which we have just given. For by this teaching so completely are we freed from the fear that on the removal of matter all thought, and even the very existence of thinking beings, would be destroyed, that on the contrary it is clearly shown, that if I remove the thinking subject the whole corporeal world must at once vanish: it is nothing save an appearance in the sensibility of our subject and a mode of its representations.

I admit that this does not give me any further knowledge of the properties of this thinking self, nor does it enable me to determine its permanence or even that it exists independently of what we may conjecture to be the transcendental substratum of outer appearances; for the latter is just as unknown to me as the thinking self. But it is nevertheless possible that I may find cause, on other than merely speculative grounds, to hope for an independent and continuing existence of my thinking nature, throughout all possible change of my state. In that case much will already have been gained if, while freely confessing my own ignorance, I am yet in a position to repel the dogmatic assaults of a speculative opponent, and to show him that he can never know more of the nature of the self in denying the possibility of my expectations than I can know in clinging to them.

Three other dialectical questions, constituting the real goal of rational psychology, are grounded on this transcendental illusion in our psychological concepts, and cannot be decided except by means of the above enquiries: namely (1) of the possibility of the communion of the soul with an organised body, i.e. concerning animality and the state of the soul in the life of man; (2) of the beginning of this communion, that is, of the soul in and before birth; (3) of the end of this communion, that is, of the soul in and after death (the question of immortality).
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und zwar der gemeinen und natürlichen Vernunft, gelten soll, einen wichtigen negativen Nutsen nicht absprechen.

Wovu haben wir wohl eine bloß auf reine Vernunftprinzipien gegründete Seelenlehre mögen! Ohne Zweifel versöhnen in der Absicht, um unser denkendes Selbst unter die Gefahr des Materialismus zu sichern. Dieses leistet aber der Vernunftbegriff von unserem denkenden Selbst, den wir gegeben haben. Denn wenigstens ein Furcht übrig bliebe, daß, wenn man die Materie wegnahme, darunter alles Denken und selbst die Existenz des denkenden Wesen aufgehoben werden würde, so wird vielmehr klar gesehen: daß, wenn ich das denkende Subjekt wegnahme, die ganze Körpere Welt verwessen muß, ab die nix ist, als die Erscheinung in der Sinnlichkeit unseres Subjekts und eine Art Vorstellungen desselben.


Auf diesen transzendentalen Schein unserer psychologischen Begriffe gründen sich dann noch drei dialektische Fragen, welche das eigentliche Ziel der rationalen Psychologie ausmachen, und nirgend anders, als durch obige Untersuchungen entschieden werden können: nämlich 1) von der Möglichkeit der Gemeinschaft der Seele mit einem organischen Körper, d. i. der Animalität und dem Zustande der Seele im Leben des Menschen, 2) vom Anfange dieser Gemeinschaft, d. i. der Seele in und vor der Geburt des Menschen, 3) dem Ende dieser Gemeinschaft, d. i. der Seele im und nach dem Tode des Menschen (Frage wegen der Unsterblichkeit).
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Now I maintain that all the difficulties commonly found in these questions, and by means of which, as dogmatic objections, men seek to gain credit for a deeper insight into the nature of things than any to which the ordinary understanding can properly lay claim, rest on a mere delusion by which they hypostatize what exists merely in thought, and take it as a real object existing, in the same character, outside the thinking subject. In other words, they regard extension, which is nothing but appearance, as a property of outer things that subsists even apart from our sensibility, and hold that motion is due to these things and really occurs in and by itself, apart from our senses. For matter, the communion of which with the soul arouses so much questioning, is nothing but a mere form, or a particular way of representing an unknown object by means of that intuition which is called outer sense. There may well be something outside us to which this appearance, which we call matter, corresponds; in its character of appearance it is not, however, outside us, but is only a thought in us, although this thought, through the above-mentioned outer sense, represents it as existing outside us. Matter, therefore, does not mean a kind of substance quite distinct and heterogeneous from the object of inner sense (the soul), but only the distinctive nature of those appearances of objects—in themselves unknown to us—the representations of which we call outer as compared with those which we count as belonging to inner sense, although like all other thoughts these outer representations belong only to the thinking subject. They have, indeed, this deceptive property that, representing objects in space, they detach themselves as if were from the soul and appear to hover outside it. Yet the very space in which they are intuited is nothing but a representation, and no counterpart of the same quality is to be found outside the soul. Consequently, the question is no longer of the communion of the soul with other known substances of a different kind outside us, but only of the connection of the representations of inner sense with the modifications of our outer sensibility—as to how these can be so connected with each other according to settled laws that they exhibit the unity of a coherent experience.

As long as we take inner and outer appearances together as mere representations in experience, we find nothing absurd

Ich behaupte nun: daß alle Schwierigkeiten, die man bei diesen Fragen vorzufinden glaubet, und mit denen, als dogmatischen Einwürfen, man sich das Ansehen einer tieferen Einsicht in die Natur der Dinge, als der gemeine Verstand wohl haben kann, zu geben sucht, auf einem bloßen Blendenwerk beruht
d, nach welchem man das, was bloß in Gedanken existiert, hypostasiert, und in eben derselben Qualität, als einen wirklichen Gegenstand außerhalb dem denkenden Subjekte annimmt, nämlich Ausdehnung, die nichts als Erscheinung ist, vor eine, auch ohne unsere Sinnlichkeit, subsistierende Eigenschaft äußerer Dinge, und Bewegung vor deren Wirkung, welche auch außer unseren Sinne an sich wirklich vorgeht, zu halten. Denn die Materie, deren Gemeinschaft mit der Seele so großes Bedenken erregt, ist nichts anders als eine bloße Form, oder eine gewisse Vorstellung eines unbekannten Gegenstandes, durch diejenige Anschauung, welche man den äußeren Sinn nennt. Es mag also wohl etwas außer uns sein, dem diese Erscheinung, welche wir Materie nennen, korrespondiert; aber, in derselben Qualität als Erscheinung ist es nicht außer uns, sondern lediglich als ein Gedanke in uns, wie wohl dieser Gedanke, durch genanntem Sinn, es als außer uns befindlich-vorstellt. Materie bedeutet also nicht eine von dem Gegenstande des inneren Sinnes (Seele) so ganz unterschiedene und heterogene Art von Substanzen, sondern nur die Ungleichartigkeit der Erscheinungen von Gegenständen (die uns an sich selbst unbekannt sind), deren Vorstellungen wir äußere nennen, in Vergleichung mit denen, die wir zum inneren Sinne zählen, ob sie gleich eben so bloß zum denkenden Subjekte, als alle übrigen Gedanken, gehören, nur daß sie dieses Täuschende, sich gleichsam von der Seele ablösen und außer ihr zu schwimmen scheinen, da doch selbst der Raum, darin sie angeschaut werden, nichts als eine Vorstellung ist, deren Gegenbild in derselben Qualität außer der Seele gar nicht angetroffen werden kann. Nun ist die Frage nicht mehr: von der Gemeinschaft der Seele mit anderen bekannten und fremdartigen Substanzen außer uns, sondern bloß von der Verknüpfung der Vorstellungen des inneren Sinnes mit den Modifikationen unserer äußeren Sinnlichkeit, und wie diese unter einander nach beständigem Gesetzen verknüpft sein mögen, so daß sie in einer Erfahrung zusammenhängen.

So lange wir unsere und äußere Erscheinungen, als bloße Vorstellungen in der Erfahrung, mit einander zusammen hal.

1 Akad.-Aug.: «beruhen».
1 Akad.-Aug.: «vorstellen, sie sieht».
and strange in the association\(^1\) of the two kinds of senses. But as soon as we hypostatise outer appearances and come to regard them not as representations but as things existing by themselves outside us, with the same quality as that with which they exist in us, and as bringing to bear on our thinking subject the activities which they exhibit as appearances in relation to each other, then the efficient causes outside us assume a character which is irreconcilable with their effects in us. For the cause relates only to outer sense, the effect to inner sense—senses which, although combined in one subject, are extremely unlike each other. In outer sense we find no other outer effects save changes of place, and no forces except mere tendencies which issue in spatial relations as their effects. Within us, on the other hand, the effects are thoughts, among which is not to be found any relation of place, motion, shape, or other spatial determination, and we altogether lose the thread of the causes in the effects to which they are supposed to have given rise in inner sense. We ought, however, to bear in mind that bodies are not objects in themselves which are present to us, but a mere appearance of what we know not what unknown object; that motion is not the effect of this unknown cause, but only the appearance of its influence on our senses. Neither bodies nor motions are anything outside us; both alike are mere representations in us; and it is not, therefore, the motion of matter that produces representations in us; the motion itself is representation only, as also is the matter which makes itself known in this way. Thus in the end the whole difficulty which we have made for ourselves comes to this, how and why the representations of our sensibility are so interconnected that those which we entitle outer intuitions can be represented according to empirical laws as objects outside us—a question which is not in any way bound up with the supposed difficulty of explaining the origin of our representations from quite heterogeneous efficient causes outside us. That difficulty has arisen from our taking the appearances of an unknown cause as being the cause itself outside us, a view which can result in nothing but confusion. In the case of judgments in which a misapprehension has taken deep root through long custom, it is impossible at once to give to their correction that clarity

\(^1\) [Gemeinschaft.]
which can be achieved in other cases where no such inevitable illusion confuses the concept. Our freeing of reason from sophistical theories can hardly, therefore, at this stage have the clearness which is necessary for its complete success.

The following comments will, I think, be helpful as contributing towards this ultimate clarity.

All objections can be divided into dogmatic, critical, and sceptical. A dogmatic objection is directed against a proposition, a critical objection against the proof of a proposition. The former requires an insight into the nature of the object such that we can maintain the opposite of what the proposition has alleged in regard to this object. It is therefore itself dogmatic, claiming acquaintance with the constitution of the object fuller than that of the counter-assertion. A critical objection, since it leaves the validity or invalidity of the proposition unchallenged, and assails only the proof, does not presuppose fuller acquaintance with the object or oblige us to claim superior knowledge of its nature; it shows only that the assertion is unsupported, not that it is wrong. A sceptical objection sets assertion and counter-assertion in mutual opposition to each other as having equal weight, treating each in turn as dogma and the other as the objection thereto. And the conflict, as the being thus seemingly dogmatic on both the opposing sides, is taken as showing that all judgment in regard to the object is completely null and void. Thus dogmatic and sceptical objections alike lay claim to such insight into their object as is required to assert or to deny something in regard to it. A critical objection, on the other hand, confines itself to pointing out that in the making of the assertion something has been presupposed that is void and merely fictitious; and it thus overthrows the theory by removing its alleged foundation without claiming to establish anything that bears directly upon the constitution of the object.

So long as we hold to the ordinary concepts of our reason with regard to the communion in which our thinking subject stands with the things outside us, we are dogmatic, looking upon them as real objects existing independently of us, in accordance with a certain transcendental dualism which does not assign these outer appearances to the subject as representations, but sets them, just as they are given us in
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derjenigen Faßlichkeit zu bringen, welche in anderen Fällen gefördert werden kann, wo keine dergleichen unvermeidliche Illusion den Begriff verwirrt. Daher wird diese unsere Befreiung der Vernunft von sophistischen Theorien schwerlich schon die Deutlichkeit haben, die ihr zur völligen Befriedigung nötig ist.

Ich glaube diese auf folgende Weise befördern zu können.

Alle Einwürfe können in dogmatische, kritische und skeptische eingeteilt werden. Der dogmatische Einwurf ist, der wider einen Satz, der kritische, der wider dem Beweis eines Satzes gerichtet ist. Der erstere bedarf einer Einicht in die Beschaffenheit der Natur des Gegenstandes, um das Gegen teil von demjenigen behaupten zu können, was der Satz von diesem Gegenstande vorgibt, er ist daher selbst dogmatisch und gibt vor, die Beschaffenheit, von der die Rede ist, besser zu kennen, als der Gegenent. Der kritische Einwurf, weil er den Satz in seinem Worte oder Umworte unangetastet läßt, und nur dem Beweis ansicht, bedarf gar nicht, den Gegenstand besser zu kennen, oder sich einer bessern Kenntnis desselben anzu maßen; er zeigt nur, daß die Behauptung grundlos, nicht, daß sie unwirklich sei. Der skeptische stellt Satz und Gegensatz wechselseitig gegen einander, als Einwürfe von gleicher Erheblichkeit, einen jeden derselben wechselseitweise als Dogma und den andern als dessen Einwurf, ist also auf zwei entgegengesetzten Seiten dem Scheine nach dogmatisch, um alles Urteil über den Gegenstand gänzlich zu vernichten. Der dogmatische also so wohi, als skeptische Einwurf, müssten beide so viel Einstich ihres Gegenstandes vorgeben, als nötig ist, etwas von ihm bejahend oder verneinend zu behaupten. Der kritische ist allein von der Art, daß, indem er bloß zeigt, man nehme zum Behuf seiner Behauptung etwas an, was nichtig und bloß eingebildet ist, die Theorie stürtzt, dadurch, daß sie ihr die angemachte Grundlage entzieht, ohne sonst etwas über die Beschaffenheit des Gegenstandes auszumachen zu wollen.

Nun sind wir nach den gemeinen Begriffen unserer Vernunft in Ansehung der Gemeinschaft, darin unser denkendes Subjekt mit den Dingen außer uns steht, dogmatisch und sehen dieses als wahrhaft unabhängig von uns bestehende Gegenstände an,
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sensible intuition, as objects outside us, completely separating them from the thinking subject. This subjection is the basis of all theories in regard to the communion between soul and body. The objective reality thus assigned to appearances is never brought into question. On the contrary, it is taken for granted; the theorising is merely as to the mode in which it has to be explained and understood. There are three usual systems devised on these lines, and they are indeed the only possible systems: that of physical influence, that of predetermined harmony, and that of supernatural intervention.

The two last methods of explaining the communion between the soul and matter are based on objections to the first view, which is that of common sense. It is argued, namely, that what appears as matter cannot by its immediate influence be the cause of representations, these being effects which are quite different in kind from matter. Now those who take this line cannot attach to what they understand by 'object of outer senses' the concept of a matter which is nothing but appearance, and so itself a mere representation produced by some sort of outer objects. For in that case they would be saying that the representations of outer objects (appearances) cannot be outer causes of the representations in our mind; and this would be a quite meaningless objection, since no one could dream of holding that what he has once come to recognise as mere representation, is an outer cause. On our principles they can establish their theory only by showing that that is the true (transcendental) object of our outer senses cannot be the cause of those representations (appearances) which we comprehend under the title 'matter'. No one, however, can have the right to claim that he knows anything in regard to the transcendental cause of our representations of the outer senses; and their assertion is therefore entirely groundless. If, on the other hand, those who profess to improve upon the doctrine of physical influence keep to the ordinary outlook of transcendental dualism, and suppose matter, as such, to be a thing-in-itself (not the mere appearance of an unknown thing), they will direct their objection to showing that such an outer object, which in itself exhibits no causality save that of movements, can never be the efficient cause of representations, but that a

was als Objekte versetzt und sie von dem denkenden Subjekte gänzlich abtrennt. Diese Subrektion ist nun die Grundlage aller Theorien über die Gemeinschaft zwischen Seele und Körper, und es wird niemals gefragt: ob denn diese objektive Realität der Erscheinungen so ganz richtig sei, sondern die ist als zugestanden vorausgesetzt und nur über die Art vernünftig, wie sie erklärt und begriffen werden müsse. Die gewöhnliche drei hierüber erdachte und wirklich einzig mögliche Systeme sind die des physischen Einflusses, der vorher bestimmten Harmonie und der übernatürlichen Assistens.

Die zwei letztliche Erklärungsarten der Gemeinschaft der Seele mit der Materie sind auf Einwürfe gegen die erstere, welche die Vorstellung des gemeinen Vorstandes ist, gegründet, daß nämlich dasjenige, was als Materie erscheint, durch seinen unmittelbaren Einfluß nicht die Ursache von Vorstellungen, als einer ganz heterogenen Art von Wirkungen, sein könne. Sie können aber alsdenn mit dem, was sie unter dem Gegenstand äußerer Sinne verstehen, nicht den Begriff einer Materie verbinden, welche nichts als Erscheinung, mithin schon an sich selbst bloße Vorstellung, die durch irgend welche äußere Gegenstände gewirkt worden, denn sonst würden sie sagen: daß die Vorstellungen äußerer Gegenstände (die Erscheinungen) nicht äußere Ursachen der Vorstellungen in unserem Gemüse sein können, welches ein ganz sinnlicher Einwurf sein würde, weil es niemanden einzählen wird, das, was er einmal als bloße Vorstellung anerkannt hat, vor eine äußere Ursache zu halten. Sie müssen also auch nach unseren Grundsätzen ihre Theorie darauf richten: daß dasjenige, was der wahre (transzendental) Gegenstand unserer äußeren Sinne ist, nicht die Ursache desjenigen Vorstellungen (Erscheinungen) sein könne, die wir unter dem Namen Materie verstehen. Da nun niemand mit Grunde vorgeben kann, etwas von der transzendentalen Ursache unserer Vorstellungen äußerer Sinne zu kennen, so ist ihre Behauptung ganz grundlos. Wollten aber die vermeinte Verbesserer der Lehre vom physischen Einfluß, nach der gemeinen Vorstellungsart eines transzendentalen Dualismus, die Materie, als solche, vor ein Ding an sich selbst (und nicht als bloße Erscheinung eines unbekannten Dinges) ansehen und ihren Einwurf dahin richten, so zeigen: daß ein solcher äußerer Gegenstand, welcher keine andere Kausalität als die der Bewegungen an sich zeigt, immerhin die wirkende Ursache von Vorstel-
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third entity must intervene to establish, if not reciprocal interaction, at least correspondence and harmony between the two. But in arguing in this way, they begin their refutation by admitting into their dualism the πρὸς τοὺς ψεύδεας of a doctrine of physical influence, and consequently their objection is not so much a disproof of natural influence as of their own dualistic presupposition. For the difficulties in regard to the connection of our thinking nature with matter have their origin, one and all, in the illicitly assumed dualistic view, that matter as such is not appearance, that is, a mere representation of the mind to which an unknown object corresponds, but is the object in itself as it exists outside us independently of all sensibility.

As against the commonly accepted doctrine of physical influence, an objection of the dogmatic type is not, therefore, practicable. For if the opponent of the doctrine accepts the view that matter and its motion are mere appearances and so themselves mere representations, his difficulty is then simply this, that it is impossible that the unknown object of our sensibility should be the cause of the representations in us. He cannot, however, have the least justification for any such contention, since no one is in a position to decide what an unknown object may or may not be able to do. And this transcendental idealism, as we have just proved, he cannot but concede. His only way of escape would be frankly to hypostatize representations, and to set them outside himself as real things.

The doctrine of physical influence, in its ordinary form, is, however, subject to a well-founded critical objection. The alleged communion between two kinds of substances, the thinking and the extended, rests on a crude dualism, and treats the extended substances, which are really nothing but mere representations of the thinking subject, as existing by themselves. This mistaken interpretation of physical influence can thus be effectively disposed of: we have shown that the proof of it is void and illicit.

The much-discussed question of the communion between the thinking and the extended, if we leave aside all that is merely fictitious, comes then simply to this: how in a thinking subject outer intuition, namely, that of space, with its filling-in of shape and motion, is possible. And this is a question which no man can possibly answer. This gap in our knowledge

lungen sein könne, sondern daß sich ein drittes Wesen deshalb ins Mittel schlagen müsse, um, wo sich Wechselwirkung, doch wenigstens Korrespondenz und Harmonie zwischen beiden zu stiften: so würden sie ihre Widerlegung davon anfangen, das πρὸς τοὺς ψεύδεας des physischen Einflusses in ihrem Dualismus anzunehmen, und also durch ihren Einwurf nicht sowohl den natürlichen Einfluß, sondern ihre eigene dualistische Vorwürfe wederlegen. Denn alle Schwierigkeiten, welche die Verbindung der denkenden Natur mit der Materie treffen, entspringen ohne Ausnahme lediglich aus jener erschichtet dualistischen Vorstellung: daß Materie, als solche, nicht Erscheinung, d. i. bloße Vorstellung des Gemüts, die ein unbekannter Gegenstand entspricht, sondern der Gegenstand an sich selbst sei, so wie er außer uns und unabhängig von aller Sinnlichkeit existiert.

Es kann also wider den gemein angenommenen physischen Einfluß kein dogmatischer Einwurf gemacht werden. Denn nimmt der Gegner an: daß Materie und ihre Bewegung bloße Erscheinungen und also selbst nur Vorstellungen seien, so kann er nur darin die Schwierigkeit setzen: daß der unbekannte Gegenstand unserer Sinnlichkeit nicht die Ursache der Vorstellungen in uns sein könne, welches aber vorzugehen ihm nicht das mindeste berechtigt, weil niemand von einem unbekannten Gegenstande auszumachen kann, was er tun oder nicht tun könne. Er muß aber, nach unseren obigen Beweisen, diesen transzendenten Idealismus notwendig einräumen, wofern er nicht offenbar Vorstellungen hypostasieret und sie, als wahre Dinge, außer sich versetzen will.

Gleichwohl kann wider die gemeine Lehrmeinung des physischen Einflusses ein gegründeter kritischer Einwurf gemacht werden. Eine solche vorgegebene Gemeinschaft zwischen zwei Arten von Substanzen, der denkenden und der ausgedehnten, legt einen groben Dualismus zum Grunde und macht die letztere, die doch nichts als bloße Vorstellungen des denkenden Subjekts sind, zu Dingen, die vor sich bestehen. Also kann der meßverstandene physische Einfluß dadurch völlig vereitelt werden, daß man den Beweisgrund desselben als nichtig und erschlichen aufdeckt.

can never be filled; all that can be done is to indicate it through the ascription of outer appearances to that transcendental object which is the cause of this species of representations, but of which we can have no knowledge whatsoever and of which we shall never acquire any concept. In all problems which may arise in the field of experience we treat these appearances as objects in themselves, without troubling ourselves about the primary ground of their possibility (as appearances). But to advance beyond these limits the concept of a transcendental object would be indispensably required.

The settlement of all disputes or objections which concern the state of the thinking nature prior to this communion (prior to life), or after the cessation of such communion (in death), rests upon these considerations regarding the communion between thinking beings and extended beings. The opinion that the thinking subject has been capable of thought prior to any communion with bodies would now appear as an assertion that, prior to the beginning of the species of sensibility in virtue of which something appears to us in space, those transcendental objects, which in our present state appear as bodies, could have been intuited in an entirely different manner. The opinion that the soul after the cessation of all communion with the corporeal world could still continue to think, would be formulated as the view that, if that species of sensibility, in virtue of which transcendental objects, at present quite unknown to us, appear as a material world, should cease, all intuition of the transcendental objects would not for that reason be removed, and it would still be quite possible that those same unknown objects should continue to be known by the thinking subject, though no longer, indeed, in the quality of bodies.

Now on speculative principles no one can give the least ground for any such assertion. Even the possibility of what is asserted cannot be established; it can only be assumed. But it is equally impossible for anyone to bring any valid dogmatic objection against it. For whoever he may be, he knows just as little as I or anybody else of the absolute inner cause of outer corporeal appearances. Since he cannot, therefore, offer any justification for claiming to know on what the outer appearances in our present state (that of life) really rest, neither can he know that the condition of all outer intui-
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or auch das denkende Subjekt selbst, nach demselben (im Tode) aufhören werde.

So ist denn also aller Streit über die Natur unseres denkenden Wesens und der Verknüpfung desselben mit der Körperwelt lediglich eine Folge davon, daß man in Anschauung dessen, womit man nichts weiß, die Lücke durch Paralogismen der Vernunft ausfüllt, da man seine Gedanken zu Sachen macht und sie hypostasieren, woraus eingebildete Wissenschaft, sowohl in Anschauung dessen, der bejahend, als dessen, der verneinend behauptet, entspringt, indem ein jeder entweder von Gegenständen etwas zu wissen vermeint, davon kein Mensch einigen Begriff hat, oder seine eigene Vorstellungen zu Gegenständen macht, und sich so in einem ewigen Zirkel von Zweideutigkeiten und Widersprüchen herum dreht. Nichts, als die Nüchternheit einer strengen, aber gerechten Kritik, kann von diesem dogmatischen Blendsenke, der so viele durch eingebildete Glückseligkeit, unter Theorien und Systemen, hinkält, befremden, und alle unsere spekulativen Ansprüche bloß auf das Feld möglicher Erfahrung einschränken, nicht etwa durch schalen Spott über solche belanglosen Versuche, oder vonmum Seufer über die Schranken unserer Vernunft, sondern vermitteln einer nach sicheren Grundstücken vollzogenen Grenzbewegung derselben, welche ihr nulliterium mit größterst Zuverlässigkeit um die herkußische Säulen heftet, die die Natur selbst aufgestellt hat, um die Fahrt unserer Vernunft nur so weit, als die stetig fortlaufenden Küsten der Erfahrung reichen, fortsatzetzen, die wir nicht verlassen können, ohne uns auf einen uferlosen Ozean zu wagen, der uns, unter immer träglicher Aussichten, am Ende nützt, alle beschwerliche und langwierige Bemühung, als hoffnungslos aufzugeben.


Man kann allen Schein darin setzen: daß die subjektive Bedingung des Denkens vor die Erkenntnis des Objekts gehalten wird. Ferner haben wir in der Einleitung in die tran-
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shown that pure reason concerns itself solely with the totality of the synthesis of the conditions, for a given conditioned. Now since the dialectical illusion of pure reason cannot be an empirical illusion, such as occurs in certain specific instances of empirical knowledge, it will relate to what is universal in the conditions of thinking, and there will therefore be only three cases of the dialectical employment of pure reason.
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1. The synthesis of the conditions of a thought in general.
2. The synthesis of the conditions of empirical thinking.
3. The synthesis of the conditions of pure thinking.

In all these three cases pure reason occupies itself only with the absolute totality of this synthesis, that is, with that condition which is itself unconditioned. On this division is founded the threefold transcendental illusion which gives occasion for the three main sections of the Dialectic, and for the three pretended sciences of pure reason—transcendental psychology, cosmology, and theology. Here we are concerned only with the first.

Since, in thinking in general, we abstract from all relation of the thought to any object (whether of the senses or of the pure understanding), the synthesis of the conditions of a thought in general (No. 1) is not objective at all, but merely a synthesis of the thought with the subject, which is mistaken for a synthetic representation of an object.

It follows from this that the dialectical inference to the condition of all thought in general, which is itself unconditioned, does not commit a material error (for it abstracts from all content or objects), but is defective in form alone, and must therefore be called a paralogism.

Further, since the one condition which accompanies all thought is the 'I' in the universal proposition 'I think', reason has to deal with this condition in so far as it is itself unconditioned. It is only the formal condition, namely, the logical unity of every thought, in which I abstract from all objects; but nevertheless it is represented as an object which I think, namely, I myself and its unconditioned unity.

If anyone propounds to me the question, 'What is the con-
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s zendentale Dialek tik gesehen: daß reines Vernunft sich lediglich mit der Totalität der Synthesis der Bedingungen, an einem gegebenen Bedingten, beschäftige. Da nun der dialektische Schein der reinen Vernunft kein empirischer Schein sein kann, der sich beim bestimmten empirischen Erkenntnisse vorfindet: so wird er das Allgemeine der Bedingungen des Denkens betreffen, und es wird nur die Fälle des dialektischen Gebrauchs der reinen Vernunft geben.

1. Die Synthesis der Bedingungen eines Gedankens überhaupt.
2. Die Synthesis der Bedingungen des empirischen Denkens.
3. Die Synthesis der Bedingungen des reinen Denkens.

In allen diesen Fällen beschäftigt sich die reinen Vernunft bloß mit der absoluten Totalität dieser Synthesis, d. i. mit derjenigen Bedingung, die selbst unbedingt ist. Auf diese Einteilung gründet sich auch der drei-fache transcendental Schein, der zu drei Abschnitten der Dialektik Anlaß gibt, und zu den soviel scheinen Wissenschaften aus der reinen Vernunft, der transcendentalen Psychologie, Kosmologie, und Theologie, die Idee an die Hand gibt. Wir haben sie hier nur mit der ersteren zu tun.

Weil wir beim Denken überhaupt von aller Bestimmung des Gedankens auf jegliches Objekt (es sei der Sinne oder des reinen Verständes) abstrahieren: so ist die Synthesis der Bedingungen eines Gedankens überhaupt (No. 1) gar nicht objektiv, sondern bloß eine Synthesis des Gedankens mit dem Subjekt, die aber fälschlich vor eine synthetische Vorstellung eines Objekts gehalten wird.

Es folgt aber auch hieraus: daß der dialektische Schluß auf die Bedingung eines Denkens überhaupt, die selbst unbedingt ist, nicht einen Fehler im Inhalte begehe (denn er abstrahiert von altem Inhalte oder Objekte), sondern, daß er allein in der Form fehlt, und Paralogismus genannt werden müsse.


Wenn mir jemand überhaupt die Frage aufwürfe: von wel-
stitution of a thing which thinks?, I have no a priori knowledge wherewith to reply. For the answer has to be synthetic—an analytic answer will perhaps explain what is meant by thought, but beyond this cannot yield any knowledge of that upon which this thought depends for its possibility. For a synthetic solution, however, intuition is always required; and owing to the highly general character of the problem, intuition has been left entirely out of account. Similarly no one can answer in all its generality the question, 'What must a thing be, to be movable?' For the question contains no trace of the answer, viz. impenetrable extension (matter). But although I have no general answer to the former question, it still seems as if I could reply in the special case of the proposition which expresses self-consciousness—'I think'. For this 'I' is the primary subject, that is, substance; it is simple, etc. But these would then have to be propositions derived from experience, and in the absence of a universal rule which expresses the conditions of the possibility of thought in general and a priori, they could not contain any such non-empirical predicates. Suspicion is thus thrown on the view, which at first seemed to me so plausible, that we can form judgments about the nature of a thinking being, and can do so from concepts alone. But the error in this way of thinking has not yet been detected.

Further investigation into the origin of the attributes which I ascribe to myself as a thinking being in general can, however, show in what the error consists. These attributes are nothing but pure categories, by which I do not think a determinate object but only the unity of the representations—in order to determine an object for them. In the absence of an underlying intuition the category cannot by itself yield a concept of an object; for by intuition alone is the object given, which thereupon is thought in accordance with the category. If I am to declare a thing to be a substance in the [field of] appearance, predicates of its intuition must first be given me, and I must be able to distinguish in these the permanent from the transitory and the substratum (the thing itself) from what is merely inherent in it. If I call a thing in the [field of] appearance simple, I mean by this that the intuition of it, although a part of the appearance, is not

\[1\] [Beschaffenheit.]

\[8\] [Reading, with Wille, könnten for könne.]
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itself capable of being divided into parts, etc. But if I know something as simple in concept only and not in the [field of] appearance, I have really no knowledge whatsoever of the object, but only of the concept which I make for myself of a something in general that does not allow of being intuited. I say that I think something as completely simple, only because I have really nothing more to say of it than merely that it is something.

Now the bare apperception, 'I', is in concept substance, in concept simple, etc.; and in this sense all those psychological doctrines are unquestionably true. Yet this does not give us that knowledge of the soul for which we are seeking. For since none of these predicates are valid of intuition, they cannot have any consequences which are applicable to objects of experience, and are therefore entirely void. The concept of substance does not teach me that the soul endures by itself, nor that it is a part of outer intuitions which cannot itself be divided into parts, and cannot therefore arise or perish by any natural alterations. These are properties which would make the soul known to me in the context of experience and might reveal something concerning its origin and future state. But if I say, in terms of the mere category, 'The soul is a simple substance', it is obvious that since the bare concept of substance (supplied by the understanding) contains nothing beyond the requirement that a thing be represented as being subject in itself, and not in turn predicate of anything else, nothing follows from this as regards the permanence of the 'I', and the attribute 'simple' certainly does not aid in adding this permanence. Thus, from this source, we learn nothing whatsoever as to what may happen to the soul in the changes of the natural world. If we could be assured that the soul is a simple part of matter, we could use this knowledge, with the further assistance of what experience teaches in this regard, to deduce the permanence, and, as involved in its simple nature, the indestructibility of the soul. But of all this, the concept of the 'I', in the psychological principle 'I think', tells us nothing.

That the being which thinks in us is under the impression that it knows itself through pure categories, and precisely

[Reading, with Rosenkranz, *die bloße* for *bloße.*]
through those categories which in each type of category express absolute unity, is due to the following reason. Apperception is itself the ground of the possibility of the categories, which on their part represent nothing but the synthesis of the manifold of intuition, in so far as the manifold has unity in apperception. Self-consciousness in general is therefore the representation of that which is the condition of all unity, and itself is unconditioned. We can thus say of the thinking 'I' (the soul) which regards itself as substance, as simple, as numerically identical at all times, and as the correlate of all existence, from which all other existence must be inferred, that it does not know itself through the categories, but knows the categories, and through them all objects, in the absolute unity of apperception, and so through itself. Now it is, indeed, very evident that I cannot know as an object that which I must presuppose in order to know any object, and that the determining self (the thought) is distinguished from the self that is to be determined (the thinking subject) in the same way as knowledge is distinguished from its object. Nevertheless there is nothing more natural and more misleading than the illusion which leads us to regard the unity in the synthesis of thoughts as a perceived unity in the subject of these thoughts. We might call it the subjection of the hypostatised consciousness (apperceptionis substantialis).

If we desire to give a logical title to the paralogism contained in the dialectical syllogisms of the rational doctrine of the soul, then in view of the fact that their premises are correct, we may call it a sophisma figurae dictiounis. Whereas the major premises, in dealing with the condition, makes a merely transcendental use of the category, the minor premise and the conclusion, in dealing with the soul which has been subsumed under this condition, use the same category empirically. Thus, for instance, in the paralogism of substantiality, the concept of substance is a pure intellectual concept, which in the absence of the conditions of sensible intuition admits only of transcendental use, that is, admits of no use whatsoever. But in the minor premise the very same concept is applied to the object.

1. [ unten jeder T itel desselben.]  
2. [Reading, with Hartenstein, apperceptionis for apperceptionis.]  
3. [i.e. of ambiguous middle.]  
4. [Reading, with Adickes, Substancialitas for Simplicitalis.]

---
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...dem Titelderselben ausdrücken, sich selbst zu erkennen vermeine, rührt daher. Die Apperception ist selbst der Grund der Möglichkeit der Kategorien, welche ihrer Sei, nicht anders vorstellen, als die Synthesis des Männigfaltigen der Anschauung, so fern dasselbe in der Apperception Einheit hat. Daher ist das Selbstbewußtsein überhaupt die Vorstellung dessen, was die Bedingung aller Einheit, und doch selbst unbedingt ist. Man kann daher von dem denkenden Ich (Seelge), das sich als Substanz, ein Fach, numerisch identisch in aller Zeit, und das Correlatum alles Daseins, aus welchem alles andere Dasein geschlossen werden muß, sagen: daß es nicht sowohl sich selbst durch die Kategorien, sondern die Kategorien, und durch die 4 alle Gegenstände, in der absoluten Einheit der Apperception, mithin durch sich selbst erkennt. Nun ist zwar sehr einleuchtend: daß ich dasjenige, was ich voraussetze muß, um überhaupt ein Objekt zu erkennen, nicht selbst als Objekt erkennen könne, und daß das bestimmende Selbst (das Denken) von dem bestimmenden Selbst (dem denkenden Subjekt) wie Erkenntnis des Gegenstande unterschieden sei. Gleichwohl ist nichts natürlicher und verführerischer, als der Schein, die Einheit in der Synthesis der Gedanken vor eine wahrgenommene Einheit im Subjekte dieser Gedanken zu halten. Man könnte ihn die Subreption des hypostasierten Bewußtseins (apperceptionis substantialis) nennen.

Wenn man den Paralogism in den dialektischen Vernunftschlüssen der rationalen Seelenlehre, so fern sie gleichwohl richtige Prämisse haben, logisch betiteln will: so kann er vor ein sophisma figurae dictionis gelten, in welchem der Obersatz von der Kategorie, in Ansehung ihrer Bedingung, einen bloß transzendentalen Gebrauch, der Untersatz aber und der Schlußsatz in Ansehung der Seele, die unter diese Bedingung subsumiert worden, von eben der Kategorie einen empirischen Gebrauch macht. So ist s. B. der Begriff des Substantias in dem Paralogismus der Simplitatem ein reiner intellektueller Begriff, der ohne Bedingungen der sinnlichen Anschauung bloß von transzendentalen, d. i. von gar keinem Gebrauch ist. Im Untersatz aber ist eben derselben Begriff auf den Gegenstand aller inneren
of all inner experience without our having first ascertained and established the condition of such employment in concreto, namely, the permanence of this object. We are thus making an empirical, but in this case inadmissible, employment of the category.  

Finally, in order to show the systematic interconnection of all these dialectical assertions of a pseudo-rational doctrine of the soul in an order determined by pure reason, and so to show that we have them in their completeness, we may note that apperception has been carried through all the classes of the categories but only in reference to those concepts of understanding which in each class form the basis of the unity of the others in a possible perception, namely, subsistence, reality, unity (not plurality), and existence. Reason here represents all of these as conditions, which are themselves unconditioned, of the possibility of a thinking being. Thus the soul knows in itself—
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1. the unconditioned unity of relation, i.e. that it itself is not inherent [in something else] but self-subsistent.

2. the unconditioned unity of quality, that is, that it is not a real whole but simple.*

3. the unconditioned unity in the plurality in time, i.e. that it is not numerically different at different times but one and the very same subject.

4. the unconditioned unity of existence in space, i.e. that it is not the consciousness of many things outside it, but the consciousness of the existence of itself only, and of other subjects merely as its representations.
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Reason is the faculty of principles. The assertions of pure psychology do not contain empirical predicates of the soul but those predicates, if there be any such, which are meant to determine the object in itself independently of experience, and so by mere reason. They ought, therefore, to be founded on principles and universal concepts bearing on the nature of reality I am not yet in a position to explain. This will be shown in the next chapter on the occasion of this same concept being put by reason to yet another use.

* How the simple here again corresponds to the category of reality I am not yet in a position to explain. This will be shown in the next chapter on the occasion of this same concept being put by reason to yet another use.

[For a more consistent account of the nature of paralogism cf. B 410-411.]
thinking beings in general. But instead we find that the single
representation, 'I am', governs them all. This representation
just because it expresses the pure formula of all my experience
in general\(^1\) announces itself as a universal proposition valid
for all thinking beings; and since it is at the same time in all
respects unitary, it carries with it the illusion of an absolute
unity of the conditions of thought in general, and so extends
itself further than possible experience can reach.

\(^1\) \text{[unbestimmt]}
THE PARALOGISMS OF PURE REASON

[AS RESTATE IN SECOND EDITION]

Since the proposition 'I think' (taken problematically) contains the form of each and every judgment of understanding and accompanies all categories as their vehicle, it is evident that the inferences from it admit only of a transcendental employment of the understanding. And since this employment excludes any admixture of experience, we cannot, after what has been shown above, entertain any favourable anticipations in regard to its methods of procedure. We therefore propose to follow it, with a critical eye, through all the predicaments of pure psychology. But for the sake of brevity the examination had best proceed in an unbroken continuity.

The following general remark may, at the outset, aid us in our scrutiny of this kind of argument. I do not know an object merely in that I think, but only in so far as I determine a given intuition with respect to the unity of consciousness in which all thought consists. Consequently, I do not know myself through being conscious of myself as thinking, but only when I am conscious of the intuition of myself as determined with respect to the function of thought. Modi of self-consciousness in thought are not by themselves concepts of objects (categories), but are mere functions which do not give thought an object to be known, and accordingly do not give even myself as object. The object is not the consciousness of the determining self, but only that of the determinable self, that is, of my inner intuition (in so far as its manifold can be combined in accordance with the universal condition of the unity of apperception in thought).

| Da nun der Satz: Ich denke (problematisch genommen), die Form eines jeden Verstandesurteils überhaupt enthält, und alle Kategorien als ihr Vehikel begleitet: so ist klar, daß die Schlüsse aus demselben einen bloß transzendentalen Gebrauch des Verstandes enthalten können, welcher alle Beimischung der Erfahrung ausschlägt, und von dessen Fortgang wir, nach dem, was wir oben gezeigt haben, uns schon zum voraus keinen vorteilhaften Begriff machen können. Wir wollen ihn also durch alle Prädikate der reinen Seelenlehre mit einem kritischen Auge verfolgen, doch um der Kürze willen ihre Prüfung in einem ununterbrochenen Zusammenhange fortgehen lassen.


1 [What follows, up to p. 383, is Kant's restatement of the Paralogisms, in B.
2 [In sequence to p. 332, above.] 4 [Reading, with Grillo, der for die.] 638
A: m.; Akad. Ausg.: das.
(1) In all judgments I am the determining subject of that relation which constitutes the judgment. That the 'I,' the 'I' that thinks, can be regarded always as subject, and as something which does not belong to thought as a mere predicate, must be granted. It is an apodeictic and indeed identical proposition; but it does not mean that I, as object, am for myself a self-subsistent being or substance. The latter statement goes very far beyond the former, and demands for its proof data which are not to be met with in thought, and perhaps (in so far as I have regard to the thinking self merely as such) are more than I shall ever find in it.

(2) That the 'I' of apperception, and therefore the 'I' in every act of thought, is one, and cannot be resolved into a plurality of subjects, and consequently signifies a logically simple subject, is something already contained in the very concept of thought, and is therefore an analytic proposition. But this does not mean that the thinking 'I' is a simple substance. That proposition would be synthetic. The concept of substance always relates to intuitions which cannot in me be other than sensible, and which therefore lie entirely outside the field of the understanding and its thought. But it is of this thought that we are speaking when we say that the 'I' in thought is simple. It would, indeed, be surprising if what in other cases requires so much labour to determine—namely, what, of all that is presented in intuition, is substance, and further, whether this substance can be simple (e.g. in the parts of matter)—should be thus given me directly, as if by revelation, in the poorest of all representations.

(3) The proposition, that in all the manifold of which I am conscious I am identical with myself, is likewise implied in the concepts themselves, and is therefore an analytic proposition. But this identity of the subject, of which I can be conscious in all my representations, does not concern any intuition of the subject, whereby it is given as object, and cannot therefore signify the identity of the person, if by that is understood the consciousness of the identity of one's own substance, as a thinking being, in all change of its states. No mere analysis of the proposition 'I think' will suffice to prove such a proposi-

1 [ein Singular.]

2 [Reading, with Erdmann, meinen for seinen.]

1 Akad.-Ausz.: 'anhängend betrachtet.'
tion; for that we should require various synthetic judgments, based upon given intuition.

(4) That I distinguish my own existence as that of a thinking being, from other things outside me—among them my body—is likewise an analytic proposition; for other things are such as I think to be distinct from myself. But I do not thereby learn whether this consciousness of myself would be even possible apart from things outside me through which representations are given to me, and whether, therefore, I could exist merely as thinking being (i.e. without existing in human form).

The analysis, then, of the consciousness of myself in thought in general, yields nothing whatsoever towards the knowledge of myself as object. The logical exposition of thought in general has been mistaken for a metaphysical determination of the object.

Indeed, it would be a great stumbling-block, or rather would be the one unanswerable objection, to our whole critique, if there were a possibility of proving a priori that all thinking beings are in themselves simple substances, and that consequently (as follows from this same mode of proof) personality is inseparable from them, and that they are conscious of their existence as separate and distinct from all matter. For by such procedure we should have taken a step beyond the world of sense, and have entered into the field of noumena; and no one could then deny our right of advancing yet further in this domain, indeed of settling in it, and, should our star prove auspicious, of establishing claims to permanent possession. The proposition, 'Every thinking being is, as such, a simple substance', is a synthetic a priori proposition; it is synthetic in that it goes beyond the concept from which it starts, and adds to the thought in general [i.e. to the concept of a thinking being] the mode of [its] existence: it is a priori, in that it adds to the concept a predicate (that of simplicity) which cannot be given in any experience. It would then follow that a priori synthetic propositions are possible and admissible, not only, as we have asserted, in relation to objects of possible experience, and indeed as principles of the possibility of this experience, but that they are applicable to things in general and to things in themselves—a result that would make
an end of our whole critique, and would constrain us to acquiesce in the old-time procedure. Upon closer consideration we find, however, that there is no such serious danger.

The whole procedure of rational psychology is determined by a paralogism, which is exhibited in the following syllogism:

*That which cannot be thought otherwise than as subject does not exist otherwise than as subject, and is therefore substance.*

A thinking being, considered merely as such, cannot be thought otherwise than as subject.

Therefore it exists also only as subject, that is, as substance.

In the major premis we speak of a being that can be thought in general, in every relation, and therefore also as it may be given in intuition. But in the minor premis we speak of it only in so far as it regards itself, as subject, simply in relation to thought and the unity of consciousness, and not as likewise in relation to the intuition through which it is given as object to thought. Thus the conclusion is arrived at fallaciously, *per sophisma figurae dictionis.*

That we are entirely right in resolving this famous argument into a paralogism will be clearly seen, if we call to mind what has been said in the General Note to the Systematic Representation of the Principles and in the Section on Nomina. For it has there been proved that the concept of a thing

---

1 [Reading, with Vorländer, es for ist.]
which can exist by itself as subject and never as mere predicate, carries with it no objective reality; in other words, that we cannot know whether there is any object to which the concept is applicable—as to the possibility of such a mode of existence we have no means of deciding—and that the concept therefore yields no knowledge whatsoever. If by the term 'substance' be meant an object which can be given, and if it is to yield knowledge, it must be made to rest on a permanent intuition, as being that through which alone the object of our concept can be given, and as being, therefore, the indispensable condition of the objective reality of the concept. Now in inner intuition there is nothing permanent, for the 'I' is merely the consciousness of my thought. So long, therefore, as we do not go beyond mere thinking, we are without the necessary condition for applying the concept of substance, that is, of a self-subsistent subject, to the self as a thinking being. And with the objective reality of the concept of substance, the allied concept of simplicity likewise vanishes; it is transformed into a merely logical qualitative unity of self-consciousness in thought in general, which has to be present whether the subject be composite or not.

Refutation of Mendelssohn's Proof of the Permanence of the Soul

This acute philosopher soon noticed that the usual argument by which it is sought to prove that the soul—if it be admitted to be a simple being—cannot cease to be through dissolution, is insufficient for its purpose, that of proving the necessary continuance of the soul, since it may be supposed to pass out of existence through simply vanishing. In his Phaedo he endeavoured to prove that the soul cannot be subject to such a process of vanishing, which would be a true annihilation, by showing that a simple being cannot cease to exist. His argument is that since the soul cannot be diminished, and so gradually lose something of its existence, being by degrees changed into nothing (for since it has no parts, it has no multiplicity in itself), there would be

was für sich selbst als Subjekt, nicht aber als bloßes Prädikat existieren kann, noch gar keine objektive Realität bei sich jürire, d.i. daß man nicht wissen könne, ob ihm überall ein Gegenstand zukommen könne, indem man die Möglichkeit einer solchen Art zu existieren nicht einsieht, folglich daß es' schlechterdings keine Erkenntnis abgebe. Soll er also unter der Benennung einer Substanz ein Objekt, das gegeben werden kann, andeuten; soll er ein Erkenntnis werden: so muß eine beharrliche Anschauung, als die unentbehrliche Bedingung der objektiven Realität eines Begriffs, nämlich das, wodurch allein der Gegenstand gegeben wird, zum Grunde gelegt werden. Nun haben wir aber in der inneren Anschauung gar nichts Beharrliches, denn das Ich ist nur das Bewußtsein meines Denkens; also fehlt es uns auch, wenn wir bloß beim Denken stehen bleiben, an der notwendigen Bedingung, den Begriff der Substanz, d. i. eines für sich bestehenden Subjekts, auf sich selbst als denkend Wesen anzuwenden, und die damit verbundene Einfachkeit der Substanz fällt mit der objektiven Realität dieses Begriffs günstig weg, und wird in eine bloße logische qualitative Einheit des Selbstbewußtseins im Denken überhaupt, das Subjekt mag zusammengezogen sein oder nicht, verwandelt.

Widerlegung des Mendelssohnschen Beweises der Beharrlichkeit der Seele

Dieser scharfsinnige Philosoph merkte bald in dem gewöhnlichen Argumente, dadurch bewiesen werden soll, daß die Seele (wenn man einräumt, sie sei ein einfaches Wesen) nicht durch Zerteilung zu sein aufhören könne, einen Mangel der Zulänglichkeit zu der Absicht, ihr die notwendige Fortdauer zu sichern, indem man noch ein Aufhören ihres Daseins durch Verschwinden annehmen könnte. In seinem Phädon suchte er nun diese Vergänglichkeit, welche eine wahre Vernichtung sein würde, von ihr dadurch abzuhalten, daß er sich zu beweisen getraute, ein einfaches Wesen könne gar nicht aufhören zu sein, weil, da es gar nicht vermindert werden und also nach und nach etwas an seinem Dasein verlieren, und so allmählich in nichts verwandelt werden könne (indem es keine Teile, also auch keine Vielheit in sich habe), zwischen einem Augenblicke,
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no time between a moment in which it is and another in which it is not—which is impossible. He failed, however, to observe that even if we admit the simple nature of the soul, namely, that it contains no manifold of constituents external to one another, and therefore no extensive quantity, we yet cannot deny to it, any more than to any other existence, intensive quantity, that is, a degree of reality in respect of all its faculties, nay, in respect of all that constitutes its existence, and that this degree of reality may diminish through all the infinitely many smaller degrees. In this manner the supposed substance—the thing, the permanence of which has not yet been proved—may be changed into nothing, not indeed by dissolution, but by gradual loss (remissio) of its powers, and so, if I may be permitted the use of the term, by elanguescence. For consciousness itself has always a degree, which always allows of diminution,* and the same must also hold of the faculty of being conscious of the self, and likewise of all the other faculties. Thus the permanence of the soul, regarded merely as object of inner sense, remains undemonstrated, and indeed indemonstrable. Its permanence during life is, of course, evident per se, since the thinking being (as man) is itself likewise an object of the outer senses. But this is very far from satisfying the rational psychologist who undertakes to prove from mere concepts its absolute permanence beyond this life.†

* Clearness is not, as the logicians assert, the consciousness of a representation. A certain degree of consciousness, though it be insufficient for recollection, must be met with even in many obscure representations, since in the absence of all consciousness we should make no distinction between different combinations of obscure representations, which yet we are able to do in respect of the characters of many concepts, such as those of right or equity, or as when the musician in improvising strikes several keys at once. But a representation is clear, when the consciousness suffices for the consciousness of the distinction of this representation from others. If it suffices for distinguishing, but not for consciousness of the distinction, the representation must still be entitled obscure. There are therefore infinitely many degrees of consciousness, down to its complete vanishing.

† Some philosophers, in making out a case for a new possibility, consider that they have done enough if they can defy others to show

1 [für sich klar ist.]
If we take the above propositions in synthetic connection, as valid for all thinking beings, as indeed they must be taken in the system of rational psychology, and proceed from the category of relation, with the proposition, 'All thinking beings are, as such, substances', backwards through the series of the propositions, until the circle is completed, we

any contradiction in their assumptions. This is the procedure of all those who profess to comprehend the possibility of thought—of which they have an example only in the empirical intuitions of our human life—even after this life has ceased. But those who resort to such a method of argument can be quite nonplussed by the citation of other possibilities which are not a whit more adventurous. Such is the possibility of the division of a simple substance into several substances, and conversely the fusing together (coalition) of several into one simple substance. For although divisibility presupposes a composite, it does not necessarily require a composite of substances, but only of degrees (of the manifold powers) of one and the same substance. Now just as we can think all powers and faculties of the soul, even that of consciousness, as diminished by one half, but in such a way that the substance still remains, so also, without contradiction, we can represent this extinguished half as being preserved, not in the soul, but outside it; and we can likewise hold that since everything which is real in it, and which therefore has a degree—in other words, its entire existence, from which nothing is lacking—has been halved, another separate substance would then come into existence outside it. For the multiplicity which has been divided exists before, not indeed as a multiplicity of substances, but as a multiplicity of every reality proper to the substance, that is, of the quantum of existence in it; and the unity of substance was therefore only a mode of existence, which in virtue of this division has been transformed into a plurality of subsistence. Similarly, several simple substances might be fused into one, without anything being lost except only the plurality of subsistence, inasmuch as the one substance would contain the degree of reality of all the former substances together. We might perhaps also represent the simple substances which yield us the appearance [which we entitle] matter as producing—not indeed by a mechanical or chemical influence upon one another, but by an influence unknown to us, of which the former influence would be merely the appearance—the souls of children, that is, as producing them through such dynamical division of the parent souls, considered as intensive quantities, and those parent souls as making good their loss through coalition with new material of the same kind.

---

1 [Reading, with Mellin, ἄνωτερον]
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come at last to the existence of these thinking beings. Now in
this system of rational psychology these beings are taken not
only as being conscious of their existence independently of outer things, but as also being able in and by themselves, to
determine that existence in respect of the permanence which
is a necessary characteristic of substance. This rationalist sys-
tem is thus unavoidably committed to idealism, or at least to
problematic idealism. For if the existence of outer things is not
in any way required for determination of one's own existence in time, the assumption of their existence is a
quite gratuitous assumption, of which no proof can ever be
given.

If, on the other hand, we should proceed analytically,
starting from the proposition 'I think', as a proposition that
already in itself includes an existence as given, and therefore
modality, and analysing it in order to ascertain its content,
and so to discover whether and how this 'I' determines its
existence in space or time solely through that content; then
the propositions of the rational doctrine of the soul would not
begin with the concept of a thinking being in general, but with
a reality, and we should infer from the manner in which this
reality is thought, after everything empirical in it has been
removed, what it is that belongs to a thinking being in general.

This is shown in the following table:

I am far from allowing any servicesbleness or validity to such fancies;
and as the principles of our Analytic have sufficiently demonstrated,
no other than an empirical employment of the categories (including
that of substance) is possible. But if the rationalist is bold enough,
out of the mere faculty of thought, without any permanent intuition
whereby an object might be given, to construct a self-sustaining being,
and this merely on the ground that the unity of apperception in thought
does not allow of its being explained [as arising] out of the composite,
instead of admitting, as he ought to do, that he is unable to explain
the possibility of a thinking nature, why should not the materialist,
though he can as little appeal to experience in support of his [con-
jectured] possibilities, be justified in being equally daring, and in
using his principle to establish the opposite conclusion, while still
preserving the formal unity upon which his opponent has relied.

1 [Cf. above, p. 330. As there noted, Kant, in his private copy of the Critique,
has changed 'The soul is substance' to 'The soul exists as substance'.]
2 [bloss dadurch.]
3 [einer denkenden Natur.]
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durch, so stoßen wir zuletzt auf die Existenz derselben, deren
sie sich in diesem System, unabhängig von äußeren Dingen,
icht allein bewußt sind, sondern diese auch (in Ansehung
| der Beharrlichkeit, die notwendig zum Charakter der Subs-
tanz gehört) aus sich selbst bestimmen können. Hieraus folgt
aber, daß der Idealismus im oben derselben rationalistischen
System unvermeidlich sei, wenigstens der problematische, und,
wenigstens der problematische, und,

Befolgen wir dagegen das analytische Verfahren, da das
Ich denke, als ein Sitz, der schon ein Dasein in sich schließt,
as gegeben, mithin die Modalität, zum Grunde liegt, und zor-
gliedern ihn, um seinen Inhalt, ob und wie nämlich dieses Ich
im Raum oder der Zeit bloß dadurch sein Dasein bestimmt,
zu erkennen, so würden die Sätze der rationalen Seelenlehre
nicht vom Begriffe eines denkenden Wesens überhaupt, son-
dern von einer Wirklichkeit anfangen, und aus der Art, wie
| diese gedacht wird, nachdem alles, was dabei empirisch ist,
| abgesondert worden, das, was einem denkenden Wesen über-
| haupt zukommt, gefolgert werden, wie folgende Tafel zeigt.

Ich bin weit entfernt, dergleichen Hirngespinsten den-mindesten Wert
| oder Gültigkeit einzuräumen, auch haben die obigen Prinzipien der Analytik
| hinreichend eingeschrieben, von den Kategorien (als der der Substanz) keinen
| anderen als Erfahrungszwecke zu machen. Wenn aber der Rationalist
| aus dem bloßen Denkvermögen, ohne irgend eine beharrliche Anschau-
| ungsgrund, ein Gegenstand gegeben würde, ein für sich bestehendes Wesen
| zu machen kämen genug ist, bloß weil die Einheit der Apperception im Den-
| ken ihm keine Erklärung aus dem Zusammenhange geben, daß ist, er
| besser tun würde, zu gestehen, er wisse die Möglichkeit einer denkenden Na-
| tur nicht zu erkennen, worum soll der Materialist es, ob er gleich auch so
| wenig zum Beihilfe seiner Möglichkeit des Bewußtsein, noch nicht ein
| gleichmäßiger Unterschied, sich sein Grundsatz, mit Beimischung
| der formalen Einheit des ersten, zum entgegengesetzt Gebrauch zu
| bedienen?

1 Akad.-Ausz.: *die sie.
1. I think,

2. as subject,

3. as simple subject,

4. as identical subject
in every state of my thought.

In the second proposition it has not been determined whether I can exist and be thought as subject only, and not also as a predicate of another being, and accordingly the concept of a subject is here taken in a merely logical sense, and it remains undetermined whether or not we are to understand by it a substance. Similarly, the third proposition establishes nothing in regard to the constitution or subsistence of the subject; none the less in this proposition the absolute unity of apperception, the simple 'I' in the representation to which all combination or separation that constitutes thought relates, has its own importance. For apperception is something real, and its simplicity is already given in the mere fact of its possibility. Now in space there is nothing real which can be simple; points, which are the only simple things in space, are merely limits, not themselves anything that can as parts serve to constitute space. From this follows the impossibility of any explanation in materialist terms of the constitution of the self as a merely thinking subject. But since my existence is taken in the first proposition as given—for it does not say that every thinking being exists, which would be to assert its absolute necessity and therefore to say too much, but only, 'I exist thinking'—the proposition is empirical, and can determine my existence only in relation to my representations in time. But since for this purpose I again require something permanent, which, so far as I think myself, is in no way given to me in inner intuition, it is quite impossible, by means of this simple self-consciousness, to determine the manner in which I exist, whether it be as substance or as accident. Thus, if materialism is disqualified from explaining my existence, spiritualism is equally incapable of doing so; and the conclusion is that in no way whatsoever can we know anything of the constitution of the soul, so far as the possibility of its separate existence is concerned.

How, indeed, should it be possible, by means of the unity

VON DEN TRANZENDENTALEN IDEEN

1. Ich denke

2. als Subjekt

3. als einfaches Subjekt

4. als identisches Subjekt,
in jedem Zustande meines Denkens

Weil hier nun im zweiten Satze nicht bestimmt wird, ob ich nur als Subjekt und nicht auch als Prädikat eines andern existieren und gedacht werden könne, so ist der Begriff eines Subjekts hier bloß logisch genommen, und es bleibt unbestimmt, ob darunter Substans verstanden werden solle oder nicht. Allein in dem dritten Satze wird die absolute Einheit der Apperception, das Einfache Ich, in der Vorstellung, drauf sich alle Verbindung oder Trennung, welche das Denken ausmacht, bestieht, auch für sich wichtig, wenn ich gleich noch nichts über das Subjekts Beschaffenheit oder Substans ausgemacht habe. Die Apperception ist etwas Reales, und die Einfachheit derselben liegt schon in ihrer Möglichkeit. Nun ist im Raume nichts Reales was einfach wäre; denn Punkte (die das einzige Einfache im Raume ausmachen) sind bloß Grenzen, nicht selbst aber etwas, was den Raum als Teil auszumachen dient. Also folgt daraus die Unmöglichkeit einer Erklärung meiner, als bloß denkenden Subjekts, Beschaffenheit aus Gründen des Materialisms. Weil aber mein Dasein in dem ersten Satze als gegeben betrachtet wird, indem es nicht heißt, ein jedes denkendes Wesen existiert (welches zugleich absolute Notwendigkeit, und also zu viel, von ihnen sagen würde), sondern nur: ich existiere denkend: so ist er empirisch, und enthält die Bestimmbarkeit meines Daseins bloß in Ansehung meiner Vorstellungen in der Zeit. Da ich aber wiederum hiernach gewiss etwas Beherrschtes bedarf, dergleichen mir, so ferner mich denke, gar nicht in der inneren Anschauung gegeben ist: so ist die Art, wie ich existiere, ob als Substans oder als Akseidens, durch dieses einfache Selbstbewußtsein gar nicht zu bestimmen möglich. Also, wenn der Materialismus zur Erklärungsaufgabe meines Daseins untauglich ist, so ist der Spiritualismus zu derselben eben sowohl unszureichend, und die Schlußfolgerung ist, daß wir auf keine Art, welche es auch sei, von der Beschaffenheit unserer Seele, die die Möglichkeit ihrer abgesonderten Existenz überhaupt betrifft, irgend etwas erkennen können.

Und wie sollte es auch möglich sein, durch die Einheit des
of consciousness—which we only know because we cannot but make use of it, as indispensable for the possibility of experience—to pass out beyond experience (our existence in this life), and even to extend our knowledge to the nature of all thinking beings in general, through the empirical, but in respect of every sort of intuition the quite indeterminate proposition, 'I think'?

Rational psychology exists not as doctrine, furnishing an addition to our knowledge of the self, but only as discipline. It sets impassable limits to speculative reason in this field, and thus keeps us, on the one hand, from throwing ourselves into the arms of a soulless materialism, or, on the other hand, from losing ourselves in a spiritualism which must be quite unfounded so long as we remain in this present life. But though it furnishes no positive doctrine, it reminds us that we should regard this refusal of reason to give satisfying response to our inquisitive progings into what is beyond the limits of this present life as reason's hint to divert our self-knowledge from fruitless and extravagant speculation to fruitful practical employment. Though in such practical employment it is directed always to objects of experience only, it derives its principles from a higher source, and determines us to regulate our actions as if our destiny reached infinitely far beyond experience, and therefore far beyond this present life.

From all this it is evident that rational psychology owes its origin simply to misunderstanding. The unity of consciousness, which underlies the categories, is here mistaken for an intuition of the subject as object, and the category of substance is then applied to it. But this unity is only unity in thought, by which alone no object is given, and to which, therefore, the category of substance, which always presupposes a given intuition, cannot be applied. Consequently, this subject cannot be known. The subject of the categories cannot by thinking the categories acquire a concept of itself as an object of the categories. For in order to think them, its pure self-consciousness, which is what was to be explained, must itself be presupposed. Similarly, the subject, in which the representation of time has its original ground, cannot thereby determine its own existence in time. And if this latter is impossible, the former, as a determination of the self (as a
thinking being in general) by means of the categories, is equally so.*

Thus the expectation of obtaining knowledge which while extending beyond the limits of possible experience is likewise to further the highest interests of humanity, is found, so far as speculative philosophy professes to satisfy it, to be grounded in deception, and to destroy itself in the attempt at fulfilment. Yet the severity of our criticism has rendered reason a not unimportant service in proving the impossibility of dogmatically determining, in regard to an object of experience, anything that lies beyond the limits of experience. For in so doing it has secured reason against all possible assertions of the opposite. That cannot be achieved save in one or other

* The 'I think' is, as already stated, an empirical proposition, and contains within itself the proposition 'I exist'. But I cannot say 'Everything which thinks, exists'. For in that case the property of thought would render all beings which possess it necessary beings. My existence cannot, therefore, be regarded as an inference from the proposition 'I think', as Descartes sought to contend—for it would then have to be preceded by the major premis 'Everything which thinks, exists'—but is identical with it. The 'I think' expresses an indeterminate empirical intuition, i.e. perception (and thus shows that sensation, which as such belongs to sensibility, lies at the basis of this existential proposition). But the 'I think' precedes the experience which is required to determine the object of perception through the category in respect of time; and the existence here referred to is not a category. The category as such does not apply to an indeterminately given object but only to one of which we have a concept and about which we seek to know whether it does or does not exist outside the concept. An indeterminate perception here signifies only something real that is given, given indeed to thought in general, and so not as appearance, nor as thing in itself (noumenon), but as something which actually exists, and which in the proposition, 'I think', is denoted as such. For it must be observed, that when I have called the proposition, 'I think', an empirical proposition, I do not mean to say thereby, that the 'I' in this proposition is an empirical representation. On the contrary, it is purely intellectual, because belonging to thought in general. Without some empirical representation to supply the material for thought, the actus, 'I think', would not, indeed, take place; but the empirical is only the condition of the application, or of the employment, of the pure intellectual faculty.

1 [in der Tat.] 1 [besiehtet.]
of two ways. Either we have to prove our proposition apodictically; or, if we do not succeed in this, we have to seek out the sources of this inability, which, if they are traceable to the necessary limits of our reason, must constrain all opponents to submit to this same law of renunciation in respect of all claims to dogmatic assertion.

Yet nothing is thereby lost as regards the right, nay, the necessity, of postulating a future life in accordance with the principles of the practical employment of reason, which is closely bound up with its speculative employment. For the merely speculative proof has never been able to exercise any influence upon the common reason of men. It so stands upon the point of a hair, that even the schools preserve it from falling only so long as they keep it unceasingly spinning round like a top; even in their own eyes it yields no abiding foundation upon which anything could be built. The proofs which are serviceable for the world at large preserve their entire value undiminished, and indeed, upon the surrender of these dogmatic pretensions, gain in clearness and in natural force. For reason is then located in its own peculiar sphere, namely, the order of ends, which is also at the same time an order of nature; and since it is in itself not only a theoretical but also a practical faculty, and as such is not bound down to natural conditions, it is justified in extending the order of ends, and therewith our own existence, beyond the limits of experience and of life. If we judged according to analogy with the nature of living beings in this world, in dealing with which reason must necessarily accept the principle that no organ, no faculty, no impulse, indeed nothing whatsoever is either superfluous or disproportioned to its use, and that therefore nothing is purposeless, but everything exactly conformed to its destiny in life—if we judged by such an analogy we should have to regard man, who alone can contain in himself the final end of all this order, as the only creature that is excepted from it. Man’s natural endowments—not merely his talents and the impulses to enjoy them, but above all else the moral law within him—go so far beyond all the utility and advantage which he may derive from them in this present life, that he learns thereby to prize the mere consciousness of a righteous will as being, apart from all advantageous consequences, apart even from the

...
shadowy reward of posthumous fame, supreme over all other values; and so feels an inner call to fit himself, by his conduct in this world, and by the sacrifice of many of its advantages, for citizenship in a better world upon which he lays hold in idea. This powerful and incontrovertible proof is reinforced by our ever-increasing knowledge of purposiveness in all that we see around us, and by contemplation of the immensity of creation, and therefore also by the consciousness of a certain illimitableness in the possible extension of our knowledge, and of a striving commensurate therewith. All this still remains to us; but we must renounce the hope of comprehending, from the merely theoretical knowledge of ourselves, the necessary continuance of our existence.

CONCLUSION, IN REGARD TO THE SOLUTION OF THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PARALOGISM

The dialectical illusion in rational psychology arises from the confusion of an idea of reason—the idea of a pure intelligence—with the completely undetermined concept of a thinking being in general. I think myself on behalf of a possible experience, at the same time abstracting from all actual experience; and I conclude therefrom that I can be conscious of my existence even apart from experience and its empirical conditions. In so doing I am confusing the possible abstraction from my empirically determined existence with the supposed consciousness of a possible separate existence of my thinking self, and I thus come to believe that I have knowledge that what is substantial in me is the transcendental subject. But all that I really have in thought is simply the unity of consciousness, on which, as the mere form of knowledge, all determination is based.

The task of explaining the communion of the soul with the body does not properly belong to the psychology with which we are here dealing. For this psychology proposes to prove the personality of the soul even apart from this communion (that is, after death), and is therefore transcendental in the proper sense of that term. It does, indeed, occupy itself with an object of experience, but only in that aspect in which

\[\text{nur sofern.}\]
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ruhm, über alles hochschätzen lehrt, und sich innerlich dazu berufen fühlt, sich durch sein Verhalten in dieser Welt, mit Versicherung auf viele Vorteile, zum Bürger einer besseren, die er in der Idee hat, tauglich zu machen. Dieser mächtige, niemals zu widerlegende Beweisgrund, begleitet durch eine sich unaufhörlich vermehrende Erkenntnis der Zweckmäßigheit in allem, was wir vor uns sehen, und durch eine Aussicht auf die Unendlichkeit der Schöpfung, mithin auch durch das Bewußtsein einer gewissen Unbegrenztheit in der möglichen Erweiterung unserer Kenntnisse, samt einem dieser angemesse nen Triebe bleibt immer noch übrig, wenn wir es gleich aufgeben müssen, die notwendige Fortdauer unserer Existenz aus der bloß theoretischen Erkenntnis unserer selbst einzusehen.

BESCHLUSS DER AUFLÖSUNG DES PSYCHOLOGISCHEN PARALOGISMS


Die Aufgabe, die Gemeinschaft der Seele mit dem Körper zu erklären, gehört nicht eigentlich zu derjenigen Psychologie, worvon hier die Rede ist, weil sie die Persönlichkeit der Seele auch außer dieser Gemeinschaft (nach dem Tode) zu beweisen die Absicht hat, und also im eigentlichen Verstande transzendental ist, ob sie sich gleich mit einem Objekte der Erfahrung beschäftigt, aber nur so form es

\[\text{Akad.-Aug.: und er sich.}\]
it ceases to be an object of experience. Our teaching, on the other hand, does supply a sufficient answer to this question. The difficulty peculiar to the problem consists, as is generally recognized, in the assumed heterogeneity of the object of inner sense (the soul) and the objects of the outer senses, the formal condition of their intuition being, in the case of the former, time only, and in the case of the latter, also space. But if we consider that the two kinds of objects thus differ from each other, not inwardly but only in so far as one appears outwardly to the other, and that what, as thing in itself, underlies the appearance of matter, perhaps after all may not be so heterogeneous in character, this difficulty vanishes, the only question that remains being how in general a communion of substances is possible. This, however, is a question which lies outside the field of psychology, and which the reader, after what has been said in the Analytic regarding fundamental powers and faculties, will not hesitate to regard as likewise lying outside the field of all human knowledge.

GENERAL NOTE ON THE TRANSITION FROM RATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY TO COSMOLOGY

The proposition, 'I think' or 'I exist thinking', is an empirical proposition. Such a proposition, however, is conditioned by empirical intuition, and is therefore also conditioned by the object [that is, the self] which is thought [in its aspect] as appearance. It would consequently seem that on our theory the soul, even in thought, is completely transformed into appearance, and that in this way our consciousness itself, as being a mere illusion, must refer in fact to nothing.

Thought, taken by itself, is merely the logical function, and therefore the pure spontaneity of the combination of the manifold of a merely possible intuition, and does not exhibit the subject of consciousness as appearance; and this for the sufficient reason that thought takes no account whatsoever of the mode of intuition, whether it be sensible or intellectual. I thereby represent myself to myself neither as I am nor as I appear to myself. I think myself only as I do any object in general from whose mode of intuition I abstract. If I here re-

1 [Schein.]
present myself as subject of thoughts or as ground of thought, these modes of representation do not signify the categories of substance or of cause. For the categories are those functions of thought (of judgment) as already applied to our sensible intuition, such intuition being required if I seek to know myself. If, on the other hand, I would be conscious of myself simply as thinking, then since I am not considering how my own self 1 may be given in intuition, the self may be mere appearance to me, the 'I' that thinks, but is no mere appearance in so far as I think; in the consciousness of myself in my own thought I am the being itself, although nothing in myself is thereby given for thought.

The proposition, 'I think', in so far as it amounts to the assertion, 'I exist thinking', is no mere logical function, but determines the subject (which is then at the same time object) in respect of existence, and cannot take place without inner sense, the intuition of which presents the object not as thing in itself but merely as appearance. There is here, therefore, not simply spontaneity of thought, but also receptivity of intuition, that is, the thought of myself applied to the empirical intuition of myself. 2 Now it is to this intuition that the thinking self would have to look for the conditions of the employment of its logical functions as categories of substance, cause, etc., if it is not merely to distinguish itself as object in itself, through the 'I', but is also to determine the mode of its existence, that is, to know itself as noumenon. This, however, is impossible, since the inner empirical intuition is sensible and yields only data of appearance, which furnish nothing to the object of pure consciousness for the knowledge of its separate existence, but can serve only for the obtaining of experience.

Should it be granted that we may in due course discover, not in experience but in certain laws of the pure employment of reason—laws which are not merely logical rules, but which while holding a priori also concern our existence—ground for regarding ourselves as legislating completely a priori in regard to our own existence, and as determining this existence, there would thereby be revealed a spontaneity through which our reality would be determinable, independently of the conditions of empirical intuition. And we should also become

1 [mein eigenes Selbst.]
2 [abenddellben Subjekts.]
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aware that in the consciousness of our existence there is contained a something a priori, which can serve to determine our existence—the complete determination of which is possible only in sensible terms—as being related, in respect of a certain inner faculty, to a non-sensible intelligible world.

But this would not be of the least service in furthering the attempts of rational psychology. In this marvellous faculty, which the consciousness of the moral law first reveals to me, I should indeed have, for the determination of my existence, a principle which is purely intellectual. But through what predicates would that determination have to be made? They could be no other than those which must be given to me in sensible intuition; and thus I should find myself, as regards rational psychology, in precisely the same position as before, namely, still in need of sensible intuitions to confer meaning on my concepts of understanding (substance, cause, etc.), through which alone I can have knowledge of myself; and these intuitions can never aid me in advancing beyond the field of experience. Nevertheless, in respect of the practical employment, which is always directed to objects of experience, I should be justified in applying these concepts, in conformity with their analogical meaning when employed theoretically, to freedom and the subject that is possessed of freedom. In so doing, however, I should understand by these concepts the merely logical functions of subject and predicate, of ground and consequence, in accordance with which the acts or effects are so determined conformably to those [moral] laws, that they always allow of being explained, together with the laws of nature, in accordance with the categories of substance and cause, although they have their source in an entirely different principle. These observations are designed merely to prevent a misunderstanding to which the doctrine of our self-intuition, as appearance, is particularly liable. We shall have occasion to make further application of them in the sequel.

ALLGEMEINE ANMERKUNG (B)

hier würden wir inne werden, daß im Bewußtsein unseres Daseins a priori etwas enthalten sei, was unsere nur sinnlich durch gängig bestimmmbare Existenz, doch in Ansehung eines gewissen inneren Vermögens in Beziehung auf eine intelligenbe (freilich nur gedachte) Welt zu bestimmen dienen kann.

THE TRANSCENDENTAL DIALECTIC

BOOK II

CHAPTER II

THE ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

We have shown in the introduction to this part of our work that all transcendental illusion of pure reason rests on dialectical inferences whose schema is supplied by logic in the three formal species of syllogisms—just as the categories find their logical schema in the four functions of all judgments. The first type of these pseudo-rational inferences deals with the unconditioned unity of the subjective conditions of all representations in general (of the subject or soul), in correspondence with the categorical syllogisms, the major premiss of which is a principle asserting the relation of a predicate to a subject.

The second type of dialectical argument follows the analogy of the hypothetical syllogisms. It has as its content the unconditioned unity of the objective conditions in the [field of] appearance. In similar fashion, the third type, which will be dealt with in the next chapter, has as its theme the unconditioned unity of the objective conditions of the possibility of objects in general.

But there is one point that calls for special notice. Transcendental paralogism produced a purely one-sided illusion in regard to the idea of the subject of our thought. No illusion which will even in the slightest degree support the opposing assertion is caused by the concepts of reason. Consequently, although transcendental paralogism, in spite of a favouring illusion, cannot disclaim the radical defect through which in the fiery ordeal of critical investigation it dwindles

ZWEITES BUCH

ZWEITES HAUPTSTÜCK

DIE ANTINOMIE DER REINEN VERNUNFT

Wir haben in der Einleitung zu diesem Teile unseres Werks gezeigt, daß aller transzendentale Schein der reinen Vernunft auf dialektischen Schlüssen beruhe, deren Schema die Logik in den drei formalen Arten der Vernunftschlüsse überhaupt an die Hand gibt, so wie etwa die Kategorien ihr logisches Schema in den vier Funktionen aller Urteile antreffen. Die erste Art dieser vernünftenden Schlüsse ging auf die unbedingte Einheit der subjektiven Bedingungen aller Vorstellungen überhaupt (des Subjekts oder der Seele), in Korrespondenz mit den kategorischen Vernunftschlüssen, deren Obersatz, als Prinzip, die Beziehung eines Prädikats auf ein Subjekt aussagt. Die zweite Art des dialektischen Arguments wird also, nach der Analogie mit hypothetischen Vernunftschlüssen, die unbedingte Einheit der objektiven Bedingungen in der Erscheinung zu ihrem Inhalte machen, so wie die dritte Art, die im folgenden Hauptstücke vorkommen wird, die unbedingte Einheit der objektiven Bedingungen der Möglichkeit der Gegenstände überhaupt zum Thema hat.

Es ist aber merkwürdig, daß der transzendentale Paralogism einen bloß einseitigen Schein, in Anschung der Idee von dem Subjekte unseres Denkens, bewirkte, und zur Be- hautung des Gegenteils sich nicht der mindeste Schein aus Vernunftbegriffen vorfinden will. Der Vorteil ist gänzlich auf der Seite des Pneumatismus, obgleich dieser den Erbfehler
into mere semblance, such advantage as it offers is altogether on the side of pneumatism.

A completely different situation arises when reason is applied to the objective synthesis of appearances. For in this domain, however it may endeavour to establish its principle of unconditioned unity, and though it indeed does so with great though illusory appearance of success, it soon falls into such contradictions that it is constrained, in this cosmological field, to desist from any such pretensions.

We have here presented to us a new phenomenon of human reason—an entirely natural antithetic, in which there is no need of making subtle enquiries or of laying snares for the unwary, but into which reason of itself quite unavoidably falls. It certainly guards reason from the slumber of fictitious conviction such as is generated by a purely one-sided illusion, but at the same time subjects it to the temptation either of abandoning itself to a sceptical despair, or of assuming an obstinate attitude, dogmatically committing itself to certain assertions, and refusing to grant a fair hearing to the arguments for the counter-position. Either attitude is the death of sound philosophy, although the former might perhaps be entitled the euthanasia of pure reason.

Before considering the various forms of opposition and dissension to which this conflict or antinomy of the laws of pure reason gives rise, we may offer a few remarks in explanation and justification of the method which we propose to employ in the treatment of this subject. I entitle all transcendental ideas, in so far as they refer to absolute totality in the synthesis of appearances, cosmical concepts, partly because this unconditioned totality also underlies the concept—itself only an idea—of the world-whole; partly because they concern only the synthesis of appearances, therefore only empirical synthesis. When, on the contrary, the absolute totality is that of the synthesis of the conditions of all possible things in general, it gives rise to an ideal of pure reason which, though it may indeed stand in a certain relation to the cosmical concept, is quite distinct from it. Accordingly, just as the paralogisms of pure reason formed the basis of a dialectical psychology, so the antinomy of pure reason will exhibit to us the transcendental principles
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nicht verleugnen kann, bei allem ihm günstigen Schein in der Feuerprobe der Kritik sich in lauter Dunst aufzulösen.

Ganz anders fällt es aus, wenn wir die Vernunft auf die objektive Synthese der Erscheinungen anwenden, wo sie ihr Principium der unbedingten Einheit zwar mit vielerlei Scheine geltend zu machen denkt, sich aber bald in solche Widersprüche verwickelt, daß sie genötigt wird, in kosmologischer Absicht, von ihrer Forderung abzustehen.


Ehe wir die Auftritte des Zwiespaltis und der Zerrüttungen sehen lassen, welche dieser Widerstreit der Gesetze (Antinomie) der reinen Vernunft veranlaßt, wollen wir gewisse Erörterungen geben, welche die Methode erläutern und rechtfertigen können, deren wir uns in Behandlung unseres Gegenstandes bedienen. Ich nenne alle transcendentalen Ideen, so fern sie die absolute Totalität in der Synthese der Erscheinungen betreffen, Weltbegriffe, teils wegen eben dieser unbedingten Totalität, worauf auch der Begriff des Weltganzen beruht, der selbst nur eine Idee ist, teils weil sie lediglich auf die Synthese der Erscheinungen, mithin die empirische, gehen, da hingegen die absolute Totalität, in der Synthese der Bedingungen aller möglichen Dinge überhaupt, ein Ideal der reinen Vernunft veranlassen wird, welches von dem Weltbegriffe gänzlich unterschieden ist, ob es gleich darauf in Beziehung steht. Daher, so wie die Paralogismen der reinen Vernunft den Grund zu einer dialektischen Psychologie legten, so wird die Antinomie der reinen Vernunft die transcendentalen Grundsätze einer vermeinten reinen (ratio-
of a pretended pure rational cosmology. But it will not do
so in order to show this science to be valid and to adopt it.
As the title, conflict of reason, suffices to show, this pretended
science can be exhibited only in its bedazzling but false
illusoriness, as an idea which can never be reconciled with
appearances.

THE ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

Section I

SYSTEM OF COSMOLOGICAL IDEAS

In proceeding to enumerate these ideas with systematic
precision according to a principle, we must bear in mind two
points. In the first place we must recognise that pure and
transcendental concepts can issue only from the understand-
ing. Reason does not really generate any concept. The most
it can do is to free a concept of understanding from the
unavoidable limitations of possible experience, and so to en-
deavour to extend it beyond the limits of the empirical, though
still, indeed, in terms of its relation to the empirical. This is
achieved in the following manner. For a given conditioned,
reason demands on the side of the conditions—to which as
the conditions of synthetic unity the understanding subjects
all appearances—absolute totality, and in so doing converts
the category into a transcendental idea. For only by carrying
the empirical synthesis as far as the unconditioned is it en-
abled to render it absolutely complete; and the unconditioned
is never to be met with in experience, but only in the idea.
Reason makes this demand in accordance with the principle
that if the conditioned is given, the entire sum of conditions,
and consequently the absolutely unconditioned (through which
alone the conditioned has been possible) is also given. The
transcendental ideas are thus, in the first place, simply categ-
ories extended to the unconditioned, and can be reduced to
a table arranged according to the [fourfold] headings of the
latter. In the second place, not all categories are fitted for such
employment, but only those in which the synthesis constitutes
a series of conditions subordinated to, not co-ordinated with,
one another, and generative of a [given] conditioned. Absolute totality is demanded by reason only in so far as the ascending series of conditions relates to a given conditioned. It is not demanded in regard to the descending line of consequences, nor in reference to the aggregate of co-ordinated conditions of these consequences. For in the case of the given conditioned, conditions are presupposed, and are considered as given together with it. On the other hand, since consequences do not make their conditions possible, but rather presuppose them, we are not called upon, when we advance to consequences or descend from a given condition to the conditioned, to consider whether the series does or does not cease; the question as to the totality of the series is not in any way a presupposition of reason.

Thus we necessarily think time as having completely elapsed up to the given moment, and as being itself given in this completed form. This holds true, even though such completely elapsed time is not determinable by us. But since the future is not the condition of our attaining to the present, it is a matter of entire indifference, in our comprehension of the latter, how we may think of future time, whether as coming to an end or as flowing on to infinity. We have, as it were, the series \( m, n, o \), in which \( n \) is given as conditioned by \( m \), and at the same time as being the condition of \( o \). The series ascends from the conditioned \( n \) to \( m \) (\( l, k, i \), etc.), and also descends from the condition \( n \) to the conditioned \( o \) (\( p, q, r \), etc.). Now I must presuppose the first series in order to be able to view \( n \) as given. According to reason, with its demand for totality of conditions, \( n \) is possible only by means of that series. Its possibility does not, however, rest upon the subsequent series, \( o, p, q, r \). This latter series may not therefore be regarded as given, but only as allowing of being given (\textit{dabilis}).

I propose to name the synthesis of a series which begins, on the side of the conditions, from the condition which stands nearest to the given appearance and so passes to the more remote conditions, the \textit{regressive} synthesis; and that which advances, on the side of the conditioned, from the first consequence to the more distant, the \textit{progressive}. The first proceeds \textit{in antecedentia}, the second \textit{in consequentia}. The cosmological ideas deal, therefore, with the totality of the regressive synthesis ten (nicht beigerechneten) Bedingungen zu einem Bedingten. Die absolute Totalität wird von der Vernunft nur so fern gefordert, als sie die aufsteigende Reihe der Bedingungen zu einem gegebenen Bedingten angeht, mithin nicht, wenn von der absteigenden Linie der Folgen, noch auch von dem Aggregat koordinierter Bedingungen zu diesen Folgen, die Rede ist. Denn Bedingungen sind in Anschauung des gegebenen Bedingten schon vorausgesetzt und mit diesem auch als gegeben anzusehen, anstatt daß, da die Folgen ihre Bedingungen nicht möglich machen, sondern vielmehr voraussetzen, man im Fortgange zu den Folgen (oder im Absteigen von der gegebenen Bedingung zu dem Bedingten) unbekümmert sein kann, ob die Reihe aufhöre oder nicht, und überhaupt die Frage, wegen ihrer Totalität, gar keine Voraussetzung der Vernunft ist.

So denkt man sich notwendig eine bis auf den gegebenen Augenblick völlig abgelaufene Zeit auch als gegeben (wenn gleich nicht durch uns bestimmbar). Was aber die künftige betrifft, da sie die Bedingung nicht ist, zu der Gegenwart zu gelangen, so ist es, um diese zu begreifen, ganz gleichgültig, wie wir es mit der künftigen Zeit halten wollen, ob man sie irgendwo aufhören, oder ins Unendliche laufen lassen will. Es sei die Reihe \( m, n, o \), worin \( n \) als bedingte in Anschauung \( m \), aber zugleich als Bedingung von \( o \) gegeben ist, die Reihe gehe aufwärts von dem bedingten \( n \) zu \( m \) (\( l, k, i \), etc.), imgleichen abwärts von der Bedingung \( n \) zum bedingten \( o \) (\( p, q, r \), etc.), so muß ich die erstere Reihe voraussetzen, um \( n \) als gegeben anzusehen, und \( n \) ist nach der Vernunft (der Totalität der Bedingungen) nur vermittelst jener Reihe möglich, seine Möglichkeit beruht aber nicht auf der folgenden Reihe \( o, p, q, r \), die daher auch nicht als gegeben, sondern nur als dabilis angesehen werden könne.

Ich will die Synthese einer Reihe auf der Seite der Bedingungen, also von derjenigen an, welche die nächste zur gegebenen Erscheinung ist, und so zu den entfernteren Bedingungen, die \textit{regressive}, diejenige aber, die auf der Seite des Bedingten, von der nächsten Folge zu den entfernteren, fortgeht, die \textit{progressive} Synthese nennen. Die erstere geht in antecedentia, die zweite in consequentia. Die kosmologischen Ideen also beschäftigen sich mit der Totalität der regressiven

\[ \text{Akad.-Ausz.: könnte} \]
proceeding in antecedentia, not in consequentia. The problem of pure reason suggested by the progressive form of totality is gratuitous and unnecessary, since the raising of it is not required for the complete comprehension of what is given in appearance. For that we require to consider only the grounds, not the consequences.

In arranging the table of ideas in accordance with the table of categories, we first take the two original quanta of all our intuition, time and space. Time is in itself a series, and indeed the formal condition of all series. In it, in regard to a given present, the antecedents can be a priori distinguished as conditions (the past) from the consequents (the future). The transcendental idea of the absolute totality of the series of conditions of any given conditioned therefore refers only to all past time; and in conformity with the idea of reason past time, as condition of the given moment, is necessarily thought as being given in its entirety. Now in space, taken in and by itself, there is no distinction between progress and regress. For as its parts are co-existent, it is an aggregate, not a series. The present moment can be regarded only as conditioned by past time, never as conditioning it, because this moment comes into existence only through past time, or rather through the passing of the preceding time. But as the parts of space are co-ordinated with, not subordinated to, one another, one part is not the condition of the possibility of another; and unlike time, space does not in itself constitute a series. Nevertheless the synthesis of the manifold parts of space, by means of which we apprehend space, is successive, taking place in time and containing a series. And since in this series of the aggregated spaces (as for instance of the feet in a rood) of the given space, those which are thought in extension of the given space are always the condition of the limits of the given space, the measuring of a space is also to be regarded as a synthesis of a series of the conditions of a given conditioned, only with this difference that the side of the conditions is not in itself distinct from that of the conditioned, and that in space regressus and progressus would therefore seem to be one and the same. Inasmuch as one part of space is not given through the others but only limited by them, we must consider each space, in so far as it is limited, as being also conditioned, in that it presupposes another space as the

Synthesis, und gehen in antecedentia, nicht in consequentia. Wenn dieses letztere geschieht, so ist es ein willkürliches und nicht notwendiges Problem der reinen Vernunft, weil wir zur vollständigen Begreiﬁßlichkeit dessen, was in der Erscheinung gegeben ist, wohl der Gründe, nicht aber der Folgen bedürfen.

Um nun nach der Tafel der Kategorien die Tafel der Ideen einzurichten, so nehmen wir zuerst die zwei ursprünglichen Quanta aller unserer Anschauung, Zeit und Raum. Die Zeit ist an sich selbst eine Reihe (und die formale Bedingung aller Reihen), und daher sind in ihr, in Ansehung einer gegebenen Gegenwart, die Antecedentia als Bedingungen (das Vergangene) von den Consequentibus (dem Künftigen) a priori zu unterscheiden. Folglich geht die transcendente Idee, der absoluten Totalität der Reihe der Bedingungen zu einem gegebenen Bedingten, nur auf alle vergangene Zeit. Es wird nach der Idee der Vernunft die ganze verlaufene Zeit als Bedingung des gegebenen Augenblicks notwendig als gegeben gedacht. Was aber den Raum betrifft, so ist in ihm an sich selbst kein Unterschied des Progressus vom Regressus, weil er ein Aggregat, aber keine Reihe ausmacht, indem seine Teile insgesamt zueinander, wie bei dem gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt könnte ich in Ansehung der vergangenen Zeit nur als bedingt, niemals aber als Bedingung derselben, ansehen, weil dieser Augenblick nur durch die verflussene Zeit (oder vielmehr durch das Verfließen der vorherrschenden Zeit) allererst entspricht. Aber da die Teile des Raumes einander nicht untergeordnet, sondern beigefügt sind, so ist ein Teil nicht die Bedingung der Möglichkeit des andern, und er macht nicht, so wie die Zeit, an sich selbst eine Reihe aus. Allein die Synthese der mannigfaltigen Teile des Raumes, wodurch wir ihn apprehendieren, ist doch sukzessiv, geschieht also in der Zeit und enthält eine Reihe. Und da in dieser Reihe der aggregierten Räume (z. B. der Füße in einer Rute) von einem gegebenen an die weiter hinzugedachten immer die Bedingung von der Grenze der vorigen sind, so ist das Messen eines Raumes auch als eine Synthese einer Reihe der Bedingungen zu einem gegebenen Bedingten anzusehen, nur daß die Seite der Bedingungen, von der Seite, nach welcher das Bedingte hinlegt, an sich selbst nicht unterschieden ist, folglich Regressus und Progressus im Raume einerlei zu sein scheint. Weil indessen ein Teil des Raumes nicht durch den andern gegeben, sondern nur begrenzt wird, so müssen wir jeden begrenzten Raum in so fern auch als bedingt ansehen, der einen andern Raum als die
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condition of its limits, and so on. In respect of limitation the advance in space is thus also a regress, and the transcendental idea of the absolute totality of the synthesis in the series of conditions likewise applies to space. I can as legitimately enquire regarding the absolute totality of appearance in space as of that in past time. Whether an answer to this question is ever possible, is a point which will be decided later.

Secondly, reality in space, i.e. matter, is a conditioned. Its internal conditions are its parts, and the parts of these parts its remote conditions. There thus occurs a regressive synthesis, the absolute totality of which is demanded by reason. This can be obtained only by a completed division in virtue of which the reality of matter vanishes either into nothing or into what is no longer matter—namely, the simple. Here also, then, we have a series of conditions, and an advance to the unconditioned.

Thirdly, as regards the categories of real relation between appearances, that of substance with its accidents is not adapted to being a transcendental idea. That is to say, in it reason finds no ground for proceeding regessively to conditions. Accidents, in so far as they inhere in one and the same substance, are co-ordinated with each other, and do not constitute a series. Even in their relation to substance they are not really subordinated to it, but are the mode of existence of the substance itself. What in this category may still, however, seem to be an idea of transcendental reason, is the concept of the \(^1\) substantial. But since this means no more than the concept of object in general, which subsists in so far as we think in it merely the transcendental subject apart from all predicates, whereas we are here dealing with the unconditioned only as it may exist in the series of appearances, it is evident that the substantial cannot be a member of that series. This is also true of substances in community. They are mere aggregates, and contain nothing on which to base a series.\(^2\) For we cannot say of them, as we can of spaces, whose limits are never determined in and by themselves but only through some other space, that they are subordinated to each other as conditions of the possibility of one another. There thus remains only the category of causality. It presents a series of causes of a given

\(^1\) [Reading, with Erdmann, \textit{wem for wen}.]
\(^2\) [\textit{keinen Exponenten einer Reihe haben}.]

SYSTEM DER KOSMOLOGISCHEN IDEEN


Zweitens, so ist die Realität im Raume, d. i. die Materie, ein Bedingtes, dessen innere Bedingungen seine Teile, und die Teile der Teile die entfernten Bedingungen sind, sodaß hier eine regressive Synthesis stattfindet, deren absolute Totalität die Vernunft fordert, welchen nicht anders als durch eine vollendete Teilung, dadurch die Realität der Materie entweder in nichts oder doch in das, was nicht mehr Materie ist, nämlich das Einfache, verschwindet, statt finden kann. Folglich ist hier auch eine Reihe von Bedingungen und ein Fortschritt zum Unbedingten.

Drittens, was die Kategorien des realen Verhältnisses unter den Erscheinungen anlangt, so schickt sich die \textit{Kategorie der Substanz mit ihren Akzidenzen nicht zu einer transzendentalen Idee; d. i. die Vernunft hat keinen Grund, in Ansehung ihrer, regressiv auf Bedingungen zu gehen. Denn Akzidenzen sind (so fern sie einer einzigen Substanz inhärieren) einander koordiniert, und machen keine Reihe aus. In Ansehung der Substanz aber sind die derselben eigentlich nicht subordinirt, sondern die Art zu existieren der Substanz selber. Was hiebei noch scheinen könnte, eine Idee der transzendentalen Vernunft zu sein, wäre der Begriff von \textit{Substantiale. Allein, da dieses nichts anderes bedeutet, als den Begriff vom Gegenstande überhaupt, welcher subordinirt, so fern man an ihm bloß das transzendente Subjekt ohne alle Prädikate denkt, hier aber nur die Rede vom Unbedingten in der Reihe der Erscheinungen ist, so ist klar, daß das Substantiale kein Glied in derselben ausmachen könne. Eben dasselbe gilt auch von Substanzen in Gemeinschaft, welche bloß Aggregate sind, und keinen Exponenten einer Reihe haben, indem sie nicht einander als Bedingungen ihrer Möglichkeit subordinirt sind, welches man wohl von den Räumen sagen könnte, deren Grenze niemals an sich, sondern immer durch einen andern Raum be- stimmt war. Es bleibt also nur die Kategorie der Kausalität, welche eine Reihe der Ursachen zu einer gegeb-
effect such that we can proceed to ascend from the latter as the conditioned to the former as conditions, and so to answer the question of reason.

Fourthly, the concepts of the possible, the actual, and the necessary do not lead to any series, save in so far as the accidental in existence must always be regarded as conditioned, and as pointing in conformity with the rule of the understanding to a condition under which it is necessary, and this latter in turn to a higher condition, until reason finally attains unconditioned necessity only in the totality of the series.

When we thus select out those categories which necessarily lead to a series in the synthesis of the manifold, we find that there are but four cosmological ideas, corresponding to the four titles of the categories:

1. Absolute completeness of the Composition of the given whole of all appearances.

2. Absolute completeness in the Division of a given whole in the [field of] appearance.

3. Absolute completeness in the Origination of an appearance.


There are several points which here call for notice. In the first place, the idea of absolute totality concerns only the exposition of appearances, and does not therefore refer to the pure concept, such as the understanding may form, of a totality of things in general. Appearances are here regarded as given; what reason demands is the absolute completeness of the conditions of their possibility, in so far as these conditions constitute a series. What reason prescribes is therefore an absolutely (that is to say, in every respect) complete synthesis, whereby the appearance may be exhibited in accordance with the laws of understanding.

1 [exponiert.]
ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

Secondly, what reason is really seeking in this serial, regressively continued, synthesis of conditions, is solely the unconditioned. What it aims at is, as it were, such a completeness in the series of premisses as will dispense with the need of presupposing other premisses. This unconditioned is always contained in the absolute totality of the series as represented in imagination. But this absolutely complete synthesis is again only an idea; for we cannot know, at least at the start of this enquiry, whether such a synthesis is possible in the case of appearance. If we represent everything exclusively through pure concepts of understanding, and apart from conditions of sensible intuition, we can indeed at once assert that for a given conditioned, the whole series of conditions subordinated to each other is likewise given. The former is given only through the latter. When, however, it is with appearances that we are dealing, we find a special limitation due to the manner in which conditions are given, namely, through the successive synthesis of the manifold of intuition—a synthesis which has to be made complete through the regress. Whether this completeness is sensibly possible is a further problem; the idea of it lies in reason, independently alike of the possibility or of the impossibility of our connecting with it any adequate empirical concepts. Since, then, the unconditioned is necessarily contained in the absolute totality of the regressive synthesis of the manifold in the [field of] appearance—the synthesis being executed in accordance with those categories which represent appearance as a series of conditions to a given conditioned—reason here adopts the method of starting from the idea of totality, though what it really has in view is the unconditioned, whether of the entire series or of a part of it. Meantime, also, it leaves undecided whether and how this totality is attainable.

This unconditioned may be conceived in either of two ways. It may be viewed as consisting of the entire series in which all the members without exception are conditioned and only the totality of them is absolutely unconditioned. This regress is to be entitled infinite. Or alternatively, the absolutely unconditioned is only a part of the series—a part to which the other members are subordinated, and which does not itself stand...
under any other condition. On the first view, the series a parte
priori is without limits or beginning, i.e. is infinite, and at the
same time is given in its entirety. But the regress in it is never
completed, and can only be called potentially infinite. On the
second view, there is a first member of the series which in
respect of past time is entitled, the beginning of the world, in
respect of space, the limit of the world, in respect of the parts
of a given limited whole, the simple, in respect of causes,
absolute self-activity (freedom), in respect of the existence of
alterable things, absolute natural necessity.

We have two expressions, world and nature, which some-
times coincide. The former signifies the mathematical sum-
total of all appearances and the totality of their synthesis, alike
in the great and in the small, that is, in the advance alike through
composition and through division. This same world is entitled
nature when it is viewed as a dynamical whole. We are not
then concerned with the aggregation in space and time, with
a view to determining it as a magnitude, but with the unity in
the existence of appearances. In this case the condition of that
which happens is entitled the cause. Its unconditioned causality
in the [field of] appearance is called freedom, and its
conditioned causality is called natural cause in the narrower
[adjectival] sense. The conditioned in existence in general is
termed contingent and the unconditioned necessary. The un-


* The absolute totality of the series of conditions to a given con-
tioned is always unconditioned, since outside it there are no further
conditions in respect of which it could be conditioned. But this
absolute totality of such a series is only an idea, or rather a problem-
atic concept, the possibility of which has to be investigated, espe-
cially in regard to the manner in which the unconditioned (the tran-
scendental idea really at issue) is involved therein.

* Nature, taken adjectively (formaliter), signifies the connec-
tion of the determinations of a thing according to an inner principle
of causality. By nature, on the other hand, taken substantively
(materialiter), is meant the sum of appearances in so far as they
stand, in virtue of an inner principle of causality, in thorough-
going interconnection. In the first sense we speak of the nature of
fluid matter, of fire, etc. The word is then employed in an adjectival
manner. When, on the other hand, we speak of the things of nature,
we have in mind a self-subsisting whole.
conditioned necessity of appearances may be entitled natural necessity.

The ideas with which we are now dealing I have above entitled cosmological ideas, partly because by the term 'world' we mean the sum of all appearances, and it is exclusively to the unconditioned in the appearances that our ideas are directed, partly also because the term 'world', in the trans-ascendental sense, signifies the absolute totality of all existing things, and we direct our attention solely to the completeness of the synthesis, even though that is only attainable in the regress to its conditions. Thus despite the objection that these ideas are one and all transcendent, and that although they do not in kind surpass the object, namely, appearances, but are concerned exclusively with the world of sense, not with noumena, they yet carry the synthesis to a degree which transcends all possible experience, I none the less still hold that they may quite appropriately be entitled cosmical concepts. In respect of the distinction between the mathematically and the dynamically unconditioned at which the regress aims, I might, however, call the first two concepts cosmical in the narrower sense, as referring to the world of the great and the small; and the other two transcedent concepts of nature. This distinction has no special immediate value; its significance will appear later.

THE ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

Section 2

ANTITHETIC OF PURE REASON

If thetic be the name for any body of dogmatic doctrines, antithetic may be taken as meaning, not dogmatic assertions of the opposite, but the conflict of the doctrines of seemingly dogmatic knowledge (thesis cum antithesis) in which no one assertion can establish superiority over another. The antithetic does not, therefore, deal with one-sided assertions. It treats only of the conflict of the doctrines of reason with one another and the causes of this conflict. The transcendental antithetic is an enquiry into the antinomy of pure reason, its causes and out-

1 [Weltbegriff.]  2 [Naturbegriffe.]
KANT'S CRITIQUE OF PURE REASON

come. If in employing the principles of understanding we do not merely apply our reason to objects of experience, but venture to extend these principles beyond the limits of experience, there arise pseudo-rational doctrines which can neither hope for confirmation in experience nor fear refutation by it. Each of them is not only in itself free from contradiction, but finds conditions of its necessity in the very nature of reason—only that, unfortunately, the assertion of the opposite has, on its side, grounds that are just as valid and necessary.

The questions which naturally arise in connection with such a dialectic of pure reason are the following: (1) In what propositions is pure reason unavoidably subject to an antinomy? (2) On what causes does this antinomy depend? (3) Whether and in what way, despite this contradiction, does there still remain open to reason a path to certainty?

A dialectical doctrine of pure reason must therefore be distinguished from all sophistical propositions in two respects.

It must not refer to an arbitrary question such as may be raised for some special purpose, but to one which human reason must necessarily encounter in its progress. And secondly, both it and its opposite must involve no mere artificial illusion such as at once vanishes upon detection, but a natural and unavoidable illusion, which even after it has ceased to beguile still continues to delude though not to deceive, and which though thus capable of being rendered harmless can never be eradicated.

Such dialectical doctrine relates not to the unity of understanding in empirical concepts, but to the unity of reason in mere ideas. Since this unity of reason involves a synthesis according to rules, it must conform to the understanding; and yet as demanding absolute unity of synthesis it must at the same time harmonise with reason. But the conditions of this unity are such that when it is adequate to reason it is too great for the understanding; and when suited to the understanding, too small for reason. There thus arises a conflict which cannot be avoided, do what we will.

These pseudo-rational assertions thus disclose a dialectical battlefield in which the side permitted to open the attack is invariably victorious, and the side constrained to act on the defensive is always defeated. Accordingly, vigorous fighters, no
matter whether they support a good or a bad cause, if only they contrive to secure the right to make the last attack, and are not required to withstand a new onslaught from their opponents, may always count upon carrying off the laurels. We can easily understand that while this arena should time and again be contested, and that numerous triumphs should be gained by both sides, the last decisive victory always leaves the champion of the good cause master of the field, simply because his rival is forbidden to resume the combat. As impartial umpires, we must leave aside the question whether it is for the good or the bad cause that the contestants are fighting. They must be left to decide the issue for themselves. After they have rather exhausted than injured one another, they will perhaps themselves perceive the futility of their quarrel, and part good friends.

This method of watching, or rather provoking, a conflict of assertions, not for the purpose of deciding in favour of one or other side, but of investigating whether the object of controversy is not perhaps a deceptive appearance which each vainly strives to grasp, and in regard to which, even if there were no opposition to be overcome, neither can arrive at any result.—this procedure, I say, may be entitled the sceptical method. It is altogether different from scepticism—a principle of technical and scientific ignorance, which undermines the foundations of all knowledge, and strives in all possible ways to destroy its reliability and steadfastness. For the sceptical method aims at certainty. It seeks to discover the point of misunderstanding in the case of disputes which are sincerely and competently conducted by both sides, just as from the embarrassment of judges in cases of litigation wise legislators contrive to obtain instruction regarding the defects and ambiguities of their laws. The antinomy which discloses itself in the application of laws is for our limited wisdom the best criterion of the legislation that has given rise to them. Reason, which does not in abstract speculation easily become aware of its errors, is hereby awakened to consciousness of the factors [that have to be reckoned with] in the determination of its principles

1 [der Nomothetik]
2 [Momenta]
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But it is only for transcendental philosophy that this sceptical method is essential. Though in all other fields of enquiry it can, perhaps, be dispensed with, it is not so in this field. In mathematics its employment would, indeed, be absurd; for in mathematics no false assertions can be concealed and rendered invisible, inasmuch as the proofs must always proceed under the guidance of pure intuition and by means of a synthesis that is always evident. In experimental philosophy the delay caused by doubt may indeed be useful; no misunderstanding is, however, possible which cannot easily be removed; and the final means of deciding the dispute, whether found early or late, must in the end be supplied by experience.

Moral philosophy can also present its principles, together with their practical consequences, one and all in concreto, in what are at least possible experiences; and the misunderstanding due to abstraction is thereby avoided. But it is quite otherwise with transcendental assertions which lay claim to insight into what is beyond the field of all possible experiences. Their abstract synthesis can never be given in any a priori intuition, and they are so constituted that what is erroneous in them can never be detected by means of any experience. Transcendental reason consequently admits of no other test than the endeavour to harmonise its various assertions. But for the successful application of this test the conflict into which they fall with one another must first be left to develop free and untrammelled. This we shall now set about arranging.

THE ANTIMONY OF PURE REASON

FIRST CONFLICT OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL IDEAS

Thesis

The world has a beginning in time, and is also limited as regards space.

Antithesis

The world has no beginning, and no limits in space; it is infinite as regards both time and space.

* The antinomies follow one another in the order of the transcendental ideas above enumerated [p. 390].

ERSTE ANTINOEMIE


ERSTER WIDERSTREIT

Thesis

Die Welt hat einen Anfang in der Zeit, und ist dem Raum nach auch in Gezeiten eingeschlossen.

Antithesis

Die Welt hat keinen Anfang, und keine Grenzen im Raume, sondern ist, sowohl in Anschauung der Zeit, als des Raums, unendlich.

Die Antinomien folgen einander nach der Ordnung der oben angeführten transcendentalen Ideen.

* Abs. 6. 254: to. 6.
FIRST ANTINOMY

Proof

If we assume that the world has no beginning in time, then up to every given moment an eternity has elapsed, and there has passed away in the world an infinite series of successive states of things. Now the infinity of a series consists in the fact that it can never be completed through successive synthesis. It thus follows that it is impossible for an infinite world-series to have passed away, and that a beginning of the world is therefore a necessary condition of the world's existence. This was the first point that called for proof.

As regards the second point, let us again assume the opposite, namely, that the world is an infinite given whole of co-existing things. Now the magnitude of a quantum which is not given in intuition as within certain limits, can be thought only through the synthesis of its parts, and the totality of such a quantum only through a synthesis that is brought to completion through repeated addition of

* An indeterminate quantum can be intuited as a whole when it is such that though enclosed within limits we do not require to construct its totality through measurement, that is, through the successive synthesis of its parts. For the limits, in cutting off anything further, themselves determine its completeness.

---

TRANZENTALE DIALEKTIK

Beweis

Denn, man nehme an, die Welt habe der Zeit nach keinen Anfang; so ist bis zu jedem gegebenen Zeitpunkte eine Ewigkeit abgelaufen, und mithin eine unendliche Reihe auf einander folgender Zustände der Dinge in der Welt ver- 

flossen. Nun besteht aber eben darin die Unendlichkeit einer 

Reihe, daß sie durch sukzessive Synthesis niemals vollendet 

sein kann. Also ist eine unendliche verfloessene Weiterei 

unmöglicher, mithin ein Anfang der Welt eine notwendige Be-

dingung ihres Daseins; welches zuerst zu beweisen war.

---

ERSTE ANTINOMIE

Beweis

Denn man setze: sie habe einen Anfang. Da der Anfang 

ein Dasein ist, vor einer Zeit vorhergegangen, darin die 

Welt nicht war, d. i. eine leere Zeit. Nun ist aber in einer 

leeren Zeit kein Entstehen irgend eines Dinges möglich; 

weil kein Teil einer solchen Zeit vor einem anderen irgend 

eine unterschiedende Bedingung des Daseins, vor die des 

Nichtwesens, an sich hat (man mag annehmen, daß sie von 

sich selbst, oder durch eine andere Ursache entsteh). Also 

kann zwar in der Welt manche Reihe der Dinge anfangen, 

die Welt selber aber kann keinen Anfang haben, und ist 

also in Anschauung der vergangenen Zeit unendlich.

---

In Anschauung des zweiten nehme man wiederum das 

Gegenteil an: so wird die Welt ein unendliches gegebenes 

Ganzes von zugleich existierenden Dingen sein. Nun können 

wir die Größe eines Quanti, welches nicht innerhalb ge-

wisser Grenzen jeder Anschauung gegeben wird,* auf 

keine andere Art, als nur durch die Synthesis der Teile, 

und die Totalität eines solchen Quanti nur durch die voll-

endete Synthesis, oder durch wiederholte Hinzusatzung der

---

Was das zweite betrifft, so nehme man zuvorderst das 

Gegenteil an, daß nämlich die Welt dem Raume nach endlich 

und begrenzt ist, so befindet sich in einem leeren Raum, der 

nicht begrenzt ist. Es würde also nicht allein ein Verhältnis der

---

* Wir können ein unbestimmtes Quantum als ein Ganzes anschauen, 

wenn es in Grenzen eingeschlossen ist, ohne die Totalität desselben 

durch Messung, d. i. die sukzessive || Synthesis seiner Teile, konstruie-

ren zu dürfen. Denn die Grenzen bestimmen schon die Vollständigkeit, 

indem sie alles Mehreres abschneiden.
unit to unit. In order, therefore, to think, as a whole, the world which fills all spaces, the successive synthesis of the parts of an infinite world must be viewed as completed, that is, an infinite time must be viewed as having elapsed in the enumeration of all coexisting things. This, however, is impossible. An infinite aggregate of actual things cannot therefore be viewed as a given whole, nor consequently as simultaneously given. The world is, therefore, as regards extension in space, not infinite, but is enclosed within limits. This was the second point in dispute.

The concept of totality is in this case simply the representation of the completed synthesis of its parts; for, since we cannot obtain the concept from the intuition of the whole—that being in this case impossible—we can apprehend it only through the synthesis of the parts viewed as carried, at least in idea, to the completion of the infinite.

Space is merely the form of outer intuition (formal intuition). It is not a real object which can be outwardly intuited. Space, as prior to all things which determine (occupy or limit) it, or rather which give an empirical intuition in accordance with its form, is, under the name of absolute space, nothing but the mere possibility of outer appearances in so far as they either exist in themselves or can be added to given appearances. Empirical intuition is not, therefore, a composite of appearances and space (of perception and empty intuition). The one is not the correlate of the other in a synthesis; they are connected in one and the same empirical intuition as matter and form of the intuition. If we attempt to set one of these two factors outside the other, space outside all appearances, there arise all sorts of empty determinations of outer intuition, which yet are not possible perceptions. For example, a determination of the relation of the motion (or rest) of the world to infinite empty space related in space but also related to space. Now since the world is an absolute whole beyond which there is no object of intuition, and therefore no correlate with which the world stands in relation, the relation of the world to empty space would be a relation of it to no object. But such a relation, and consequently the limitation of the world by empty space, is nothing. The world cannot, therefore, be limited in space; that is, it is infinite in respect of extension.

The concept of totality in this case simply the representation of the completed synthesis of its parts; for, since we cannot obtain the concept from the intuition of the whole—that being in this case impossible—we can apprehend it only through the synthesis of the parts viewed as carried, at least in idea, to the completion of the infinite.

Space is merely the form of outer intuition (formal intuition). It is not a real object which can be outwardly intuited. Space, as prior to all things which determine (occupy or limit) it, or rather which give an empirical intuition in accordance with its form, is, under the name of absolute space, nothing but the mere possibility of outer appearances in so far as they either exist in themselves or can be added to given appearances. Empirical intuition is not, therefore, a composite of appearances and space (of perception and empty intuition). The one is not the correlate of the other in a synthesis; they are connected in one and the same empirical intuition as matter and form of the intuition. If we attempt to set one of these two factors outside the other, space outside all appearances, there arise all sorts of empty determinations of outer intuition, which yet are not possible perceptions. For example, a determination of the relation of the motion (or rest) of the world to infinite empty space related in space but also related to space. Now since the world is an absolute whole beyond which there is no object of intuition, and therefore no correlate with which the world stands in relation, the relation of the world to empty space would be a relation of it to no object. But such a relation, and consequently the limitation of the world by empty space, is nothing. The world cannot, therefore, be limited in space; that is, it is infinite in respect of extension.

The Begriff der Totalität ist in diesem Falle nichts anderes, als die Vorstellung der vollendeten Synthese seiner Teile, weil, da wir nicht von der Anschauung des Ganzen (als welche in diesem Falle unmöglich ist) den Begriff abziehen können, wir diesen nur durch die Synthese der Teile, bis zur Vollendung des Unendlichen, wenigstens in der Idee fassen können.

Der Raum ist bloß die Form der äußeren Anschauung (formale Anschauung), aber kein wirklicher Gegenstand, der äußerlich angesehen werden kann. Der Raum, vor allen Dingen, die ihn bestimmen (erfüllen oder begrenzen), oder die vielmehr einer seiner Form gemäß empirische Anschauung geben, ist unter dem Namen des absoluten Raumes, nichts anderes, als die bloße Möglichkeit äußerer Erscheinungen, sofern sie entweder als sich existierende, oder zu gegebener Erscheinungen noch hinzukommen können. Die empirische Anschauung ist also nicht zusammenzusetzen aus Erscheinungen und dem Raume (der Wahrnehmung und der leeren Anschauung). Einem ist nicht das andern Correlatum der Synthese, sondern nur in einer und derselben empirischen Anschauung verbunden, als Materie und Form derselben. Will man eines dieser zwei Stücke außer dem anderen setzen (Raum außerhalb all Erscheinungen), so entstehen daraus allerlei leere Bestimmungen der äußeren Anschauung, die doch nicht mögliche Wahrnehmungen sind. Z. B. Bewegung oder Ruhe der Welt im unendlichen leeren Raum, eine Bestimmung des
I. On the Thesis

The proof of the infinitude of the given world-series and of the world-whole, rests upon the fact that, on the contrary assumption, an empty time and an empty space, must constitute the limit of the world. I am aware that attempts have been made to evade this conclusion by arguing that a limit of the world in time and space is quite possible without our having to make the impossible assumption of an absolute time prior to the beginning of the world, or of an absolute space extending beyond the real world. With the latter part of this doctrine, as held by the philosophers of the Leibnizian school, I am entirely satisfied. Space is merely the form of outer intuition; it is not a real object which can be outwardly intuited; it is not a correlate of the appearances, but the form of the appearances themselves. And since space is thus no object but only the form of possible objects, it cannot be a determination which can never be perceived, and is therefore the predicate of a mere thought-entity.

II. On the Antithesis

Ich habe bei diesem einander widerstreitenden Argumenten nicht Blendwerke gesucht, um etwa (wie man sagt) einen Advokatenbeweis zu führen, welcher sich der Unbehutsamkeit des Gegners zu seinem Vorteile bedient, und seine Berufung auf ein mißverständnes Gesetz gerne gelten läßt, um seine eigene unrechtmaßige Ansprüche auf die Widerlegung desletzen zu haben. Jeder dieser Beweise ist aus der Sache Natur genommen und der Vorteil bei Seite gesetzt worden, den und die Fehlschlüsse der Dogmatiker von beiden Teilen geben konnten.

contains, is not possible. Now no multiplicity is the greatest, since one or more units can always be added to it. Consequently an infinite given magnitude, and therefore an infinite world (infinite as regards the elapsed series or as regards extension) is impossible; it must be limited in both respects. Such is the line that my proof might have followed. But the above concept is not adequate to what we mean by an infinite whole. It does not represent how great it is, and consequently is not the concept of a maximum. Through it we think only its relation to any assignable unit in respect to which it is greater than all number. According as the unit chosen is greater or smaller, the infinite would be greater or smaller. Infinitude, however, as it consists solely in the relation to the given unit, would always remain the same. The absolute magnitude of the whole would not, therefore, be known in this way; indeed, the above regarded as something absolute in itself that determines the existence of things. Things, as appearances, determine space, that is, of all its possible predicates of magnitude and relation they determine this or that particular one to belong to the real. Space, on the other hand, viewed as a self-subsistent something, is nothing real in itself; and cannot, therefore, determine the magnitude or shape of real things. Space, it further follows, whether full or empty, may be limited by appearances, but appearances cannot be limited by an empty space outside them. This is likewise true of time. But while all this may be granted, it yet cannot be denied that these two non-entities, empty space outside the world and empty time prior to it, have to be assumed if we are to assume a limit to the world in space and in time.

The method of argument which professes to enable us to avoid the above consequence (that of having to nungen, bestimmen wohl den Raum, d. i. unter allen möglichen Prädikaten desselben (Größe und Verhältnis) machen sie es, daß diese oder jene zur Wirklichkeit gehören; aber umgekehrt kann der Raum, als etwas, welches für sich besteht, die Wirklichkeit der Dinge in Anschauung der Größe oder Gestalt nicht bestimmen, weil er an sich selbst nichts Wirkliches ist. Es kann also wohl ein Raum (er sei voll oder leer*) durch Erscheinungen begrenzt, Erscheinungen aber können indurch einen leeren Raum außer desselben begrenzt werden. Eben dieses gilt auch von der Zeit. Alles dieses nun zugegeben, so ist gleichwohl unstreitig, daß man diese zwei Unendige, den leeren Raum außer und die leere Zeit vor der Welt, durchaus annehmen müsse, wenn man eine Weltgrenze, es sei dem Raume oder der Zeit nach, annimmt.

* Man bemerkt leicht, daß hiedurch gesagt werden wolle: der leere Raum, so fern er durch Erscheinungen begrenzt wird, mit demjenige innerehalb der Welt, widerspreche wenigstens nicht den transzendentalen Prinzipien, und könne also in Anschauung dieser eingeräumt (obgleich darum seine Möglichkeit nicht sofort behauptet) werden.

Denn was den Ausweg betrifft, durch den man der Konsequenz ausweichen sucht, nach welcher wir sagen: daß,
FIRST ANTIMONY

The true transcendental concept of infinitude is this, that the successive synthesis of units required for the enumeration of a quantum can never be completed. Hence it follows with complete certainty that an eternity of actual successive states leading up to a given (the present) moment cannot have elapsed, and that the world must therefore have a beginning.

In the second part of the thesis the difficulty involved in a series that is infinite and yet has elapsed does not arise, since the manifold of a world which is infinite in respect of extension is given as co-existing. But if we are to think the totality of such a multiplicity, and yet cannot appeal to limits that of themselves constitute it a totality in intuition, we have to account for a concept which in this case cannot proceed from the whole to the determine multiplicity of the parts, but which must demonstrate the possibility of a whole by means of the successive synthesis of the parts. Now since this syn-

ICH concept does not really deal with it.

Assume that if the world has limits in time and space, the infinite void must determine the magnitude in which actual things are to, exist) consists in surreptitiously substituting for the sensible world some intelligible world of which we know nothing; for the first beginning (an existence preceded by a time of non-existence) an existence in general which presupposes no other condition whatsoever; and for the limits of extension boundaries of the world - whole—thus getting rid of time and space. But we are here treating only of the mundus phaenomenon and its magnitude, and cannot therefore abstract from the aforesaid conditions of sensibility without destroying the very being of that world. If the sensible world is limited, it must necessarily lie in the infinite void. If that void, and consequently space in general as a priori condition of the possibility of appearances, be set aside, the entire sensible world vanishes. This world is all that is given us in our problem. The mundus intelligibilis is nothing but the general concept of a

* This quantum therefore contains a quantity (of given units) which is greater than any number—which is the mathematical concept of the infinite.

Der wahre (transzendentele) Begriff der Unendlichkeit ist: daß die sukzessive Synthese der Einheit in Durchmes-
sung eines Quantums niemals vollendet sein kann. Hieraus folgt ganz sicher, daß eine Ewigkeit wirklich auf einander folgenden Zustände bis zu einem gegebenen (dem gegen-
wärtigen) Zeitpunkte nicht verloren sein kann, die Welt also einen Anfang haben müsse.

In Ansehung des zweiten Teils der Thesis fällt die Schwie-
rigkeit, von einer unendlichen und doch abgelassenen Reihe, zwar weg; denn das Mannigfaltige einer der Ausdehnung nach unendlichen Welt ist zugleich gegeben. Allein, um die Totalität einer solchen Menge zu denken, da wir uns nicht auf Grenzen berufen können, welche diese Totali-
tät von selbst in der Anschauung ausmachen, müssen wir von unserem Begriffe Rechnung geben, der in solchem Falle nicht von einem der bestimmten Menge der Teile geben kann, sondern die Möglichkeit eines Ganzen durch die sukzessive Synthese der Teile dargest und muß. Da

* Dieses enthält dadurch eine Menge (von gegebener Einheit), die größer ist als alle Zahl, welche der mathematische Begriff des Unend-
lichen ist.
thesis must constitute a never to be completed series, I cannot think a totality either prior to the synthesis or by means of the synthesis. For the concept of totality is in this case itself the representation of a completed synthesis of the parts. And since this completion is impossible, so likewise is the concept of it.

THE ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

SECOND CONFLICT OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL IDEAS

**Thesis**

Every composite substance in the world is made up of simple parts, and nothing anywhere exists save the simple or what is composed of the simple.

**Proof**

Let us assume that composite substances are not made up of simple parts. If all composition be then removed in thought, no composite part, and (since we admit no simple parts) also no simple part, that is to say, nothing at all, will remain, and accordingly no substance will be given. Either, therefore, it is impossible to remove in thought all composition, or after its removal there must remain something which world in general, in which abstraction is made from all conditions of its intuition, and in reference to which, therefore, no synthetic proposition, either affirmative or negative, can possibly be asserted.

**Antithesis**

No composite thing in the world is made up of simple parts, and there nowhere exists in the world anything simple.

**Proof**

Assume that a composite thing (as substance) is made up of simple parts. Since all external relation, and therefore all composition of substances, is possible only in space, a space must be made up of as many parts as are contained in the composite which occupies it. Space, however, is not made up of simple parts, but of spaces. Every part of the composite must therefore occupy a space. But the absolutely first part

diese Synthesis nun eine nie zu vollendende Reihe ausmachen müßte: so kann man sich nicht vor ihr, und mithin auch nicht durch sie, eine Totalität denken. Denn der Be- griff der Totalität selbst ist in diesem Falle die Vorstellung einer vollendeten Synthesis der Teile, und diese Vollendung, mithin auch der Begriff derselben, ist unmöglich.
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**Thesis**

Eine jede zusammengesetzte Substanz in der Welt besteht aus einfachen Teilen, und es existiert überall nichts als das Einfache, oder das, was aus diesem zusammengesetzt ist.

**Beweis**

Denn, nehmst du, die zusammengesetzte Substanzen beständen nicht aus einfachen Teilen: so würde, wenn alle Zusammensetzung in Gedanken aufgehoben würde, kein zusammengesetzter Teil, und (da es keine einfache Teile gibt) auch kein einfacher, mithin gar nichts übrig bleiben, folglich keine Substanz sein gegeben worden. Entweder also läßt sich unmöglich alle Zusammensetzung in Gedanken aufheben, oder es muß nach deren Aufhebung etwas ohne
griß einer Welt überhaupt, in welchem man von allen Be- dingungen der Anschauung derselben abträgt, und in Ansehung dessen folglich gar kein synthetischer Satz, we- der bejahend, noch verneinend möglich ist.

| B 401 | A 433 |
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**Antithesis**

Kein zusammengesetztes Ding in der Welt besteht aus einfachen Teilen, und es existiert überall nichts Einfaches in derselben.

**Beweis**

Setzt: ein zusammengesetztes Ding (als Substanz) be- stehe aus einfachen Teilen. Weil alles äußere Verhältnis, mithin auch alle Zusammensetzung aus Substanzen, nur im Raume möglich ist: so muß, aus so viel Teilen das Zusammengesetzte besteht, aus eben so viel Teilen auch der Raum bestehen, den es einnimmt. Nun besteht der Raum nicht aus einfachen Teilen, sondern aus Räumen. Also muß jeder Teil des Zusammengesetzten einen Raum einnehmen, Die
exists without composition, that is, the simple. In the former case the composite would not be made up of substances; composition, as applied to substances, is only an accidental relation in independence of which they must still persist as self-subsistent beings. Since this contradicts our supposition, there remains only the original supposition, that a composite of substances in the world is made up of simple parts.

It follows, as an immediate consequence, that the things in the world are all, without exception, simple beings; that composition is merely an external state of these beings; and that although we can never so isolate these elementary substances as to take them out of this state of composition, reason must think them as the primary subjects of all composition, and therefore, as simple beings, prior to all composition.

of every composite are simple. The simple therefore occupies a space. Now since everything real, which occupies a space, contains in itself a manifold of constituents external to one another, and is therefore composite; and since a real composite is not made up of accidents (for accidents could not exist outside one another, in the absence of substance) but of substances, it follows that the simple would be a composite of substances—which is self-contradictory.

The second proposition of the antithesis, that nowhere in the world does there exist anything simple, is intended to mean only this, that the existence of the absolutely simple cannot be established by any experience or perception, either outer or inner; and that the absolutely simple is therefore a mere idea, the objective reality of which can never be shown in any possible experience, and which, as being without an object, has no application in the explanation of the appearances. For if we assumed that in experience an object might be found for this transcendental idea, the empirical intuition of such an object

alle Zusammensetzung Bestehendes, d. i. das Einfache, übrig bleiben. Im ersteren Falle aber würde das Zusammengesetzte wiederum nicht aus Substanzen bestehen (weil bei diesem die Zusammensetzung nur eine zufällige Relation der Substanzen ist, ohne welche diese, als für sich beherrschliche Wesen, bestehen müssen). Da nun dieses der Fall der Voraussetzung widerspricht, so bleibt nur der zweite Überig: daß nämlich das substantielle Zusammengesetzte in der Welt aus einfachen Teilen besteh...

schlechtthin ersten Teile aber alles Zusammengesetzten sind einfach. Also nimmt das Einfache einen Raum ein. Da nun alles Reale, was einen Raum einnimmt, ein außerdem ent- ander befindliches Mannigfaltiges in sich fasset, mithin zusammengesetzt ist, und zwar, als ein reales Zusammengesetztes, nicht aus Akzidenzen (denn die können nicht ohne Substanzen außerdem ent- ander sein), mithin aus Substanzen; so würde das Einfache ein substantielles Zusammengesetztes sein; welches sich widerspricht.

Hieraus folgt unmittelbar, daß die Dinge der Welt insgesamt einfache Wesen sein, daß die Zusammensetzung nur ein äußerer Zustand derselben sei, und daß, wenn wir die Elementar-Substanzen gleich niemals völlig aus diesem Zustande der Verbindung setzen und isolieren können, doch die Vernunft sie als die ersten Subjekte aller Komposition, und mithin, vor derselben, als einfache Wesen denken müsse.

1 [Exposition.]

Der zweite Satz der Antithesis, daß in der Welt gar nichts Einfaches existiere, soll hier nur so viel bedeuten, als: Es könne das Dasein des schlechtthin Einfachen aus keiner Erfahrung oder Wahrnehmung, weder äußerer noch innerer, dargestellt werden, und das schlechtthin Einfache sei also eine bloße Idee, deren objektive Realität niemals in irgend einer möglichen Erfahrung kann dargestellt werden, mithin in der Exposition der Erscheinungen ohne alle Anwendung und Gegenstand. Denn wir wollen annehmen, es leide sich für diese transcendente Idee ein Gegenstand der Erfahrung finden: so müßte die empirische Anschauung irgend eines
I. On the Thesis

When I speak of a whole as necessarily made up of simple parts, I am referring only to a substantial whole that is composite in the strict sense of the term 'composite', that is, to that accidental unity of the manifold which, given as separate (at least in thought), is brought into a mutual connection, and thereby constitutes a unity. Space should properly be called not *compositum* but *totum*, since its parts are possible only in the whole, not the whole through the parts. It might, indeed, be called a *compositum ideale*, but not *reale*. This, however, is a mere subtility. Since space is not a composite made up of substances (nor even of real accidents), if I remove all compositeness from it, nothing remains, not even the point. For a point is possible only as the limit of a space, and so of a composite. Space and time do not, therefore, consist of simple parts. What belongs only to the state of a substance, even though it has a magnitude, e.g. alteration, does not consist of the simple;

II. On the Antithesis

Against the doctrine of the infinite divisibility of matter, the proof of which is purely mathematical, objections have been raised by the monadists. These objections, however, at once lay the monadists open to suspicion. For however evident mathematical proofs may be, they decline to recognise that the proofs are based upon insight into the constitution of space, in so far as space is in actual fact the formal condition of the possibility of all matter. They regard them merely as inferences from abstract but arbitrary concepts, and so as not being applicable to real things. How can it be possible to invent a different kind of intuition from that given in the original intuition of space, and how can the *a priori* determinations of space fail to be directly applicable to what is only possible in so far as it fills this space? Were we to give heed to them, then beside the mathematical point, which, while simple, is not a part but only the limit of a space, we should have to conceive physical points as being likewise

---

1. *A priori*. [B 465 | A 439]
2. As eines Mannigfaltigen auf die gleiche Unmöglicheit ein solcher in irgendeiner Anschauung desselben Objektes. [B 469 | A 439]
that is to say, a certain degree of alteration does not come about through the accretion of many simple alterations. Our inference from the composite to the simple applies only to self-subsisting things. Accidents of the state [of a thing] are not self-subsisting. Thus the proof of the necessity of the simple, as the constitutive parts of the substantially composite, can easily be upset (and therewith the thesis as a whole), if it be extended too far and in the absence of a limiting qualification be made to apply to everything composite—as has frequently happened.

Moreover I am here speaking only of the simple in so far as it is necessarily given in the composite—the latter being resolvable into the simple, as its constituent parts. The word monas, in the strict sense in which it is employed by Leibniz, should refer only to the simple which is immediately given as simple substance (e.g. in self-consciousness), and not to an element of the composite. This latter is better entitled atomus. As I am seeking to prove the [existence of] simple substances only as elements in the composite, I

änderungen. Unser Schluß vom Zusammengesetzten auf das Einfache gilt nur von für sich selbst bestehenden Dingen. Akzidenzen aber des Zustandes bestehen nicht für sich selbst. Man kann also den Beweis für die Notwendigkeit des Einfachen, als der Bestandteile alles substanziellen Zusammengesetzten, und dadurch überhaupt seine Sache leichtlich verderben, wenn man ihn zu weit ausdehnt und ihn für alles Zusammengesetzte ohne Unterschied geltend machen will, wie es wirklich mehrmalen schon geschehen ist.

Ich rede übrigens hier nur von dem Einfachen, so fern es notwendig im Zusammengesetzten gegeben ist, indem dieses darin, als in seine Bestandteile, aufgelöst werden kann. Die eigentliche Bedeutung des Wortes Monas (nach Leibniz' Gebrauch) sollte wohl nur auf das Einfache geben, welches unmittelbar als einfache Substanz gegeben ist (z.B. im Selbstbewußtsein) und nicht als Element des Zusammengesetzten, welches man besser den

1 [den Atomus. This use of the term as a masculine is peculiar to Kant.]
might entitle the thesis\(^1\) of
the second antinomy, transcendent
tom substantial phaenomenon which, as empirical intuition in space, carries
with it the necessary characteristic that no part of it is
simple, because no part of space is simple. The monadists have, indeed, been suffi-
ciently acute to seek escape from this difficulty by refusing
to treat space as a condition of the possibility of the objects of outer
intuition (bodies), and by taking instead these
and the dynamical relation of substances as the condition of the possibility of space. But
we have a concept of bodies only as appearances; and as such they necessarily presuppose space as the condition of the possibility of all outer appearance. This eva-
sion of the issue is therefore futile, and has already been sufficiently disposed of in the Transcendental Aesthetic.
The argument of the monadists would indeed be valid if bodies were things in them-
selves.

The second dialectical as-
\[A 443\]
\[B 471\]
ertion has this peculiarity, that over against it stands
a dogmatic assertion which is the only one of all the pseudo-rational assertions that undertakes to afford mani-
\[\text{[Reading, with Mellin and Valentin, Thesee or Antithese.]}\]fesct evidence, in an empirical

\[\text{[A dem.} \quad \text{[A: leichtlich dadurch verderbene.} \quad \text{[A: Thesee.}\]

\[\text{[B 458, 471] A: 440, 441}\]
object, of the reality of that which we have been ascribing only to transcendental ideas, namely, the absolute simplicity of substance—I refer to the assertion that the object of inner sense, the ‘I’ which there thinks, is an absolutely simple substance. Without entering upon this question (it has been fully considered above), I need only remark, that if (as happens in the quite bare representation, ‘I’) anything is thought as object only, without the addition of any synthetic determination of its intuition, nothing manifold and no compositeness can be perceived in such a representation. Besides, since the predicates through which I think this object are merely intuitions of inner sense, nothing can there be found which shows a manifold [of elements] external to one another, and therefore real compositeness. Self-consciousness is of such a nature that since the subject which thinks is at the same time its own object, it cannot divide itself, though it can divide the determinations which inhere in it; for in regard to itself every object is absolute unity. Nevertheless, when this subject is viewed outwardly, as

Wirklichkeit dessen, was wir oben bloß zu transcendentalen Ideen rechneten, nämlich die absolute Simplicität der Substanz, augenscheinlich zu beweisen: nämlich daß der Gegenstand des inneren Sinnes, das Ich, was da denkt, eine schlechthin einfache Substanz se[i]ei. Ohne mich hierauf jetzt einzulassen (da es oben ausführlicher erworben ist), so bemerke ich nur: daß, wenn etwas bloß als Gegenstand gedacht wird, ohne irgend eine synthetische Bestimmung seiner Anschauung hinsichtlich zu setzen (wie denn dies durch die ganz nackte Vorstellung: Ich, geschlechts), so könnte freilich nichts Mannigfaltiges und keine Zusammensetzung in einer solchen Vorstellung wahrgenommen werden. Da überdies die Prädikate, wodurch ich diesen Gegenstand denke, bloß Anschauungen des inneren Sinnes sind, so kann darin auch nichts vorkommen, welches im Mannigfaltigen außerhalb einander, mithin reale Zusammensetzung beweise. Es bringt also nur das Selbstbewußtsein es so mit sich, daß, weil das Subjekt, welches denkt, zugleich sein eigenes Objekt ist, es sich selber nicht teilen kann (obgleich die ihm inbegriffenen Bestimmungen); denn in Ansehung seiner selbst ist jeder Gegenstand absolute Einheit. Nichts destoweniger, wenn dieses Subjekt äußerlich, als
THIRD ANTINOMY

an object of intuition, it must exhibit [some sort of] com-
positeness in its appearance; 
and it must always be viewed in this way if we wish to
know whether or not there 
be in it a manifold [of ele-
ments] external to one an-
other.

THE ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

THIRD CONFLICT OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL IDEAS

Thesis
Causality in accordance 
with laws of nature is not the 
only causality from which the 
appearances of the world can 
one and all be derived. To 
explain these appearances it 
is necessary to assume that 
there is also another causality, 
that of freedom.

Proof
Let us assume that there 
is no other causality than that 
in accordance with laws of nature. This being so, every-
thing which takes place pre-
supposes a preceding state 
upon which it inevitably fol-
ows according to a rule. But 
the preceding state must it-
self be something which has 
taken place (having come to 
be in a time in which it 
previously was not); for if it

A 444
B 472

|| DER ANTINOMIE

Dritter Widerstreit

Thesis
Die Kausalität nach Gesetzen der Natur ist nicht die 
einzige, aus welcher die Erscheinungen der Welt insgesamt 
abgeleitet werden können. Es ist noch eine Kausalität durch 
Freiheit zu Erklärung derselben anzunehmen notwendig.

Antithesis
Es ist keine Freiheit, sondern alles in der Welt geschieht 
lediglich nach Gesetzen der Natur.

Beweis
Man nehme an, es gebe keine andere Kausalität, als nach 
Gesetzen der Natur: so setzt alles, was geschieht, einen 
vorigen Zustand voraus, auf den es unausbleiblich nach 
einer Regel folgt. Nun muß aber der vorige Zustand selbst 
einen anderen haben, woraus er kamer. So wird nicht allein 
eine Reihe

Beweis
Setzt: es gebe eine Freiheit im transzendentalen Ver-
stande, als eine besondere Art von Kausalität, nach welcher 
die Begebenheiten der Welt erfolgen könnten, nämlich ein 
Vermögen, einen Zustand, wahrhin sich eine Reihe von Fol-
gen dasselben, schlethim anzuwenden: so wird nicht allein 
eine Reihe

409

had always existed, its consequence also would have always existed, and would not have only just arisen. The causality of the cause through which something takes place is itself, therefore, something that has taken place, which again presupposes, in accordance with the law of nature, a preceding state and its causality, and this in similar manner a still earlier state, and so on. If, therefore, everything takes place solely in accordance with laws of nature, there will always be only a relative\(^1\) and never a first beginning, and consequently no completeness of the series on the side of the causes that arise the one from the other. But the law of nature is just this, that nothing takes place without a cause sufficiently determined \textit{a priori}. The proposition that no causality is possible save in accordance with laws of nature, when taken in unlimited universality, is therefore self-contradictory; and this cannot, therefore, be regarded as the sole kind of causality.

We must, then, assume a causality through which something takes place, the cause of which is not itself deter-

\(^1\) [subalternen]
THIRD ANTINOMY

minded, in accordance with necessary laws, by another cause antecedent to it, that is to say, an absolute spontaneity of the cause, whereby a series of appearances, which proceeds in accordance with laws of nature, begins of itself. This is transcendental freedom, without which, even in the [ordinary] course of nature, the series of appearances on the side of the causes, can never be complete.

noch weiter, durch eine andere vorhergehende Ursache, nach notwendigen Gesetzen bestimmt sei, d. i. eine absolute Spontaneität der Ursachen, eine Reihe von Erscheinungen, die nach Naturgesetzen läuft, von selbst anzu-fangen, mit hin transzendental Freiheit, ohne welche selbst im Laufe der Natur die Reihenfolge der Erscheinungen auf der Seite der Ursachen niemals vollständig ist.
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I. On the Thesis

The transcendental idea of freedom does not by any means constitute the whole content of the psychological concept of that name, which is mainly empirical. The transcendental idea stands only for the absolute spontaneity of an action, as the proper ground of its imputability. This, however, is, for philosophy, the real stumbling-block; for there are insurmountable difficulties in the way of admitting any such type of unconditioned causality. What has always so greatly embarrassed speculative reason in dealing with the question of the freedom of the will, is its strictly transcendental aspect. The problem, properly viewed, is solely this: whether we must admit a power of *spontaneously* beginning a series of successive things or states. How such a power is possible is not a question which requires to be answered in this case, any more than in regard to causality in accordance with the laws of nature. For, [as we have found], we have to remain satisfied with the
a priori knowledge that this latter type of causality must be
presupposed; we are not in the least able to comprehend how
it can be possible that through one existence the existence
of another is determined, and for this reason must be guided
by experience alone. The necessity of a first beginning,
due to freedom, of a series of appearances we have demonstr-
atedly only in so far as it is required to make an origin
of the world conceivable; for all the later following states
can be taken as resulting according
to purely natural laws. But since the power
of spontaneously beginning
a series in time is thereby
proved (though not under-
stood), it is now also per-
missible for us to admit
within the course of the
world different series as cap-
able in their causality of
beginning of themselves, and
so to attribute to their sub-
stances a power of acting
from freedom. And we must
not allow ourselves to be prevented from drawing this
conclusion by a misapprehen-
sion, namely that, as a series
occurring in the world can
have only a relatively first
beginning, being always pre-
ceded in the world by some
other state of things, no
looked for. The possibility of
such an infinite derivation,
without a first member to
which all the rest is merely a
sequel, cannot indeed, in re-
spect of its possibility, be ren-
dered comprehensible. But
if for this reason you refuse
to recognise this enigma in
nature, you will find yourself
compelled to reject many
fundamental synthetic pro-
erties and forces, which as
little admit of comprehension.
The possibility even of altera-
tion itself would have to be
denied. For were you not
assured by experience that
alteration actually occurs,
you would never be able to
excogitate a priori the pos-
sibility of such a ceaseless
sequence of being and not-
being.

Even if a transcendental
power of freedom be allowed,
as supplying a beginning of
happenings in the world, this
power would in any case have
to be outside the world
(though any such assump-
tion that over and above the
sum of all possible intuitions
there exists an object which
cannot be given in any pos-
sible perception, is still a very
bold one). But to ascribe to
substances in the world itself
such a power, can never be
permissible; for, should this

a priori zu erkennen, daß eine
solche vorausgesetzt werden müsse, ob wir gleich die Mög-
llichkeit, wie durch ein gewisses Dasein das Dasein eines
anderen gesetzt werde, auf keine Weise begreifen; und uns
desfalls lediglich an die Erfahrung halten müssen. Nun haben
wir diese Notwendigkeit eines ersten Anfangs einer Reihe von
Erscheinungen aus Freiheit, zwar nur eigentlich in soweit dar-
gesehen, als zur Begreiflichkeit eines Ursprungs der Welt erforder-
liech ist, indessen daß man alle nachfolgende Zustände für
eine Abfolge nach bloßen Naturgesetzen [nehmen kann.
Weil aber dadurch doch einmal das Vermögen, eine Reihe in
der Zeit ganz von selbst anzufangen, bewiesen (obzwar nicht
eingesesehen) ist, so ist es uns nunmehr auch erlaubt, mittendrin
im Laufe der Welt verschiedene Reihen, der Kausalität nach,
von selbst anfangen zu lassen, und den Substanzen derselben
ein Vermögen beizulegen, aus Freiheit zu handeln. Man lasse
sich aber hierbei nicht durch einen Mißverständnis aufhalten:
daß, da nämlich eine sukzessive Reihe in der Welt nur einen
kompensierenden Anfang haben kann, indem doch immer
zustand der Dinge in der Welt vorherrschend, etwa kein ab-
namisch, gesucht werden dürfte. Die Möglichkeit einer sol-
chen unendlichen Abstammung, ohne ein erstes Glied, in
Anzeige dessen alles übrige bloß nachfolgend ist, läßt sich,
seiner Möglichkeit nach, nicht begreiflich machen: Aber
wenn ihr diese Naturrätsel darum wegwerfen wollt, so wer-
det ihr euch genötigt sehen, viel synthetische Grundbe-
schaffenheiten zu verwerfen (Grundkräfte), die ihr eben so
wenig begreifen könnt, [und selbst die Möglichkeit einer
Veränderung überhaupt muß euch außerordentlich. Denn,
wennoch nicht durch Erfahrung fändet, daß sie wirklich ist,
so würdet ihr niemals a priori ersinnen können, wie eine
solche unauflöbare Folge von Sein und Nichtsein mög-
lich sei.
absolute first beginning of a series is possible during the course of the world. For the absolutely first beginning of which we are here speaking is not a beginning in time, but in causality. If, for instance, I at this moment arise from my chair, in complete freedom, without being necessarily determined thereto by the influence of natural causes, a new series, with all its natural consequences in infinitum, has its absolute beginning in this event, although as regards time this event is only the continuation of a preceding series. For this resolution and act of mine do not form part of the succession of purely natural effects, and are not a mere continuation of them. In respect of its happening, natural causes exercise over it no determining influence whatsoever. It does indeed follow upon them, but without arising out of them; and accordingly, in respect of causality though not of time, must be entitled an absolutely first beginning of a series of appearances.

This requirement of reason, that we appeal in the series of natural causes to a first beginning, due to freedom, is amply confirmed when we observe that all the philo-


weil es dann der Zusammenhang nach allgemeinen Gesetzen sich einander notwendig bestimmender Ereignis, den man Natur nennt, und mit ihm das Merkmal empirischer Wahrheit, welches Erfahrung vom Traum unterscheidet, größtenteils verschwindet. Denn es läßt sich, neben einem solchen gesetzlosen Vermögen der Freiheit, kaum mehr Natur denken; weil die Gesetze der letzteren durch die Einfüsse der erstern unaufhörlich abgeändert, und das Spiel der Erscheinungen, welches nach der bloßen Natur regelmäßig und gleichförmig sein würde, dadurch verwirret und unzusammenhängend gemacht wird.

Die Bestätigung von der Bedürfnis der Vernunft, in der Reihe der Naturursachen sich auf einen ersten Anfang aus Freiheit zu berufen, leuchtet daran sehr klar in die Augen.
sophers of antiquity, with the sole exception of the Epicurean School, felt themselves obliged, when explaining cosmical movements, to assume a prime mover, that is, a freely acting cause, which first and of itself began this series of states. They made no attempt to render a first beginning conceivable through nature’s own resources.

**FOURTH CONFLICT OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL IDEAS**

**Thesis**

There belongs to the world, either as its part or as its cause, a being that is absolutely necessary.

**Antithesis**

An absolutely necessary being nowhere exists in the world, nor does it exist outside the world as its cause.

**Proof**

The sensible world, as the sum-total of all appearances, contains a series of alterations. For without such a series even the representation of serial time, as a condition of the possibility of the sensible world, would not be given us. But every alteration stands under its condition, which precedes it in time and renders it possible.

* Time, as the formal condition of the possibility of changes, is indeed objectively prior to them; subjectively, however, in actual consciousness, the representation of time, like every other, is given only in connection with perceptions.

**FOURTH ANTINOMY**

daß (die epikurische Schule ausgenommen) alle Philosophen des Altertums sich gedrungen haben, zur Erklärung der Weltbewegung einen ersten Beweger anzunehmen, d. i. eine freihändigende Ursache, welche diese Reihe von Zuständen auserst und von selbst anfängt. Denn aus bloßer Natur unterfingen sie sich nicht, einen ersten Anfang begründlich zu machen.

**THE ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON**

**DER ANTINOMIE DER TRANSCENDENTALEN IDEEN**

**Thesis**

Zu der Welt gehört etwas, das, entweder als ihr Teil, oder ihre Ursache, ein schlechtthin notwendiges Wesen ist.

**Antithesis**

Es existiert überall kein schlechtthinnotwendiges Wesen, weder in der Welt, noch außer der Welt, als ihre Ursache.

**Proof**

Die Sinnenwelt, als das Ganze aller Erscheinungen, enthält zugleich eine Reihe von Veränderungen. Denn, ohne diese, würde selbst die Vorstellung der Zeitreihe, als einer Bedingung der Möglichkeit der Sinnenwelt, uns nicht gegeben sein. Eine jede Veränderung aber steht unter ihrer Bedingung, die der Zeit nach vorhergeht, und unter welcher

* Die Zeit geht zwar als formale Bedingung der Möglichkeit der Veränderungen vor dieser objektiv vorher, allein subjektiv, und in der Wirklichkeit des Bewußtseins, ist diese Vorstellung doch nur, so wie jede andere, durch Veranlassung der Wahrnehmungen gegeben.

* Akad.-Aug.: dieses.

| B 480, 482 | A 452, 454 |
it necessary. Now every conditioned that is given presupposes, in respect of its existence, a complete series of conditions up to the unconditioned, which alone is absolutely necessary. Alteration thus existing as a consequence of the absolutely necessary, the existence of something absolutely necessary must be granted. But this necessary existence itself belongs to the sensible world. For if it existed outside that world, the series of alterations in the world would derive its beginning from a necessary cause which would not itself belong to the sensible world. This, however, is impossible. For since the beginning of a series in time can be determined only by that which precedes it in time, the highest condition of the beginning of a series of changes must exist in the time when the series as yet was not (for a beginning is an existence preceded by a time in which the thing that begins did not yet exist). Accordingly the causality of the necessary cause of

*The word ‘begin’ is taken in two senses: first as active, signifying that as cause it begins (infinit) a series of states which is its effect; secondly as passive, signifying the causality which begins to operate (infinit) in the cause itself. I reason here from the former to the latter meaning.

---

**[Menge.]**

---

...
FOURTH ANTINOMY

alterations, and therefore the cause itself, must belong to time and so to appearance—time being possible only as the form of appearance. Such causality cannot, therefore, be thought apart from that sum of all appearances which constitutes the world of sense. Something absolutely necessary is therefore contained in the world itself, whether this something be the whole series of alterations in the world or a part of the series.

A 456) Observation on the Fourth Antinomy (B 455)

I. On the Thesis

In proving the existence of a necessary being I ought not, in this connection, to employ any but the cosmological argument, that, namely, which ascends from the conditioned in the [field of] appearance to the unconditioned in concept, this latter being regarded as the necessary condition of the absolute totality of the series. To seek proof of this from the mere idea of a supreme being belongs to another principle of reason, and will have to be treated separately.

The pure cosmological proof, in demonstrating the existence of a necessary being, connection with it), does there exist any absolutely necessary being.

Veränderungen, mithin auch die Ursache selbst, zu der Zeit, mithin zur Erscheinung (an welcher die Zeit allain als deren Form möglich ist), folglich kann sie von der Sinneuwelt, als dem Inbegriff aller Erscheinungen, nicht abgesondert gedeckt werden. Also ist in der Welt selbst etwas Schlecht- hinnotwendiges enthalten (es mag nun dieses die ganze Weltreiche selbst, oder ein Teil derselben sein).

salverbindung) irgend ein schlechtthin notwendiges Wesen.

II. On the Antithesis

The difficulties in the way of asserting the existence of an absolutely necessary highest cause, which we suppose ourselves to meet as we ascend in the series of appearances, cannot be such as arise in connection with mere concepts of the necessary existence of a thing in general. The difficulties are not, therefore, ontological, but must concern the causal connection of a series of appearances for which a condition has to be assumed that is itself unconditioned, and so must be cosmological, and relate to empirical laws. It must be shown that regress in the

|| Anmerkung zur Vierten Antinomie

I. zur Thesis


II. Anmerkung zur Antithesis

Wenn man, beim Aufsteigen in der Reihe der Erscheinungen, wider das Dasein einer schlechtthin notwendigen obersten Ursache, Schwierigkeiten antrifft, so müssen sich diese auch nicht auf blinde Begriffe vom notwendigen Dasein eines Dinges überhaupt gründen, und mithin nicht ontologisch sein, sondern sich aus der Kausalverbindung mit einer Reihe von Erscheinungen, um zu der selben eine Bedingung anzunehmen, die selbst unbedingt ist, hervor finden, folglich kosmologisch und nach empirischen Gesetzen gefolgt sein. Es muß sich nämliche zeigen,

Der reine kosmologische Beweis kann man das Dasein eines notwendigen Wesens nicht anders darum, als daß er es

\[\text{\ldots}\]
has to leave unsettled whether this being is the world itself or a thing distinct from it. To establish the latter view, we should require principles which are no longer cosmological and do not continue in the series of appearances. For we should have to employ concepts of contingent beings in general (viewed as objects of the understanding alone) and a principle which will enable us to connect these, by means of mere concepts, with a necessary being. But all this belongs to a transcendent philosophy; and that we are not yet in a position to discuss.

If we begin our proof cosmologically, resting it upon the series of appearances and the regress therein according to empirical laws of causality, we must not afterwards suddenly deviate from this mode of argument, passing over to something that is not a member of the series. Anything taken as condition must be viewed precisely in the same manner in which we viewed the relation of the conditioned to its condition in the series which is supposed to carry us by continuous advance to the supreme condition. If, then, this relation is a series of causes (in the sensible world) can never terminate in an empirically unconditioned condition, and that the cosmological argument from the contingency of states of the world, as evidenced by their alterations, does not support the assumption of a first and absolutely originate cause of the series.

A strange situation is disclosed in this antimony. From the same ground on which, in the thesis, the existence of an original being was inferred, its non-existence is inferred in the antithesis, and this with equal stringency. We were first assured that a necessary being exists because the whole of past time comprehends the series of all conditions and therefore also the unconditioned (that is, the necessary); we are now assured that there is no necessary being, and precisely for the reason that the whole of past time comprehends the series of all conditions (which therefore are one and all themselves conditioned). The explanation is this. The former argument takes account only of the absolute totality of the series of conditions determining each other in time, zugleich unausgemacht lass, ob dasselbe die Welt selbst, oder ein von ihr unterschiedenes Ding sei. Denn, um das letztere auszumitteln, dazu werden Grundätze erfordert, die nicht mehr kosmologisch sind, und nicht in der Reihe der Erscheinungen fortgehen, sondern Begriffe von außerlichen Wesen überhaupt (so fern sie bloß als Gegenstände des Verstandes erwogen werden), und ein Prinzip, welche mit einem notwendigen Wesen, durch bloße Begriffe, zu verknüpfen, welches alles für eine transcendentale Philosophie gehört, für welche hier noch nicht der Platz ist.

Wenn man aber einmal den Beweis kosmologisch anfängt, indem man die Reihe von Erscheinungen, und den Regressus in derselben nach empirischen Gesetzen der Kausalität, zum Grunde legt: so kann man nachher davon nicht abspringen und auf etwas übergehen, was gar nicht in die Reihe als ein Glied gehört. Denn 'in eben derselben'bed Bedeutung muß etwas als Bedingung angesehen werden, in welcher die Relation des Bedingten zu seiner Bedingung in der Reihe genommen wurde, die auf diese höchste Bedingung in kontinuierlichem Fortschritte führen sollte. Ist nun die-

Es zeigt sich aber in dieser Antinomie ein seltsamer Kontrast: daß nämlich aus eben derselben Beweisgründe, woraus in der Thesis das Dasein eines Ursagens geschlossen wurde, in der Antithesis das Nichtsein derselben, und zwar mit derselben Schärfe, geschlossen wird. Erst hieß es: es ist ein notwendiges Wesen, weil die ganze vergangene Zeit die Reihe aller Bedingungen und hiermit also auch das Unbedingte (Notwendige) in sich faßt. Nun heißt es: es ist kein notwendiges Wesen, eben darum, weil die ganze vergangene Zeit die Reihe aller Bedingungen (die mithin insgesamt wiederum bedingt sind) in sich faßt. Die Ursache hiervon ist diese. Das erste Argument sieht nur auf die absolute Totalität der Reihe der Bedingungen, deren eine die andere in der Zeit bestimmt,
sensible and falls within the province of the possible empirical employment of understanding, the highest condition or cause can bring the regress to a close only in accordance with the laws of sensibility, and therefore only in so far as it itself belongs to the temporal series. The necessary being must therefore be regarded as the highest member of the cosmical series.

Nevertheless certain thinkers have allowed themselves the liberty of making such a saltus (μεταβάσις εἰς ἄλλο γένος). From the alterations in the world they have inferred their empirical contingency, that is, their dependence on empirically determining causes, and so have obtained an ascending series of empirical conditions. And so far they were entirely in the right. But since they could not find in such a series any first beginning, or any highest member, they passed suddenly from the empirical concept of contingency, and laid hold upon the pure category, which then gave rise to a strictly intelligible series the completeness of which rested on the existence of an absolutely necessary cause. Since this cause

sensible and falls within the province of the possible empirical employment of understanding, the highest condition or cause can bring the regres to a close only in accordance with the laws of sensibility, and therefore only in so far as it itself belongs to the temporal series. The necessary being must therefore be regarded as the highest member of the cosmical series.

Nevertheless certain thinkers have allowed themselves the liberty of making such a saltus (μεταβάσις εἰς ἄλλο γένος). From the alterations in the world they have inferred their empirical contingency, that is, their dependence on empirically determining causes, and so have obtained an ascending series of empirical conditions. And so far they were entirely in the right. But since they could not find in such a series any first beginning, or any highest member, they passed suddenly from the empirical concept of contingency, and laid hold upon the pure category, which then gave rise to a strictly intelligible series the completeness of which rested on the existence of an absolutely necessary cause. Since this cause...
was not bound down to any sensible conditions, it was freed from the temporal condition which would require that its causality should itself have a beginning. But such procedure is entirely illegitimate, as may be gathered from what follows.

In the strict meaning of the category, the contingent is so named because its contradictory opposite is possible. Now we cannot argue from empirical contingency to intelligible contingency. When anything is altered, the opposite of its state is actual at another time, and is therefore possible. This present state is not, however, the contradictory opposite of the preceding state. To obtain such a contradictory opposite we require to conceive, that in the same time in which the preceding state was, its opposite could have existed in its place, and this can never be inferred from [the fact of] the alteration. A body which was in motion (−A) comes to rest (−non-A). Now from the fact that a state opposite to the state A follows upon the state A, we cannot argue that the contradictory opposite of A is possible, and that A is therefore contingent. To prove such a mehr, da sie an keine sinnliche Bedingungen gebunden war, auch, von der Zeitbedingung, ihre Kausalität selbst anzu-

tagen, befreit wurde. Dieses Verfahren ist aber ganz wahr-

errechtlich, wie man aus Folgendem schließen kann.

beständig dieselbe Seite zukehrt. Beide Schlüsse waren rach-

tig, nachdem man den Standpunkt nahm, aus dem man die Mondbewegung beobachten wollte.
conclusion, it would have to be shown that in place of the motion, and at the time at which it occurred, there could have been rest. All that we know is that rest was real in the time that followed upon the motion, and was therefore likewise possible. Motion at one time and rest at another time are not related as contradictory opposites. Accordingly the succession of opposite determinations, that is, alteration, in no way establishes contingency of the type represented in the concepts of pure understanding; and cannot therefore carry us to the existence of a necessary being, similarly conceived in purely intelligible terms. Alteration proves only empirical contingency; that is, that the new state, in the absence of a cause which belongs to the preceding time, could never of itself have taken place. Such is the condition prescribed by the law of causality. This cause, even if it be viewed as absolutely necessary, must be such as can be thus met with in time, and must belong to the series of appearances.

daß in derselben Zeit, als die Bewegung war, anstatt der- selben die Ruhe habe sein können. Nun wissen wir nichts weiter, als daß die Ruhe in der folgenden Zeit wirklich, mit- hin auch möglich war. Bewegung aber zu einer Zeit, und Ruhe zu einer andern Zeit, sind einander nicht kontradik- torisch entgegengesetzt. Also beweist die Sukzession ent- gegengesetzter Bestimmungen, d. i. die Veränderung, kei- neswegs die Zufälligkeit nach Begriffen des reinen Verstan- des, und kann also auch nicht auf das Dasein eines notwen- digen Wesens, nach reinen Verstehensbegriffen, führen. Die Veränderung beweist nur die empirische Zufälligkeit, d. i. daß der neue Zustand für sich selbst, ohne eine Ursache, die zur vorigen Zeit gehört, gar nicht hätte stattfinden können, zu Folge dem Gesetze der Kausalität. Diese Ursache, und wenn sie auch als schlechthin notwendig angenommen wird, muß auf diese Art doch in der Zeit angetroffen werden, und zur Reihe der Erscheinungen gehören.
THE ANTIMONY OF PURE REASON

Section 3

THE INTEREST OF REASON IN THESE CONFLICTS

We have now completely before us the dialectic play of cosmological ideas. The ideas are such that an object congruent with them can never be given in any possible experience, and that even in thought reason is unable to bring them into harmony with the universal laws of nature. Yet they are not arbitrarily conceived. Reason, in the continuous advance of empirical synthesis, is necessarily led up to them whenever it endeavours to free from all conditions and apprehend in its unconditioned totality that which according to the rules of experience can never be determined save as conditioned. These pseudo-rational assertions are so many attempts to solve four natural and unavoidable problems of reason. There are just so many, neither more nor fewer, owing to the fact that there are just four series of synthetic presuppositions which impose a priori limitations on the empirical synthesis.

The proud pretensions of reason, when it strives to extend its domain beyond all limits of experience, we have represented only in dry formulas that contain merely the ground of their legal claims. As befits a transcendental philosophy, they have been divested of all empirical features, although only in connection therewith can their full splendour be displayed. But in this empirical application, and in the progressive extension of the employment of reason, philosophy, beginning with the field of our experiences and steadily soaring to these lofty ideas, displays a dignity and worth such that, could it but make good its pretensions, it would leave all other human science far behind. For it promises a secure foundation for our highest expectations in respect of those ultimate ends towards which all the endeavours of reason must ultimately converge. Whether the world has a beginning [in time] and any limit to its extension in space; whether there is anywhere, and perhaps in my thinking self, an indivisible and indestructible unity, or nothing but what is divisible and transitory; whether I am free in my actions or, like other beings, am led by the hand of
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nature and of fate; whether finally there is a supreme cause of the world, or whether the things of nature and their order must as the ultimate object terminate thought—an object that even in our speculations can never be transcended: these are questions for the solution of which the mathematician would gladly exchange the whole of his science. For mathematics can yield no satisfaction in regard to those highest ends that most closely concern humanity. And yet the very dignity of mathematics (that pride of human reason) rests upon this, that it guides reason to knowledge of nature in its order and regularity—alike in what is great in it and in what is small—and in the extraordinary unity of its moving forces, thus rising to a degree of insight far beyond what any philosophy based on ordinary experience would lead us to expect; and so gives occasion and encouragement to an employment of reason that is extended beyond all experience, and at the same time supplies it with the most excellent materials for supporting its investigations—so far as the character of these permits—by appropriate intuitions.

Unfortunately for speculation, though fortunately perhaps for the practical interests of humanity, reason, in the midst of its highest expectations, finds itself so compromised by the conflict of opposing arguments, that neither its honour nor its security allows it to withdraw and treat the quarrel with indifference as a mere mock fight; and still less is it in a position to command peace, being itself directly interested in the matters in dispute. Accordingly, nothing remains for reason save to consider whether the origin of this conflict, whereby it is divided against itself, may not have arisen from a mere misunderstanding. In such an enquiry both parties, perchance, may have to sacrifice proud claims; but a lasting and peaceful reign 1 of reason over understanding and the senses would thereby be inaugurated.

For the present we shall defer this thorough enquiry, in order first of all to consider upon which side we should prefer to fight, should we be compelled to make choice between the opposing parties. The raising of this question, how we should proceed if we consulted only our interest and not the logical criterion of truth, will decide nothing in regard to

1 [Regiment.]


Unglücklicher Weise für die Spekulation (vielleicht aber zum Glück für die praktische Bestimmung des Menschen) sieht sich die Vernunft, mitten unter ihren größten Erwartungen, in einem Gedränge von Gründen und Gegen- gründen so befangen, daß, da es sowohl ihrer Ehre, als auch sogar ihrer Sicherheit wegen nicht tunlich ist, sich zurück zu ziehen, und diesem Zwist als einem bloßen Spießgefechte gleichgültig zuzusehen, noch weniger schlechthin Friede zu gebieten, weil der Gegenstand des Streits sehr interessiert, ihm nichts weiter übrig bleibt, als über den Ursprung dieser Verunreinigung der Vernunft mit sich selbst nachzuzeichnen, ob nicht etwa ein bloßer Mißverständnis daran schuld sei, nach dessen Erörterung zwar | 1 beiderseits stolze Ansprüche vielleicht wegzufallen, aber dafür ein dauerhaft ruhiges Regiment der Vernunft über Verstand und Sinnein Anfang nehmen würde.

Wir wollen vorerst diese gründliche Erörterung noch etwas aussetzen, und zuvor in Erwägung ziehen: auf welche Seite wir uns wohl am liebsten schlagen möchten, wenn wir etwa genötigt würden, Partei zu nehmen. Da wir, in diesem Falle, nicht den logischen Probierstein der Wahrheit, sondern bloß unser Interesse befragen, so wird eine solche Untersuchung, ob sie gleich in Ansehung des streitigen 2

2 A: streitigem.
the contested rights of the two parties, but has this advantage, that it enables us to comprehend why the participants in this quarrel, though not influenced by any superior insight into the matter under dispute, have preferred to fight on one side rather than on the other. It will also cast light on a number of incidental points, for instance, the passionate zeal of the one party and the calm assurance of the other; and will explain why the world hails the one with eager approval, and is implacably prejudiced against the other.

Comparison of the principles which form the starting-points of the two parties is what enables us, as we shall find, to determine the standpoint from which alone this preliminary enquiry can be carried out with the required thoroughness. In the assertions of the antithesis we observe a perfect uniformity in manner of thinking and complete unity of maxims, namely a principle of pure empiricism, applied not only in explanation of the appearances within the world, but also in the solution of the transcendental ideas of the world itself, in its totality. The assertions of the thesis, on the other hand, presuppose, in addition to the empirical mode of explanation employed within the series of appearances, intelligible beginnings; and to this extent its maxim is complex. But as its essential and distinguishing characteristic is the presupposition of intelligible beginnings, I shall entitle it the dogmatism of pure reason.

In the determination of the cosmological ideas, we find on the side of dogmatism, that is, of the thesis:

First, a certain practical interest in which every well-disposed man, if he has understanding of what truly concerns him, heartily shares. That the world has a beginning, that my thinking self is of simple and therefore indestructible nature, that it is free in its voluntary actions and raised above the compulsion of nature, and finally that all order in the things constituting the world is due to a primordial being, from which everything derives its unity and purposive connection—these are so many foundation stones of morals and religion. The antithesis robs us of all these supports, or at least appears to do so.

Secondly, reason has a speculative interest on the side of...
the thesis. When the transcendental ideas are postulated and employed in the manner prescribed by the thesis, the entire chain of conditions and the derivation of the conditioned can be grasped completely a priori. For we then start from the unconditioned. This is not done by the antithesis, which for this reason is at a very serious disadvantage. To the question as to the conditions of its synthesis it can give no answer which does not lead to the endless renewal of the same enquiry. According to the antithesis, every given beginning compels us to advance to one still higher, every part leads to a still smaller part; every event is preceded by another event as its cause; and the conditions of existence in general rest always again upon other conditions, without ever obtaining unconditioned footing and support in any self-subsistent thing, viewed as primordial being.

Thirdly, the thesis has also the advantage of popularity; and this certainly forms no small part of its claim to favour. The common understanding finds not the least difficulty in the idea of the unconditioned beginning of all synthesis. Being more accustomed to descend to consequences than to ascend to grounds, it does not puzzle over the possibility of the absolutely first; on the contrary, it finds comfort in such concepts, and at the same time a fixed point to which the thread by which it guides its movements can be attached. In the restless ascent from the conditioned to the condition, always with one foot in the air, there can be no satisfaction.

In the determination of the cosmological ideas, we find on the side of empiricism, that is, of the antithesis: first, no such practical interest (due to pure principles of reason) as is provided for the thesis by morals and religion. On the contrary, pure empiricism appears to deprive them of all power and influence. If there is no primordial being distinct from the world, if the world is without beginning and therefore without an Author, if our will is not free, if the soul is divisible and perishable like matter, moral ideas and principles lose all validity, and share in the fate of the transcendental ideas which served as their theoretical support.

But secondly, in compensation, empiricism yields advantages to the speculative interest of reason, which are very

---

1 ['Speculative' means for Kant theoretical, in distinction from the 'practical'.]
attractive and far surpass those which dogmatic teaching bearing on the ideas of reason can offer. According to the principle of empiricism the understanding is always on its own proper ground, namely, the field of genuinely possible experiences, investigating their laws, and by means of these laws affording indefinite extension to the sure and comprehensive knowledge which it supplies. Here every object, both in itself and in its relations, can and ought to be represented in intuition, or at least in concepts for which the corresponding images can be clearly and distinctly provided in given similar intuitions. There is no necessity to leave the chain of the natural order and to resort to ideas, the objects of which are not known, because, as mere thought-entities, they can never be given. Indeed, the understanding is not permitted to leave its proper business, and under the pretence of having brought it to completion to pass over into the sphere of idealising reason and of transcendent concepts—a sphere in which it is no longer necessary for it to observe and investigate in accordance with the laws of nature, but only to think and to invent, in the assurance that it cannot be refuted by the facts of nature, not being bound by the evidence which they yield, but presuming to pass them by or even to subordinate them to a higher authority, namely, that of pure reason.

The empiricist will never allow, therefore, that any epoch of nature is to be taken as the absolutely first, or that any limit of his insight into the extent of nature is to be regarded as the widest possible. Nor does he permit any transition from the objects of nature—which he can analyse through observation and mathematics, and synthetically determine in intuition (the extended)—to those which neither sense nor imagination can ever represent in concreto (the simple). Nor will he admit the legitimacy of assuming in nature itself any power that operates independently of the laws of nature (freedom), and so of encroaching upon the business of the understanding, which is that of investigating, according to necessary rules, the origin of appearances. And, lastly, he will not grant that a cause ought ever to be sought outside nature, in an original being. We know nothing but nature, since it alone can present objects to us and instruct us in regard to their laws.

1 [dichten.]
If the empirical philosopher had no other purpose in pro-
pounding his antithesis than to subdue the rashness and pre-
sumption of those who so far misconstrue the true vocation of
reason as to boast of insight and knowledge just where true in-
sight and knowledge cease, and to represent as furthering specu-
lation interests that which is valid only in relation to practical
interests (in order, as may suit their convenience, to break the
thread of physical enquiries, and then under the pretence of ex-
tending knowledge to fasten it to transcendental ideas, through
which we really know only that we know nothing); if, I say,
the empiricist were satisfied with this, his principle would be
a maxim urging moderation in our pretensions, modesty in
our assertions, and yet at the same time the greatest possible
extension of our understanding, through the teacher fittingly
assigned to us, namely, through experience. If such were our
procedure, we should not be cut off from employing intel-
lectual presuppositions and faith on behalf of our practical
interest; only they could never be permitted to assume the
title and dignity of science and rational insight. Knowledge,
which as such is speculative, can have no other object than
that supplied by experience; if we transcend the limits thus
imposed, the synthesis which seeks, independently of experi-
ence, new species of knowledge, lacks that substratum of
intuition upon which alone it can be exercised.

But when empiricism itself, as frequently happens, be-
comes dogmatic in its attitude towards ideas, and confidently
denies whatever lies beyond the sphere of its intuitive know-
ledge, it betrays the same lack of modesty; and this is all the
more reprehensible owing to the irreparable injury which is
thereby caused to the practical interests of reason.

The contrast between the teaching of Epicurus* and that of
Plato is of this nature.

* It is, however, open to question whether Epicurus ever pro-
pounded these principles as objective assertions. If perhaps they
were for him nothing more than maxims for the speculative employ-
ment of reason, then he showed in this regard a more genuine phi-
osophical spirit than any other of the philosophers of antiquity. That,
in explaining the appearances, we must proceed as if the field of our
enquiry were not circumscribed by any limit or beginning of the
world; that we must assume the material composing the world to
be such as it must be if we are to learn about it from experience;

A: tadelhafter.
Each of the two types of philosophy says more than it knows. Epicurus encourages and furthers knowledge, though to the prejudice of the practical; Plato supplies excellent practical principles, but permits reason to indulge in ideal explanations of natural appearances, in regard to which a speculative knowledge is alone possible to us—to the neglect of physical investigation.

Finally, as regards the third factor which has to be considered in a preliminary choice between the two conflicting parties, it is extremely surprising that empiricism should be so universally unpopular. The common understanding, it might be supposed, would eagerly adopt a programme which promises to satisfy it through exclusively empirical knowledge and the rational connections there revealed—in preference to the transcendental dogmatism which compels it to rise to concepts far outstripping the insight and rational faculties of the most practised thinkers. But this is precisely what commends such dogmatism to the common understanding. For it then finds itself in a position in which the most learned can claim no advantage over it. If it understands little or nothing about these matters, no one can boast of understanding much more; and though in regard to them it cannot express itself in so scholastically correct a manner as those with special training, nevertheless there is no end to the plausible arguments which it can propound, wandering as it does amidst mere ideas, about which no one knows anything, and in regard to which it is therefore free to be as eloquent as it pleases; whereas that we must postulate no other mode of the production of events than one which will enable them to be [regarded as] determined through unalterable laws of nature; and finally that no use must be made of any cause distinct from the world—all these principles still retain their value. They are very sound principles (though seldom observed) for extending the scope of speculative philosophy, while at the same time enabling us to discover the principles of morality without depending for this discovery upon alien [i.e., non-moral, theoretical] sources; and it does not follow in the least that those who require us, so long as we are occupied with mere speculation, to ignore these dogmatic propositions [that there is a limit and beginning to the world, a Divine Cause, etc.], can justly be accused of wishing to deny them.

VON DEM INTERESSE DER VERNUNFT

Ein jeder von beiden sagt mehr als er weiß, doch so, daß der erstere das Wissen, obzwar zum Nachteile des Praktischen, aufmuntert und befördert, der zweite zwar zum Praktischen vortreffliche Prinzipien an die Hand gibt, aber eben dadurch in Ansehung alles dessen, worin uns allein ein spekulatives Wissen vergönnet ist, der Vernunft erlaubt, idealischen Erklärungen der Naturerscheinungen nachzuhängen und darüber die physische Nachforschung zu verabsäumen.

Was endlich das dritte Moment, worauf bei der völ- ligen Wahl zwischen beiden streitigen Teilen gesehen werden kann, anlangt: so ist es überaus befremdlich, daß der Empirismus aller Popularität gänzlich zuwider ist, ob man gleich glauben sollte, der gemeine Verstand werde einen Entwurf begierig aufnehmen, der ihn durch nichts als Erfahrungserkenntnisse und deren vernunftmäßigen Zusammenhang zu befriedigen verspricht; anstatt daß die transzendentale Dogmatik ihn aß, zu Begriffen hinauf- zusteigen, welche die Einsicht und das Vernunftvermögen der im Denken geübtesten Köpfe weit übersteigen: aber eben dieses ist sein Bewegungsgrund. Denn er befindet sich alsdenn in einem Zustande, in welchem sich auch der Gelehrte über ihn nichts herausnehmen kann. Wenn er wenig oder nichts davon versteht, so kann sich doch auch niemand rühmen, viel mehr davon zu verstehen, und, ob er gleich hierüber nicht so schulgerecht als andere sprechen kann, so kann er doch darüber unendlich mehr vermüfeln, weil er unterlauter Ideen herumwandelt, über die man eben darum am beherzten ist, weil...
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when matters that involve the investigation of nature are in question, it has to stand silent and to admit its ignorance. Thus
indolence and vanity combine in sturdy support of these prin-
ciples. Besides, although the philosopher finds it extremely
hard to accept a principle for which he can give no justifica-
tion, still more to employ concepts the objective reality of
which he is unable to establish, nothing is more usual in the case of
the common understanding. It insists upon having something
from which it can make a confident start. The difficulty of even
conceiving this presupposed starting-point does not disquiet
it. Since it is unaware what conceiving really means, it never
occurs to it to reflect upon the asumption; it accepts as known
whatever is familiar to it through frequent use. For the
common understanding, indeed, all speculative interests pale
before the practical; and it imagines that it comprehends and
knows what its fears or hopes induce it to assume or to believe.
Thus empiricism is entirely devoid of the popularity of tran-
scendental idealising reason; and however prejudicial such empiricism may be to the highest practical principles, there is
no need to fear that it will ever pass the limits of the Schools,
and acquire any considerable influence in the general life or
any real favour among the multitude.

Human reason is by nature architectonic. That is to say, it
regards all our knowledge as belonging to a possible system,
and therefore allows only such principles as do not at any rate
make it impossible for any knowledge that we may attain to
combine into a system with other knowledge. But the proposi-
tions of the antithesis are of such a kind that they render the
completion of the edifice of knowledge quite impossible. They
maintain that there is always to be found beyond every state
of the world a more ancient state, in every part yet other parts
similarly divisible, prior to every event still another event
which itself again is likewise generated, and that in existence
in general everything is conditioned, an unconditioned and
first existence being nowhere discernible. Since, therefore,
the antithesis thus refuses to admit as first or as a beginning
anything that could serve as a foundation for building, a

1 [Reading, with Erdmann, aller Popularität der transcendental-idealisi-
serenden Vernunft; des der transcendental-idealisierenden aller Popularität.]

2 [Reading, with Mellin, er . . . er for sie . . . sie.]
complete edifice of knowledge is, on such assumptions, altogether impossible. Thus the architectonic interest of reason—the demand not for empirical but for pure a priori unity of reason—forms a natural recommendation for the assertions of the thesis.

If men could free themselves from all such interests, and consider the assertions of reason irrespective of their consequences, solely in view of the intrinsic force of their grounds, and were the only way of escape from their perplexities to give adhesion to one or other of the opposing parties, their state would be one of continuous vacillation. To-day it would be their conviction that the human will is free; to-morrow, dwelling in reflection upon the indissoluble chain of nature, they would hold that freedom is nothing but self-deception, that everything is simply nature. If, however, they were summoned to action, this play of the merely speculative reason would, like a dream, at once cease, and they would choose their principles exclusively in accordance with practical interests. Since, however, it is fitting that a reflective and enquiring being should devote a certain amount of time to the examination of his own reason, entirely divesting himself of all partiality and openly submitting his observations to the judgment of others, no one can be blamed for, much less prohibited from, presenting for trial the two opposing parties, leaving them, terrorised by no threats, to defend themselves as best they can, before a jury of like standing with themselves, that is, before a jury of fallible men.

THE ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

Section 4

THE ABSOLUTE NECESSITY OF A SOLUTION OF THE TRANSCENDENTAL PROBLEMS OF PURE REASON

To profess to solve all problems and to answer all questions would be impudent boasting, and would argue such extravagant self-conceit as at once to forfeit all confidence. Nevertheless there are sciences the very nature of which requires that every question arising within their domain should be com-

VON DEM INTERESE DER VERNUNFT

DIGES GEBÄUDE DER ERKENNTNIS, BEI DERSELBEN VORAUSSETZUNGEN, GÄNZLICH UNMÖGLICH. DÄHRE FÜHRT DAS ARCHITEKTONISCHE INTERESSE DER VERNUNFT (WELCHES NICHT-EMPIRISCHE, SONDERN REINE VERNUNFEINHEIT: A PRIORI FORDERT) EINE NATÜRLICHE EMPFEHLUNG FÜR DIE BEHAUPTUNGEN DER THESIS BEI SICH.

KONNTE SICH ABER EIN MENSCH VON ALLEM INTERESSE LOSSEN, UND DIE BEHAUPTUNGEN DER VERNUNFT, GLEICHGÜLTIG GEGEN ALLE FOLGEN, BLOß NACH DEM GEBÄUDE IHRE-GRUNDE IN BETRACHTUNG ZIEHEN: SO WÜRDE EIN SOLCHER, GESETZ DAFER KEINEN AUSWEG WÜRFTE, ANDERS ALS DAS LEGO- GESetz, ALS DAS ER SICH ZU EINER ODER Anderen DER STRITEN1 LEHREN BEKENNETE, IN EINEM UNAUSFÜHRLICH SCHWANKENDEN Zustande sein. HEUTE WURDE ES EHM ÜBERZEUGEND VORKom MEN, DER MENSCHLICHE WILLE SEI FREI, MORGEN, WENN ER DIE UNAUSFÜHRLICHE NATURKETTE IN BETRACHTUNG ZÖGE, WURDE ER DAFÜR HALTEN, DIE FREIHEIT SEI NICHTS ALS SELBSTTÄUSCHUNG, UND ALLES SEI BLOß NATUR. Wenn es nun aber zum Tun und Handeln käme, so würde dieses Spiel der bloß spekulativen Vernunft, wie Schattenbilder eines Traums, verschwinden, und es würde seine Prinzipien bloß nach dem praktischen Interesse wählen. WEIL ES aber doch einem nachdenkenden und forschenden Wesen anständig ist, gewisse Zeiten lediglich der Prüfung seiner eigenen Vernunft zu widmen, hiebei aber alle Parteilichkeit gänzlich auszusehnen, und so seine Bemerkungen anderen zur Beurteilung öffentlich mitzuteilen: so kann es niemanden verarzten, noch weniger verwirrt werden, die Sätze und | Gegensätze, so wie sie sich, durch keine Drohung geschreckt, vor Geschworenen von seinem eigenen Stande (nämlich dem Stande schwacher Menschen) verteidigen können, auftreten zu lassen.

DER ANTINOMIE DER REINEN VERNUNFT VIERTER ABSCHNITT

VON DEN TRANSCENDENTALÄN AUFGABEN DER REINEN VERNUNFT,
IN SO FERN SIE SCHLECHTERDINGS MÜSSEN AUFGELOSET WERDEN KöNNEN

Alle Aufgaben auflösen und alle Fragen beantworten zu wollen, würde eine unverschämte Großsprecherei und ein so ausschweifender Eigendünkel sein, daß man dadurch sich so fort um alles Zutrauen bringen müßte. Gleichwohl gibt es Wissenschaften, deren Natur es so mit sich bringt, daß eine jede darin vorkommende Frage, aus dem, was man

1 As: streiten.
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pletelley answerable in terms of what is known, inasmuch as the answer must issue from the same sources from which the question proceeds. In these sciences it is not permissible to plead unavoidable ignorance; the solution can be demanded. We must be able, in every possible case, in accordance with a rule, to know what is right and what is wrong, since this concerns our obligation, and we have no obligation to that which we cannot know. In the explanation of natural appearances, on the other hand, much must remain uncertain and many questions insoluble, because what we know of nature is by no means sufficient, in all cases, to account for what has to be explained. The question, therefore, is whether in transcendental philosophy there is any question relating to an object presented to pure reason which is unanswerable by this reason, and whether we may rightly excuse ourselves from giving a decisive answer. In thus excusing ourselves, we should have to show that any knowledge which we can acquire still leaves us in complete uncertainty as to what should be ascribed to the object, and that while we do indeed have a concept sufficient to raise a question, we are entirely lacking in materials or power to answer the same.

Now | maintain that transcendental philosophy is unique in the whole field of speculative knowledge, in that no question which concerns an object given to pure reason can be insoluble for this same human reason, and that no excuse of an unavoidable ignorance, or of the problem's unfathomable depth, can release us from the obligation to answer it thoroughly and completely. That very concept which puts us in a position to ask the question must also qualify us to answer it, since, as in the case of right and wrong, the object is not to be met with outside the concept.

In transcendental philosophy, however, the only questions to which we have the right to demand a sufficient answer bearing on the constitution of the object, and from answering which the philosopher is not permitted to excuse himself on the plea of their impenetrable obscurity, are the cosmological. These questions [bearing on the constitution of the object] must refer exclusively to cosmological ideas. For the object must be given empirically, the question being only as to its conformity to an idea. If, on the other hand, the object is

VON DEN TRANSCENDENTALEN VERNUNFTAUFgaben 451

weiβ, schlecht hin beantwortlich sein muß, weil die Antwort aus denselben Quellen entspringen muß, daraus die Frage entspringt, und wo es keinesweges erlaubt ist, unvermeidliche Unwissenheit vorzuschützen, sondern die Auflösung gefordert werden kann. Was in allen möglichen Fällen Recht oder Unrecht sei, muß man der Regel nach wissen können, weil es unsere Verbindlichkeit betrifft, und wir zu dem, was wir nicht wissen können, auch keine Verbindlichkeit haben. In der Erklärung der Erscheinungen der Natur muß uns indessen viel ungewiß und manche Frage unauflässlich bleiben, weil das, was wir von der Natur wissen, zu dem, was wir erklären sollen, bei weitem nicht in allen Fällen zureichend ist. Es frägt sich nun: ob in der Transzendentalphilosophie irgend eine Frage, die ein der Vernunft vorgelegtes Objekt betrifft, durch eine solche rein Vernünft unbeantwortlich sei, und ob man sich ihrer entscheidenden Beantwortung durch Recht entziehen könne, daß man es als schlecht ungewiß (aus allem dem, was wir erkennen können) demjenigen beizählt, wovon wir zwar so viel Begriff haben, um eine Frage aufzuwerfen, es sei aber gänzlich an Mitteln oder am Vermögen fehlt: sie jemals zu beantworten.

Ich behaupte nun, daß die Transzendentalphilosophie unter allem spekulativen Erkenntnis dieses Eigentümliche habe: daß gar keine Frage, welche einem der reinen Vernunft gegebenen Gegenstand betrifft, für eben dieselbe menschliche Vernunft unauflässlich sei, und daß keine Verhinderung einer unvermeidlichen Unwissenheit und unergründlichen Tiefe der Aufgabe von der Verbindlichkeit frei sprechen könne, sie gründlich und vollständig zu beantworten, weil eben derselbe Begriff, der uns in den Stand setzt zu fragen, durchaus uns auch tüchtig machen muß, auf diese Frage zu antworten, indem der Gegenstand außer dem Be- griffe gar nicht angetroffen wird (wie bei Recht und Unrecht).

Es sind aber in der Transzendentalphilosophie keine anderen als nur die kosmologischen Fragen, in Ansehung deren man mit Recht eine genugende Antwort, die die Beschaffenheit des Gegenstandes betrifft, fordern kann, ohne daß dem Philosophen erlaubt ist, sich derselben dadurch zu entziehen, daß er undurchdringliche Dunkelheit vorschützt, und diese Fragen können nur kosmologische Ideen betref- fen. Denn der Gegenstand muß empirisch gegeben sein, und die Frage geht nur auf die Angemessenheit derselben mit einer Idee. Ist der Gegenstand transzendental und also
transcendental, and therefore itself unknown; if, for instance, the question be whether that something, the appearance of which (in ourselves) is thought (soul), is in itself a simple being, whether there is an absolutely necessary cause of all things, and so forth, what we have then to do is in each case to seek an object for our idea; and we may well confess that this object is unknown to us, though not therefore impossible. The cosmological ideas alone have the peculiarity that they can presuppose their object, and the empirical synthesis required for its concept, as being given. The question which arises out of these ideas refers only to the advance in this synthesis, that is, whether it should be carried so far as to contain absolute totality—such totality, since it cannot be given in any experience, being no longer empirical. Since we are here dealing solely with a thing as object of a possible experience, not as a thing in itself, the answer to the transcendent cosmological question cannot lie anywhere save in the idea. We are not asking what is the constitution of any object in itself, nor as regards possible experience are we enquiring what can be given in concreto in any experience. Our sole question is as to what lies in the idea, to which the empirical synthesis can do no more than merely approximate; the question must therefore be capable of being solved entirely from the idea. Since the idea is a mere creature of reason, reason cannot disclaim its responsibility and saddle it upon the unknown object.

Although to the question, what is the constitution of a transcendental object, no answer can be given stating what it is, we can yet reply that the question itself is nothing, because there is no given object [corresponding] to it. Accordingly all questions dealt with in the transcendent doctrine of the soul are answerable in this latter manner, and have indeed been so answered; its questions refer to the transcendent subject of all inner appearances, which is not itself appearance and consequently not given as object, and in which none of the categories (and it is to them that the question is really directed) meet with the conditions required for their application. We have here a case where the common saying holds, that no answer is itself an answer. A question as to the constitution of that something which cannot be thought through any determinate predicate—inasmuch as it is completely outside the sphere of those objects which can be given to us—is entirely null and void.

Man kann zwar auf die Frage, was ein transzendentaler Gegenstand für eine Beschaffenheit habe, keine Antwort geben; nämlich was es sei; aber wohl, daß die Frage selbst nicht selbster, darum, weil kein Gegenstand derselben gegeben worden, daher sind alle Fragen der transzendentalen Seelenlehre auch beantwortlich und wirklich beantwortet, denn sie betreffen das trasc. Subjekt aller inneren Erscheinungen, welches selbst nicht Erscheinung ist und also nicht ein Gegenstand gegeben ist, und worauf keine der Kategorien (auf welche doch eigentlich die Frage gestellt ist) Bedingungen ihrer Anwendung an treffen. Also ist hier der Fall, da der gemeine Ausdruck gilt, daß keine Antwort auch eine Antwort sei, nämlich daß eine Frage nach der Beschaffenheit desjenigen Etwas, was durch kein bestimmtes Prädikat gedacht werden kann, weil es gänzlich außer der Sphäre der Gegenstände gesetzt wird, die uns gegeben werden können, gänzlich nichtig und leer sei.

A: *so wird.*
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It is not so extraordinary as at first seems the case, that a science should be in a position to demand and expect none but assured answers to all the questions within its domain (quaestiones domesticae), although up to the present they have perhaps not been found. In addition to transcendental philosophy, there are two pure rational sciences, one purely speculative, the other with a practical content, namely, pure mathematics and pure ethics. Has it ever been suggested that, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it must remain uncertain what exact relation, in rational or irrational numbers, a diameter bears to a circle? Since no adequate solution in terms of rational numbers is possible, and no solution in terms of irrational numbers has yet been discovered, it was concluded that at least the impossibility of a solution can be known with certainty, and of this impossibility Lambert\(^1\) has given the required proof. In the universal principles of morals nothing can be uncertain, because the principles are either altogether void and meaningless, or must be derived from the concepts of our reason. In natural science, on the other hand, there is endless conjecture, and certainty is not to be counted upon. For the natural appearances are objects which are given to us independently of our concepts, and the key to them lies not in us and our pure thinking, but outside us; and therefore in many cases, since the key is not to be found, an assured solution is not to be expected. I am not, of course, here referring to those questions of the Transcendental Analytic which concern the deduction of our pure knowledge; we are at present treating only of the certainty of judgments with respect to their objects and not with respect to the source of our concepts themselves.

The obligation of an at least critical solution of the questions which reason thus propounds to itself, we cannot, therefore, escape by complaints of the narrow limits of our reason, and by confessing, under the pretext of a humility based on self-knowledge, that it is beyond the power of our reason to determine whether the world exists from eternity or has a beginning; whether cosmical space is filled with beings to infinitude,

\(^1\) J. H. Lambert (1728–77). The proof that \( w \) is incommensurable, Lambert communicated, in a memoir on transcendental magnitudes, to the Berlin Academy in 1768.
or is enclosed within certain limits; whether anything in the world is simple, or everything such as to be infinitely divisible; whether there is generation and production through freedom, or whether everything depends on the chain of events in the natural order; and finally whether there exists any being completely unconditioned and necessary in itself, or whether everything is conditioned in its existence and therefore dependent on external things and itself contingent. All these questions refer to an object which can be found nowhere save in our thoughts, namely, to the absolutely unconditioned totality of the synthesis of appearances. If from our own concepts we are unable to assert and determine anything certain, we must not throw the blame upon the object as concealing itself from us. Since such an object is nowhere to be met with outside our idea, it is not possible for it to be given. The cause of failure we must seek in our idea itself. For so long as we obstinately persist in assuming that there is an actual object corresponding to the idea, the problem, as thus viewed, allows of no solution. A clear exposition of the dialectic which lies within our concept itself would soon yield us complete certainty how we ought to judge in reference to such a question.

The pretext that we are unable to obtain certainty in regard to these problems can be at once met with the following question which certainly calls for a clear answer: Whence come those ideas, the solution of which involves us in such difficulty? Is it, perchance, appearances that demand explanation, and do we, in accordance with these ideas, have to seek only the principles or rules of their exposition? Even if we suppose the whole of nature to be spread out before us, and that of all that is presented to our intuition nothing is concealed from our senses and consciousness, yet still through no experience could the object of our ideas be known by us in concreto. For that purpose, in addition to this exhaustive intuition, we should require what is not possible through any empirical knowledge, namely, a completed synthesis and the consciousness of its absolute totality. Accordingly our question does not require to be raised in the explanation of any given appearance, and is therefore not a question which can be regarded as imposed on us by the object itself. The object can never come before us, since it cannot be given through any possible experience. In all
possible perceptions we always remain involved in conditions, whether in space or in time, and come upon nothing unconditioned requiring us to determine whether this unconditioned is to be located in an absolute beginning of synthesis, or in an absolute totality of a series that has no beginning. In its empirical meaning, the term ‘whole’ is always only comparative. The absolute whole of quantity (the universe), the whole of division, of derivation, of the condition of existence in general, with all questions as to whether it is brought about through finite synthesis or through a synthesis requiring infinite extension, have nothing to do with any possible experience. We should not, for instance, in any wise be able to explain the appearances of a body better, or even differently, in assuming that it consisted either of simple or of inexhaustibly composite parts; for neither a simple appearance nor an infinite composition can ever come before us. Appearances demand explanation only so far as the conditions of their explanation are given in perception; but all that may ever be given in this way, when taken together in an absolute whole, is not itself a perception. Yet it is just the explanation of this very whole that is demanded in the transcendental problems of reason.

Thus the solution of these problems can never be found in experience, and this is precisely the reason why we should not say that it is uncertain what should be ascribed to the object [of our idea]. For as our object is only in our brain, and cannot be given outside it, we have only to take care to be at one with ourselves, and to avoid that amphiboly which transforms our idea into a supposed representation of an object that is empirically given and therefore to be known according to the laws of experience. The dogmatic solution is therefore not only uncertain, but impossible. The critical solution, which allows of complete certainty, does not consider the question objectively, but in relation to the foundation of the knowledge upon which the question is based.

4 [Reading, with Mellin, keine for eine.]
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Section 5

Sceptical Representation of the Cosmological Questions in the Four Transcendental Ideas

We should of ourselves desist from the demand that our questions be answered dogmatically, if from the start we understood that whatever the dogmatic answer might turn out to be it would only increase our ignorance, and cast us from one inconceivability into another, from one obscurity into another still greater, and perhaps even into contradictions. If our question is directed simply to a yes or no, we are well advised to leave aside the supposed grounds of the answer, and first consider what we should gain according as the answer is in the affirmative or in the negative. Should we then find that in both cases the outcome is mere nonsense, there will be good reason for instituting a critical examination of our question, to determine whether the question does not itself rest on a groundless presupposition, in that it plays with an idea the falsity of which can be more easily detected through study of its application and consequences than in its own separate representation.

This is the great utility of the sceptical mode of dealing with the questions which pure reason puts to pure reason. By its means we can deliver ourselves, at but a small cost, from a great body of sterile dogmatism, and set in its place a sober critique, which as a true cathartic will effectively guard us against such groundless beliefs and the supposed polythomy to which they lead.

If therefore, in dealing with a cosmological idea, I were able to appreciate beforehand that whatever view may be taken of the unconditioned in the successive synthesis of appearances, it must either be too large or too small for any concept of the understanding, I should be in a position to understand that since the cosmological idea has no bearing save upon an object of experience which has to be in conformity with a possible concept of the understanding, it must be

\[1 \text{[Kant here plays on the double meaning of }} \text{sinnlos, "empty of sense" and "nonsense".} \]

FÜNFTER-ABSCHNITT

SKEPTISCHE VORSTELLUNG DER KOSMOLOGISCHEN FRAGEN DURCH ALLE VIER TRANSZENDENTALE IDEEN

Wir würden von der Forderung, gem. abzustehen, unsere Fragen dogmatisch beantwortet zu sehen, wenn wir schon zum voraus begriffen: die Antwort möchte ausfallen, wie sie wollte, so würde sie unsere Unwissenheit nur noch vermehren, und uns aus einer Unbegreiflichkeit in eine andere, aus einer Dunkelheit in eine noch größere und vielleicht gar in Widersprüche stützen. Wenn unsere Frage bloß auf Bejahung oder Verneinung gestellt ist, so ist es klug, die vermutlichen Gründe der Beantwortung vor der Hand dahin gestaltet sein zu lassen, und zuerst in Erwägung zu ziehen, was man denn gewinnen würde, wenn die Antwort auf die eine, und was, wenn sie auf die andere Seite ausfiele. Trifft es sich nun, daß in beiden Fällen lauter Sinnleeres (Nonsens) herauskommt, so haben wir eine geprüfte Aufforderung, unsere Frage selbst kritisch zu untersuchen, und zu sehen: ob sie nicht selbst auf einer grundlosen Voraussetzung beruht, und mit einer Idee spiele, die ihre Falschheit besser in der Anwendung und durch ihre Folgen, als in der abgesonderten Vorstellung verrät. Das ist der große Nutzen, den die skeptische Art hat, die Fragen zu behandeln, welche reine Vernunft, reine Vernunft tut, und wodurch man eines großen dogmatischen Wustes mit wenig Aufwand überhoben sein kann, um an dessen Statt eine nüchterne Kritik zu setzen, die, als ein wahres Kantitikon, den Wahn, zusamm seinem Gefolge, der Wissenschaft, glücklich abführen wird.

Wenn ich dennoch von einer kosmologischen Idee zum voraus eingeschlossen hätte, daß, auf welche Seite des Unbedingten der regressive Synthese, der Erscheinungen sie sich auch schlug, so würde sie doch für einen jeden Verständissbegriff entweder zu groß oder zu klein sein: so würde ich begreifen, daß, da jene doch es nur mit einem Gegenstand der Erfahrung zu tun hat, welche — einem möglichen Verständissbegriffe angemessen sein soll, sie ganz leer

\[\text{A. sdero.} \; \text{Akad.-Ausz.: sKantitikon.} \; \text{Akad.-Ausz.: welches.}\]
entirely empty and without meaning; for its object, view it as we may, cannot be made to agree with it. This is in fact the case with all cosmical concepts; and this is why reason, so long as it holds to them, is involved in an unavoidable antinomy. For suppose—

First, that the world has no beginning: it is then too large for our concept, which, consisting as it does in a successive regress, can never reach the whole eternity that has elapsed. Or suppose that the world has a beginning, it will then, in the necessary empirical regress, be too small for the concept of the understanding. For since the beginning still presupposes a time which precedes it, it is still not unconditional; and the law of the empirical employment of the understanding therefore obliges us to look for a higher temporal condition; and the world [as limited in time] is therefore obviously too small for this law.

This is also true of the twofold answer to the question regarding the magnitude of the world in space. If it is infinite and unlimited, it is too large for any possible empirical concept. If it is finite and limited, we have a right to ask what determines these limits. Empty space is no self-subsistent correlate of things, and cannot be a condition at which we could stop; still less can it be an empirical condition, forming part of a possible experience. (For how can there be any experience of the absolutely void?) And yet to obtain absolute totality in the empirical synthesis it is always necessary that the unconditioned be an empirical concept. Consequently, a limited world is too small for our concept.

Secondly, if every appearance in space (matter) consists of infinitely many parts, the regress in the division will always be too large for our concept; while if the division of space is to stop at any member of the division (the simple), the regress will be too small for the idea of the unconditioned. For this member always still allows of a regress to further parts contained in it.

Thirdly, if we suppose that nothing happens in the world save in accordance with the laws of nature, the causality of the cause will always itself be something that happens, making necessary a regress to a still higher cause, and thus a continuation of the series of conditions a parte priori without end.

und ohne Bedeutung sein müsse, weil ihr der Gegenstand nicht anpaßt, ich mag ihn derselben bequemen, wie ich will. Und dieses ist wirklich der Fall mit allen Weltbegriffen, welche auch, eben um deswillen, die Vernunft, so lange sie ihnen anhängt, in eine unvermeidliche Antinomie verwirkeln. Denn nehmt

Erstlich an: die Welt habe keinen Anfang, so ist sie für euren Begriff zu groß; denn dieser, welcher in einem sukzessiven Regressus besteht, kann die ganze verflossene Ewigkeit niemals erreichen. Setz tet: sie habe einen Anfang, so ist sie wiederum für euren Verstandesbegriff in dem notwendigen empirischen Regressus zu klein. Denn, weil der Anfang noch immer eine Zeit, die vorhergeht, voraussetzt, so ist er noch nicht unbedingt, und das Gesetz des empirischen Gebräuchs des Verstandes legt es euch auf, noch nach einer höheren Zeitbedingung zu fragen, und die Welt ist also offenbar für dieses Gesetz zu klein.

Ebenso ist es mit der doppelten Beantwortung der Frage, wegen der Weltgröße, dem Raum nach, bewandt. Denn, ist sie unendlich und unbegrenzt, so ist sie für allen möglichen empirischen Begriff zu groß. Ist sie endlich und begrenzt, so fragt ihr mit Recht noch: was bestimmt diese Grenze? Der leere Raum ist nicht ein für sich bestehendes Correlatum der Dinge, und kann keine Bedingung sein, bei der ihr sehen bleibet könnet, noch viel weniger eine empirische Bedingung, die einen Teil einer möglichen Erfahrung ausmacht. (Denn wer kann eine Erfahrung vom Schlechthinleeren haben?) Zur absoluten Totalität aber der empirischen Synthesis wird jederzeit erodert, daß das Unbedingte ein Erfahrungsbegriff sei. Also ist eine begrenzte Welt für euren Begriff zu klein.

Zweitens, besteht jede Erscheinung im Raume (Materie) aus unendlich vielen Teilen, so ist der Regressus der Teilung für euren Begriff jederzeit zu groß; und soll die Teilung des Raumes irgend bei einem Gliede derselben (dem Einfachen) aufhören, so ist er für die Idee des Unbedingten zu klein: Denn dieses | Glied läßt noch immer einen Regressus zumehern in ihm enthaltenen Teilen übrig: Drittens, nehmet ihr an: in allem, was in der Welt geschieht, sei nichts; als Erfolg nach Gesetzen der Natur, so ist die Kausalität der Ursache immer wiederum etwas, das geschieht, und euren Regressus zu noch höherer Ursache, mithin die Verlängerung der Reihe von Bedingungen a parte priori ohne Aufhören notwendig macht. Die bleibe
Nature, as working always through efficient causes, is thus too large for any of the concepts which we can employ in the synthesis of cosmical events.

If, in certain cases, we admit the occurrence of self-caused events, that is, generation through freedom, then by an unavoidable law of nature the question ‘why’ still pursues us, constraining us, in accordance with the law of causality [which governs] experience, to pass beyond such events; and we thus find that such totality of connection is too small for our necessary empirical concept.

Fourthly, if we admit an absolutely necessary being (whether it be the world itself, or something in the world, or the cause of the world), we set it in a time infinitely remote from any given point of time, because otherwise it would be dependent upon another being antecedent to it. But such an existence is then too large for our empirical concept, and is unapproachable through any regress, however far this be carried.

If, again, we hold that everything belonging to the world (whether as conditioned or as condition) is contingent, any and every given existence is too small for our concept. For we are constrained always still to look about for some other existence upon which it is dependent.

We have said that in all these cases the cosmical idea is either too large or too small for the empirical regress, and therefore for any possible concept of the understanding. We have thus been maintaining that the fault lies with the idea, in being too large or too small for that to which it is directed, namely, possible experience. Why have we not expressed ourselves in the opposite manner, saying that in the former case the empirical concept is always too small for the idea, and in the latter too large, and that the blame therefore attaches to the empirical regress? The reason is this. Possible experience is that which can alone give reality to our concepts; in its absence a concept is a mere idea, without truth, that is, without relation to any object. The possible empirical concept is therefore the standard by which we must judge whether the idea is a mere idea and thought-entity, or whether it finds its object in the world. For we can say of anything that it is too large

1 [der Erfahrung]
or too small relatively to something else, only if the former is
required for the sake of the latter, and has to be adapted to it.
Among the puzzles propounded in the ancient dialectical
Schools was the question, whether, if a ball cannot pass
through a hole, we should say that the ball is too large or the
hole too small. In such a case it is a matter of indifference
how we choose to express ourselves, for we do not know which
exists for the sake of the other. In the case, however, of a man
and his coat, we do not say that a man is too tall for his coat,
but that the coat is too short for the man.

We have thus been led to what is at least a well-grounded
suspicion that the cosmological ideas, and with them all the
mutually conflicting pseudo-rational assertions, may perhaps
rest on an empty and merely fictitious concept of the manner
in which the object of these ideas is given to us; and this sus-
picion may set us on the right path for laying bare the illusion
which has so long led us astray.

THE ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

Section 6

TRANSCENDENTAL IDEALISM AS THE KEY TO THE
SOLUTION OF THE COSMOLOGICAL DIALECTIC

We have sufficiently proved in the Transcendental Aesthetic
that everything intuited in space or time, and therefore all
objects of any experience possible to us, are nothing but ap-
appearances, that is, mere representations, which, in the manner
in which they are represented, as extended beings, or as series of
alterations, have no independent existence outside our thoughts.
This doctrine I entitle transcendental idealism.* The realist in
the transcendental meaning of this term, treats these modifica-
tions of our sensibility as self-subsistent things, that is, treats
mere representations as things in themselves.

It would be unjust to ascribe to us that long-decired

* I have also, elsewhere, sometimes entitled it formal idealism,
to distinguish it from material idealism, that is, from the usual type
of idealism which doubts or denies the existence of outer things
themselves. [Note added in B.]

...
empirical idealism, which, while it admits the genuine reality of space, denies the existence of the extended beings in it, or at least considers their existence doubtful, and so does not in this regard allow of any properly demonstrable distinction between truth and dreams. As to the appearances of inner sense in time, empirical idealism finds no difficulty in regarding them as real things; indeed it even asserts that this inner experience is the sufficient as well as the only proof of the actual existence of its object (in itself, with all this time-determination).

Our transcendental idealism, on the contrary, admits the reality of the objects of outer intuition, as intuited in space, and of all changes in time, as represented by inner sense. For since space is a form of that intuition which we entitle outer, and since without objects in space there would be no empirical representation whatever, we can and must regard the extended beings in it as real; and the same is true of time. But this space and this time, and with them all appearances, are not in themselves things; they are nothing but representations, and cannot exist outside our mind. Even the inner and sensible intuition of our mind (as object of consciousness) which is represented as being determined by the succession of different states in time, is not the self proper, as it exists in itself—that is, is not the transcendental subject—but only an appearance that has been given to the sensibility of this, to us unknown, being. This inner appearance cannot be admitted to exist in any such manner in and by itself; for it is conditioned by time, and time cannot be a determination of a thing in itself. The empirical truth of appearances in space and time is, however, sufficiently secured; it is adequately distinguished from dreams, if both dreams and genuine appearances cohere truly and completely in one experience, in accordance with empirical laws.

The objects of experience, then, are never given in themselves, but only in experience, and have no existence outside it.

That there may be inhabitants in the moon, although no one has ever perceived them, must certainly be admitted. This, however, only means that in the possible advance of experience we may encounter them. For everything is real which stands in connection with a perception in accordance with the

---

[Reading, with Erdmann, selbst, mit.]

---

Unser transcendente Idealisum erlaubt es dagegen, daß die Gegenstande äußerer Anschauung, eben so wie sie im Raume angeschaut werden, auch wirklich sein, und in der Zeit alle Veränderungen, so wie sie der innere Sinn vorstellt. Denn, da der Raum schon eine Form derjenigen Anschauung ist, die wir die äußere nennen, und, ohne Gegenstände in demselben, es gar keine empirische Vorstellung geben würde: so können und müssen wir darin ausgedehnte Wesen als wirklich annehmen, und eben so ist es auch mit der Zeit. Jener Raum selber aber, samt dieser Zeit, und, zugleich mit beiden, alle Erscheinungen, sind doch an sich selbst keine Dinge, sondern nichts als Vorstellungen, und können gar nicht ausser unserem Gemüt existieren, und selbst ist die innere und sinnliche Anschauung unseres Gemüts (als Gegenstandes des Bewußtseins), dessen Bestimmung durch die Sukzession verschiedener Zustände in der Zeit-vorgestellt wird; auch nicht das eigentliche Selbst, so wie es an sich existiert, oder das transcendente Subjekt, sondern nur eine Erscheinung, die der Sinnlichkeit dieses uns unbekannten Wesens gegeben worden. Das Dasein dieser inneren Erscheinung, als eines an sich existierenden Dinges, kann nicht eingeraumtet werden, weil die Bedingung die Zeit ist, welche keine Bestimmung irgend eines Dinges an sich selbst sein kann: in dem Raume aber und der Zeit ist die empirische Wahrheit der Erscheinungen genugsmässig gesichert, und von der Verwandtschaft mit dem Traume hinreichend unterscheiden, wenn beide nach-empirischen Gesetzen in einer Erfahrung richtig und durchgängig zusammenhängen.

Es sind demnach die Gegenstände der Erfahrung niemals an sich selbst, sondern nur in der Erfahrung gegeben, und existieren außer derselben gar nicht. Daß es Einwohner im Monde geben könne, ob sie gleich kein Mensch in einem wahr genommen hat, man allerdings eingeraumet werden, aber es bedeutet nur soviel: daß wir in dem möglichen Fortschritt der Erfahrung auf sie treffen könnten; denn alles ist wirklich, was mit einer Wahrnehmung nach
laws of empirical advance. They are therefore real if they stand in an empirical connection with my actual consciousness, although they are not for that reason real in themselves, that is, outside this advance of experience.

Nothing is really given us save perception and the empirical advance from this to other possible perceptions. For the appearances, as mere representations, are in themselves real only in perception, which perception is in fact nothing but the reality of an empirical representation, that is, appearance. To call an appearance a real thing prior to our perceiving it, either means that in the advance of experience we must meet with such a perception, or it means nothing at all. For if we were speaking of a thing in itself, we could indeed say that it exists in itself apart from relation to our senses and possible experience. But we are here speaking only of an appearance in space and time, which¹ are not determinations of things in themselves but only of our sensibility. Accordingly, that which is in space and time is an appearance; it is not anything in itself but consists merely of representations, which, if not given in us—that is to say, in perception—are nowhere to be met with.

The faculty of sensible intuition is strictly only a receptivity, a capacity of being affected in a certain manner with representations,² the relation of which to one another is a pure intuition of space and of time (mere forms of our sensibility), and which, in so far as they are connected in this manner in space and time, and are determinable according to laws of the unity of experience, are entitled objects. The non-sensible cause of these representations is completely unknown to us, and cannot therefore be intuited by us as object. For such an object would have to be represented as neither in space nor in time (these being merely conditions of sensible representation), and apart from such conditions we cannot think any intuition. We may, however, entitle the purely intelligible cause of appearances in general the transcendental object, but merely in order to have something corresponding to sensibility viewed as a receptivity. To this transcendental object we can ascribe the whole extent and connection of our possible perceptions, and can say that it is given in itself prior to all experience. But the appearances,

¹ [Reading, with Vorländer, die beide für die beides.]
² [mit Vorstellungen affiziert zu werden.]
while conforming to it, are not given in themselves, but only in this experience, being mere representations, which as perceptions can mark out a real object only in so far as the perception connects with all others according to the rules of the unity of experience. Thus we can say that the real things of past time are given in the transcendental object of experience; but they are objects for me and real in past time only in so far as I represent to myself (either by the light of history or by the guiding clauses of causes and effects) that a regressive series of possible perceptions in accordance with empirical laws, in a word, that the course of the world, conducts us to a past time-series as condition of the present time—a series which, however, can be represented as actual not in itself but only in the connection of a possible experience. Accordingly, all events which have taken place in the immense periods that have preceded my own existence mean really nothing but the possibility of extending the chain of experience from the present perception back to the conditions which determine this perception in respect of time.

If, therefore, I represent to myself all existing objects of the senses in all time and in all places, I do not set them in space and time [as being there] prior to experience. This representation is nothing but the thought of a possible experience in its absolute completeness. Since the objects are nothing but mere representations, only in such a possible experience are they given. To say that they exist prior to all my experience is only to assert that they are to be met with if, starting from perception, I advance to that part of experience to which they belong. The cause of the empirical conditions of this advance (that which determines what members I shall meet with, or how far I can meet with any such in my regress) is transcendental, and is therefore necessarily unknown to me. We are not, however, concerned with this transcendental cause, but only with the rule of the advance in the experience in which objects, that is to say, appearances, are given to me. Moreover, in outcome it is a matter of indifference whether I say that in the empirical advance in space I can meet with stars a hundred times farther removed than the outermost now perceptible to me, or whether I say that they are perhaps to be met with in cosmical space even

\[\text{[bedeutet]}\]
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though no human being has ever perceived or ever will perceive them. For even supposing they were given as things in themselves, without relation to possible experience, it still remains true that they are nothing to me, and therefore are not objects, save in so far as they are contained in the series of the empirical regress. Only in another sort of relation, when these appearances would be used for the cosmological idea of an absolute whole, and when, therefore, we are dealing with a question which oversteps the limits of possible experience, does distinction of the mode in which we view the reality of those objects of the senses become of importance, as serving to guard us against a deceptive error which is bound to arise if we misinterpret our empirical concepts.

THE ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

Section 7

CRITICAL SOLUTION OF THE COSMOLOGICAL CONFLICT
OF REASON WITH ITSELF

The whole antinomy of pure reason rests upon the dialectical argument: If the conditioned is given, the entire series of all its conditions is likewise given; objects of the senses are given as conditioned; therefore, etc. Through this syllogism, the major premiss of which appears so natural and evident, as many cosmological ideas are introduced as there are differences in the conditions (in the synthesis of appearances) that constitute a series. The ideas postulate absolute totality of these series; and thereby they set reason in unavoidable conflict with itself. We shall be in a better position to detect what is deceptive in this pseudo-rational argument, if we first correct and define some of the concepts employed in it.

In the first place, it is evident beyond all possibility of doubt, that if the conditioned is given, a regress in the series of all its conditions is set us as a task.¹ For it is involved in the very concept of the conditioned that something is referred to a condition, and if this condition is again itself conditioned, to a more remote condition, and so through all the members of the

¹ [aufgegeben.]
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raume anzutreffen, wenn sie gleich niemals ein Mensch wahrgenommen hat, oder wahrenehmen wird; denn, wenn sie gleich als Dinge an sich selbst, ohne Beziehung auf mögliche Erfahrung, überhaupt gegeben wären, so sind sie doch für mich nichts, mithin keine Gegenstände, als so fern sie in der Reihe des empirischen Regressus enthalten sind. Nur in anderweitiger Beziehung, wenn eben diese Erscheinungen zur kosmologischen Idee von einem absoluten Ganzen gebraucht werden sollen, und, wenn es also um eine Frage zu tun ist, die über die Grenzen möglicher Erfahrung hinausgeht, ist die Unterscheidung der Art, wie man die Wirklichkeit gedachtter Gegenstände der Sinne nimmt, von Erheblichkeit, um einem träumlichen Wahn vorzubeugen, welcher aus der Mißdeutung unserer eigenen Erfahrungs begriffe unvermeidlich entspringen muß.

DER ANTINOMIE DER REINEN VERNUFT

SIEBENTER ABSCHNITT

KRITISCHE ENTSCHEIDUNG DES KOSMOLOGISCHEN WIDERSTREITS
DER VERNUFT MIT SICH SELBST

Die ganze Antinomie der reinen Vernunft beruht auf dem diallektischen Argumente: Wenn das Bedingte gegeben ist, so ist auch die ganze Reihe aller Bedingungen desselben gegeben; nun sind uns Gegenstände der Sinne als bedingt gegeben; folglich etc. Durch diesen Vernunftschluß, dessen Obersatz so natürlich und einleuchtend scheint, werden nun, nach Verschiedenheit der Bedingungen (in der Synthese der Erscheinungen), so fern sie eine Reihe ausmachen, ebenso viel kosmologische Ideen eingeführt, welche die absolute Totalität dieser Reihen postulieren und eben dadurch die Vernunft unvermeidlich in Widerstreit mit sich selbst versetzen. Ehe wir aber das Trügliche dieses vernünftelnden Arguments aufdekken, müssen wir uns durch Berichtigung und Bestimmung gewisser darin vorkommenden Begriffe dazu in Stand setzen.

Zuerst ist folgender Satz klar und unzweifelhaft gewiß: daß, wenn das Bedingte gegeben ist, uns eben dadurch ein Regressus in der Reihe aller Bedingungen zu demselben aufgegeben sei; denn dieses bringt schon der Begriff des Bedingten so mit sich, daß dadurch etwas auf eine Bedingung, und, wenn diese wiederum bedingt ist, auf eine entferntere Bedingung, und so durch alle Glieder der Reihe be-
series. The above proposition is thus analytic, and has nothing to fear from a transcendental criticism. It is a logical postulate of reason, that through the understanding we follow up and extend as far as possible that connection of a concept with its conditions which directly results from the concept itself.

Further, if the conditioned as well as its condition are things in themselves, then upon the former being given, the regress to the latter is not only *set as a task*, but therewith already really *given*. And since this holds of all members of the series, the complete series of the conditions, and therefore the unconditioned, is given therewith, or rather is presupposed in view of the fact that the conditioned, which is only possible through the complete series, is given. The synthesis of the conditioned with its condition is here a synthesis of the mere understanding, which represents things as *they are*, without considering whether and how we can obtain knowledge of them. If, however, what we are dealing with are appearances— as mere representations appearances cannot be given save in so far as I attain knowledge of them, or rather attain them in themselves, for they are nothing but empirical modes of knowledge— I cannot say, in the same sense of the terms, that if the conditioned is given, all its conditions (as appearances) are likewise given, and therefore cannot in any way infer the absolute totality of the series of its conditions. The appearances are in their apprehension themselves nothing but an empirical synthesis in space and time, and are given only in this synthesis. It does not, therefore, follow, that if the conditioned, in the field of appearance, is given, the synthesis which constitutes its empirical condition is given therewith and is presupposed. This synthesis first occurs in the regress, and never exists without it. What we can say is that a *regress* to the conditions, that is, a continued empirical synthesis, on the side of the conditions, is enjoined or *set as a task*, and that in this regress there can be no lack of given conditions.

These considerations make it clear that the major premise of the cosmological inference takes the conditioned in the transcendental sense of a pure category, while the minor premise takes it in the empirical sense of a concept of the understanding applied to mere appearances. The argument thus commits that dialectical fallacy which is entitled *sophisma*.
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*figurae dictions.* This fallacy is not, however, an artificial one; a quite natural illusion of our common reason leads us, when anything is given as conditioned, thus to assume in the major premiss, as it were *without thought or question*, its conditions and their series. This assumption is indeed simply the logical requirement that we should have adequate premisses for any given conclusion. Also, there is no reference to a time-order in the connection of the conditioned with its condition; they are presupposed as given *together* with it. Further, it is no less natural, in the minor premiss, to regard appearances both as things in themselves and as objects given to the pure understanding, than to proceed as we have done in the major, in which we have [similarly] abstracted from all those conditions of intuition under which alone objects can be given. Yet in so doing we have overlooked an important distinction between the concepts. The synthesis of the conditioned with its conditions (and the whole series of the latter) does not in the major premiss carry with it any limitation through time or any concept of succession. The empirical synthesis, on the other hand, that is, the series of the conditions in appearance, as subsumed in the minor premiss, is necessarily successive, the members of the series being given only as following upon one another in time; and I have therefore, in this case, no right to assume the absolute *totality* of the synthesis and of the series thereby represented. In the major premiss all the members of the series are given in themselves, without any condition of time, but in this minor premiss they are possible only through the successive regress, which is given only in the process in which it is actually carried out.

When this error has thus been shown to be involved in the argument upon which both parties alike base their cosmological assertions, both might justly be dismissed, as being unable to offer any sufficient title in support of their claims. But the quarrel is not thereby ended—as if one or both of the parties had been proved to be wrong in the actual doctrines they assert, that is, in the conclusions of their arguments. For although they have failed to support their contentions by valid grounds of proof, nothing seems to be clearer than that since one of them asserts that the world has a beginning and the other that it has no beginning and is from eternity, one of the

*phasia figurae dictions* nennt. Dieser Betrug ist aber *nicht* erkünstelt, sondern *eine ganz natürliche Täuschung der gemeinen Vernunft.* Denn durch dieselbe setzen wir (im Übersatzes) die Bedingungen und ihre Reihe, gleichsam unbeschritten, voraus, wenn etwas als bedingt gegeben ist, weil dieses nichts andres, als die logische Eoderung ist, vollständige Prämissen zu einem gegebenen Schlussatzes anzunehmen, und *da ist in der Verknüpfung des Bedingten mit seiner Bedingung keine Zeiordnung anzutreffen; sie werden an sich, als zugleich gegeben, vorausgesetzt.* Ferner ist es eben so natürlich (im Untersatzes), Erscheinungen als Dinge an sich und eben: *sowohl dem bloßen Verstande gegebene Gegenstände anzusehen; wie es im Übersatzes geschah, da ich von allen Bedingungen der Anschauung, unter denen allein Gegenstände gegeben werden können, abstrahierte. Nun hatten wir aber hiebei einen merkwürdigen Unterschied zwischen den Begriffen übersehen. Die Synthese des Bedingten mit seiner Bedingung und die ganze Reihe der letzteren (im Übersatzes) führte gar nichts von Einschränkung durch die Zeit und keinen Begriff der Sukzession bei sich. Dagegen ist die empirische Synthese und die Reihe der Bedingungen und der Erscheinung (die im Untersatzes subsumiert wird) notwendig sukzessiv und nur in der Zeit nach einander gegeben; folglich konnte ich die absolute Totalität der Synthese und der dadurch vorgestellten Reihe hier nicht: eben so wohl, als dort vorausgesetzt, weil dort alle Glieder der Reihe an sich (ohne Zeitbegründung) gegeben sind, hier aber nur durch den sukzessiven Regressus möglich sind, der nur dadurch gegeben ist, daß man ihn wirklich vollführt.*

Nach der Überweisung eines solchen Fehltritts, des gemeinschaftlich zum Grunde der kosmologischen Behauptungen gelegten Arguments, können beide streitende Teile Recht, als solche, die ihre Forderung auf keinen gründlichen Titel gründen, abgewiesen werden: Dadurch aber ist ihr Zwist noch nicht in so fern geendigt, daß sie überführt worden wären, sie, oder einer von beiden, hätte in der Sache selbst, die er behauptet (im Schlussatzes), Unrecht, wenn er sie gleich nicht auf tückige Beweisgründe zu bauen wüsste. Es scheint doch nichts klarer, als daß von zweien, deren der eine behauptet: die Welt hat einen Anfang, der andere: die Welt hat keinen Anfang, sondern sie ist von Ewigkeit her,
two must be in the right. But even if this be so, none the less, since the arguments on both sides are equally clear, it is impossible to decide between them. The parties may be commanded to keep the peace before the tribunal of reason; but the controversy none the less continues. There can therefore be no way of settling it once for all and to the satisfaction of both sides, save by their becoming convinced that the very fact of their being able to refute one another is evidence that they are really quarrelling about nothing, and that a certain transcendental illusion has mocked them with a reality where none is to be found. This is the path which we shall now proceed to follow in the settlement of a dispute that defies all attempts to come to a decision.

* * *

Zeno of Elea, a subtle dialectician, was severely reprimanded by Plato as a mischievous Sophist who, to show his skill, would set out to prove a proposition through convincing arguments and then immediately overthrow them by other arguments equally strong. Zeno maintained, for example, that God (probably conceived by him as simply the world) is neither finite nor infinite, neither in motion nor at rest, neither similar nor dissimilar to any other thing. To the critics of his procedure he appeared to have the absurd intention of denying both of two mutually contradictory propositions. But this accusation does not seem to me to be justified. The first of his propositions I shall consider presently more in detail. As regards the others, if by the word 'God' he meant the universe, he would certainly have to say that it is neither abidingly present in its place, that is, at rest, nor that it changes its place, that is, in motion; because all places are in the universe, and the universe is not, therefore, itself in any place. Again, if the universe comprehends in itself everything that exists, it cannot be either similar or dissimilar to any other thing, because there is no other thing, nothing outside it, with which it could be compared. If two opposed judgments presuppose an inadmissible condition, then in spite of their opposition, which does not amount to a contradiction strictly so-called, both fall to the ground, inasmuch as the condition, under which alone either of them can be maintained, itself falls.

* * *

Der eleatische Zeno, ein subtler Dialektiker, ist schon vom Plato als ein mutwilliger Sophist darüber sehr getadelt worden, daß er, um seine Kunst zu zeigen, einerlei Satz durch scheinbare Argumente zu beweisen und bald darauf durch andere eben so starke wieder umzustürzen suchte. Er behauptete, Gott (vermutlich war es bei ihm nichts als die Welt) sei weder endlich, noch unendlich; er sei weder in Bewegung, noch in Ruhe, sei keinem andern Ding weder ähnlich, noch unähnlich: Es schien denen, die ihn hierüber beurteilten, er habe zwei einander widersprechende Sätze gänzlich ableugnen wollen, welches ungereimt ist. Allein ich finde nicht, daß ihm dieses mit Recht zur Last gelegt werden könne. Den ersteren dieser Sätze werde ich bald näher beleuchten. Was die übrigen betrifft, wenn er unter dem Worte: Gott, das Universum verstand, so mußte er allerdings sagen: daß dieses weder in seinem Orte beharrlich gegenwärtig (in Ruhe) sei, noch denselben verändernde (sich bewegende) Welt alle Orter im Univers, dies es selbst also in keinem Orte ist. Wenn das Weltall alles, was existiert, in sich faßt, so ist es auch so fern keinem andern Ding, weder ähnlich, noch unähnlich, weil es außer ihm kein anderes Ding gibt, mit dem es könnte verglichen werden. Wenn zwei einander entgegengesetzte Urteile eine unstattliche Bedingung voraussetzen, so fallen sie; unerachtet ihres Widerstreits (der gleichwohl kein eigentlicher Widerspruch ist), alle beide weg; weil die Bedingung wegfällt, unter der allein jeder dieser Sätze gelten sollte.
ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

If it be said that all bodies have either a good smell or a smell that is not good, a third case is possible, namely, that a body has no smell at all; and both the conflicting propositions may therefore be false. If, however, I say: all bodies are either good-smelling or not good-smelling (vel suaveolens vel non suaveolens), the two judgments are directly contradictory to one another, and the former only is false, its contradictory opposite, namely, that some bodies are not good-smelling, comprehending those bodies also which have no smell at all. Since, in the previous opposition (per disparata), smell, the contingent condition of the concept of the body, was not removed by the opposed judgment, but remained attached to it, the two judgments were not related as contradictory opposites.

If, therefore, we say that the world is either infinite in extension or is not infinite (non est infinitus), and if the former proposition is false, its contradictory opposite, that the world is not infinite, must be true. And I should thus deny the existence of an infinite world, without affirming in its place a finite world. But if we had said that the world is either infinite or finite (non-infinite), both statements might be false. For in that case we should be regarding the world in itself as determined in its magnitude, and in the opposed judgment we do not merely remove the infinitude, and with it perhaps the entire separate existence of the world, but attach a determination to the world, regarded as a thing actually existing in itself. This assertion may, however, likewise be false; the world may not be given as a thing in itself, nor as being in its magnitude either infinite or finite. I beg permission to entitle this kind of opposition dialectical, and that of contradictories analytical. Thus of two dialectically opposed judgments both may be false; for the one is not a mere contradictory of the other, but says something more than is required for a simple contradiction.

If we regard the two propositions, that the world is infinite in magnitude and that it is finite in magnitude, as contradictory opposites, we are assuming that the world, the complete series of appearances, is a thing in itself that remains even if I suspend the infinite or the finite regress in the series of its appearances. If, however, I reject this assumption, or

[Reading, with Hartenstein, des Körpers für der Körper.]

Kritische Entscheidung

Wenn jemand sagte, ein jeder Körper riecht entweder gut, oder er riecht nicht gut, so findet ein Drittes statt, nämlich, daß er gar nicht rieche (ausdufte), und so könnten beide widerstreitende Sätze falsch sein. Sage ich, er ist entweder wohlrreichend, oder er ist nicht wohlrreichend (vel suaveolens vel non suaveolens): so sind beide Urteile einander kontradiktorisch entgegengesetzt und nur der erste ist falsch, sein kontradiktorisches Gegenteil aber, nämlich, einige Körper sind nicht wohlrreichend, befaßt auch die Körper in sich, die gar nicht riechen. In der vorigen Entgegensestellung (per disparata) blieb die zuflügende Bedingung des Begriffs der Körper (der Geruch) noch bei dem widerstreitenden Urteile, und wurde durch dieses also nicht mit aufgehoben, daher war das letztere nicht das kontradiktorische Gegenteil des ersten.

Sage ich demnach die Welt ist dem Raume nach entweder unendlich, oder sie ist nicht unendlich (non est infinitus); so muß, wenn der erstere Satz falsch ist, sein kontradiktorisches Gegenteil: die Welt ist nicht unendlich, wahr sein. Dadurch würde ich nur eine unendliche Welt aufheben, ohne eine andere, nämlich die endliche, zu setzen. || Hieße es aber: die Welt ist entweder unendlich, oder endlich (nichtunendlich), so könnten beide falsch sein. Denn ich sehe auch die Welt, als sich selbst, ihrer Größe nach bestimmt an, indem ich in dem Gegensatz nicht bloß die Unendlichkeit aufhebe, und: mit ihr, vielleicht ihre ganze abgesonderte Existenz, sondern eine Bestimmung zur Welt, als einem an sich selbst wirklich Dinge, hinzusetzen, welches eben so wohl falsch sein kann, wenn nämlich die Welt gar nicht als ein Ding an sich, mitthun auch nicht ihrer Größe nach, weder als unendlich, noch als endlich gegeben sein sollte. Man erlaube mir, daß ich dergleichen Entgegengesetztheit die dialektische, die des Widerspruchs aber die analytische Opposition nennen darf. Also können von zwei dialektisch einander entgegengesetzten Urteilen alle beide falsch sein, darum, weil eines dem andern nicht bloß widerspricht, sondern etwas mehr sagt, als zum Widerspruche erforderlich ist.

Wenn man die zwei Sätze: die Welt ist der Größe nach unendlich, die Welt ist ihrer Größe nach endlich, als einander kontradiktorisch entgegengesetzt anseht, so nimmt man an, daß die Welt (die ganze Reihe der Erscheinungen) ein Ding an sich selbst sei. Denn sie bleibt, ich mag den unendlichen oder endlichen Regressus in der Reihe ihrer Erscheinungen aufheben. Nehme ich aber diese Vorausset-
rather this accompanying transcendental illusion, and deny
that the world is a thing in itself, the contradictory opposition
of the two assertions is converted into a merely dialectical
opposition. Since the world does not exist in itself, independ-
ently of the regressive series of my representations, it exists
in itself neither as an infinite whole nor as a finite whole. It
exists only in the empirical regress of the series of appear-
ances, and is not to be met with as something in itself. If, then,
this series is always conditioned, and therefore can never be
given as complete, the world is not an unconditioned whole,
and does not exist as such a whole, either of infinite or of
finite magnitude.

What we have here said of the first cosmological idea,
that is, of the absolute totality of magnitude in the [field
of] appearance, applies also to all the others. The series of
conditions is only to be met with in the regressive synthesis
itself, not in the [field of] appearance viewed as a thing given
in and by itself, prior to all regress. We must therefore say that
the number of parts in a given appearance is in itself neither
finite nor infinite. For an appearance is not something existing
in itself, and its parts are first given in and through the regress
of the decomposing synthesis, a regress which is never given
in absolute completeness, either as finite or as infinite. This
also holds of the series of subordinated causes, and of the
series that proceeds from the conditioned to unconditioned
necessary existence. These series can never be regarded as
being in themselves in their totality either finite or infinite.
Being series of subordinated representations, they exist only
in the dynamical regress, and prior to this regress can have no
existence in themselves as self-subsistent series of things.

Thus the antimony of pure reason in its cosmological ideas
vanishes when it is shown that it is merely dialectical, and
that it is a conflict due to an illusion which arises from our
applying to appearances that exist only in our representations,
and therefore, so far as they form a series, not otherwise than
in a successive regress, that idea of absolute totality which
holds only as a condition of things in themselves. From this
antimony we can, however, obtain, not indeed a dogmatic, but
a critical and doctrinal advantage. It affords indirect proof of

1 [der dekompomierenden Synthesis.]

zung, oder diesen transzendentalen Schein weg, und leugne,
daß sie ein Ding an sich selbst sei, so verwandelt ich der
kontradiktorische Widerstreit beider Behauptungen in einen
bloß dialektischen, und weil die Welt gar nicht an sich
(ungehindert von der regressiven Reihe meiner Vorstellungen)
existiert, so existiert sie weder als ein an sich unendliches,
noch als ein an sich endliches Ganzes. Sie ist nur
im empirischen Regressus der Reihe der Erscheinungen und
für sich selbst gar nicht anzutreffen. Daher, wenn diese jeder-
zeitz bedingt ist, so ist sie niemals ganz gegeben, und die Welt
ist also kein unbedingtes Ganzes, existiert also auch nicht als
ein solches, weder mit unendlicher, noch endlicher Größe.

Was hier von der ersten kosmologischen Idee, nämlich
der absoluten Totalität der Größe in der Erscheinung ge-
sagt worden; gilt auch von allen übrigen. Die Reihe der Be-
dingungen ist nur in der regresiven Synthesis selbst, nich-
aber an sich in der Erscheinung, als einem eigenen, vor allem
Regressus (gegebenen Dinge, anzutreffen. Daher werde ich
auch sagen müssen: die Menge der Teile in einer gegebenen
Erscheinung ist an sich weder endlich, noch unendlich, weil
Erscheinung an sich selbst Existierendes ist, und die
Teile allerdich durch den Regressus der dekompomierenden
Synthesis, und in demselben, gegeben werden, welcher Re-
gressus niemals schlechthin ganz, weder als endlich, noch
als unendlich gegeben ist. Eben das gilt von der Reihe der
über einander geordneten Ursachen, oder der bedingten bis
zur unbedingten notwendigen Existenz, welche niemals we-
der an sich ihrer Totalität nach als endlich, noch als unend-
lich angesehen werden kann, weil sie als Reihe subordinier-
ter Vorstellungen nur im dynamischen Regressus besteht,
vordemselben aber, und als für sich bestehende Reihe von
Dingen, an sich selbst gar nicht existieren kann.

So wird demnach die Antinomie der reinen Vernunft bei
ihren kosmologischen Ideen gehoben, dadurch, daß gezeigt
wird, sie sei bloß dialektisch und ein Widerstreit eines
Scheins, der daher entspringt, daß man die Idee der abso-
luten Totalität, welche nur als eine Bedingung der Dinge
an sich selbst gilt, auf Erscheinungen angewandt hat, die
nur in der Vorstellung, und wenn sie eine Reihe ausmachen,
im sukzessiven Regressus, sonst aber gar nicht existieren.
Man kann aber auch umgekehrt aus dieser Antinomie einen
wahren, zwar nicht dogmatischen, aber doch kritischen und
doktrinalen Nutzen ziehen: nämlich die transzendentale
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the transcendental ideality of appearances—a proof which ought to convince any who may not be satisfied by the direct proof given in the Transcendental Aesthetic. This proof would consist in the following dilemma. If the world is a whole existing in itself, it is either finite or infinite. But both alternatives are false (as shown in the proofs of the antithesis and thesis respectively). It is therefore also false that the world (the sum of all appearances) is a whole existing in itself. From this it then follows that appearances in general are nothing outside our representations—which is just what is meant by their transcendental ideality.

This remark is of some importance. It enables us to see that the proofs given in the fourfold antinomy are not merely baseless deceptions. On the supposition that appearances, and the sensible world which comprehends them all, are things in themselves, these proofs are indeed well-grounded. The conflict which results from the propositions thus obtained shows, however, that there is a fallacy in this assumption, and so leads us to the discovery of the true constitution of things, as objects of the senses. While the transcendental dialectic does not by any means favor scepticism, it certainly does favor the sceptical method, which can point to such dialectic as an example of its great services. For when the arguments of reason are allowed to oppose one another in unrestricted freedom, something advantageous, and likely to aid in the correction of our judgments, will always accrue, though it may not be what we set out to find.
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Section 8

The Regulative Principle of Pure Reason in its Application to the Cosmological Ideas

Since no maximum of the series of conditions in a sensible world, regarded as a thing in itself, is given through the cosmological principle of totality, but can only be set as a task that calls for regress in the series of conditions, the principle of pure reason has to be amended in these terms; and it
then preserves its validity, not indeed as the *axiom* that we think the totality as actually in the object, but as a *problem* for the understanding, and therefore for the subject, leading it to undertake and to carry on, in accordance with the completeness prescribed by the idea, the regress in the series of conditions of any given conditioned. For in our sensibility, that is, in space and time, every condition to which we can attain in the exposition of given appearances is again conditioned. For they are not objects in themselves — were they such, the absolutely unconditioned might be found in them — but simply empirical representations which must always find in intuition the condition that determines them in space and time. The principle of reason is thus properly only a *rule*, prescribing a regress in the series of the conditions of given appearances, and forbidding it to bring the regress to a close by treating anything at which it may arrive as absolutely unconditioned. It is not a principle of the possibility of experience and of empirical knowledge of objects of the senses, and therefore not a principle of the understanding; for every experience, in conformity with the given (forms of) intuition, is enclosed within limits. Nor is it a *constitutive* principle of reason, enabling us to extend our concept of the sensible world beyond all possible experience. It is rather a principle of the greatest possible continuation and extension of experience, allowing no empirical limit to hold as absolute. Thus it is a principle of reason which serves as a *rule*, postulating what we ought to do in the regress, but not anticipating what is present in the object as it is in itself, *prior to all regress*. Accordingly I entitle it a *regulative* principle of reason, to distinguish it from the principle of the absolute totality of the series of conditions, viewed as actually present in the object (that is, in the appearances), which would be a constitutive cosmological principle. I have tried to show by this distinction that there is no such constitutive principle, and so to prevent what otherwise, through a transcendental subreption, inevitably takes place, namely, the ascribing of objective reality to an idea that serves merely as a rule.

In order properly to determine the meaning of this rule of

1 [gegeben.]

2 [als im Objekte (den Erscheinungen) an sich selbst gegeben.]
pure reason, we must observe, first, that it cannot tell us what the object is, but only how the empirical regress is to be carried out so as to arrive at the complete concept of the object. If it attempted the former task, it would be a constitutive principle, such as pure reason can never supply. It cannot be regarded as maintaining that the series of conditions for a given conditioned is in itself either finite or infinite. That would be to treat a mere idea of absolute totality, which is only produced in the idea, as equivalent to thinking an object that cannot be given in any experience. For in terms of it we should be ascribing to a series of appearances an objective reality which is independent of empirical synthesis. This idea of reason can therefore do no more than prescribe a rule to the regressive synthesis in the series of conditions; and in accordance with this rule the synthesis must proceed from the conditioned, through all subordinate conditions, up to the unconditioned. Yet it can never reach this goal, for the absolutely unconditioned is not to be met with in experience.

We must therefore first of all determine what we are to mean by the synthesis of a series, in cases in which the synthesis is never complete. In this connection the two expressions are commonly employed, which are intended to mark a distinction, though without correctly assigning the ground of the distinction. Mathematicians speak solely of a progressus in infinimum. Philosophers, whose task it is to examine concepts, refuse to accept this expression as legitimate, substituting for it the phrase progressus in indefinitum. We need not stop to examine the reasons for such a distinction, or to enlarge upon its useful or useless employment. We need only determine these concepts with such accuracy as is required for our particular purposes.

Of a straight line we may rightly say that it can be produced to infinity. In this case the distinction between an infinite and an indeterminately great advance (progressus in indefinitum) would be mere subtlety. When we say, 'Draw a line,' it sounds indeed more correct to add in indefinitum than in infinimum. Whereas the latter means that you must not cease producing it—which is not what is intended—the former means only, produce it as far as you please; and if we are referring only to what it is in our power to do, this expression is quite

hörig zu bestimmen, so ist zuvörderst zu bemerken, daß die nicht sagen können, was das Objekt sei, sondern wie der empirische Regressus anzustellen sei, um zu dem vollständigen Begriffe des Objekts zu gelangen. Denn, fände das erstere statt, so würde sie ein konstitutives Prinzip sein, dergleichen aus reiner Vernunft niemals möglich ist. Man kann also damit keinesweges die Absicht haben, zu sagen, die Reihe der Bedingungen zu einem gegebenen Bedingten sei an sich endlich, oder unendlich; denn dadurch würde eine bloße Idee der absoluten Totalität, die lediglich in ihr selbst geschaffen ist, einen Gegenstand denken, der in keiner Erfahrung gegeben werden kann, indem einer Reihe von Erscheinungen eine von der empirischen Synthese unabhängige objektive Realität erteilt würde. Die Vernunftidee wird also nur der regressiven Synthese in der Reihe der Bedingungen eine Regel vorschreiben, nach welcher sie vom Bedingten, vermittelst aller einander vorgeordneten Bedingungszum Unbedingten fortgeht, obgleich dieses niemals erreicht wird. Denn das Schlechthinunbedingte wird in der Erfahrung gar nicht angetroffen.

Zu diesem Ende ist nun erstlich die Synthese einer Reihe, so fern sie niemals vollständig, ist genau zu bestimmen. Man bedient sich in dieser Absicht gewöhnlich zweier Ausdrücke, die darin etwas unterscheiden sollen, ohne daß man doch den Grund dieser Unterscheidung recht anzeuge wissen. Die Mathematiker sprechen lediglich von einem progressus in infinimum; die Forscher der Begriffe (Philosophen) wollen an dessen statt nur den Ausdruck von einem progressus in indefinitum gelten lassen. Ohne mich bei der Prüfung der Bedenklichkeit, die diesen eine solche Unterscheidung angetan hat, und dem guten oder fruchtbereich der selben aufzuhalten, will ich diese Begriffe in Beziehung auf meine Absicht genau zu bestimmen suchen.

Von einer geraden Linie kann man mit Recht sagen, sie könne ins Unendliche verlängert werden, und hier würde die Unterscheidung des Unendlichen und des unbestimmbar weiten Fortgangs (progressus in indefinitum) eine leere Subtilität sein. Denn, obgleich, wenn es heißt: ziehet eine Linie fort, es freilich richtiger lautet, wenn man hinzusetzt, in indefinitum, als wenn es heißt, in infinitum; weil das erstere nicht mehr bedeutet als: verlängert sie, so weit ihr wollet, das zweite aber: ihr sollt niemals aufhören, sie zu verlängern (welches hiebei eben nicht die Absicht ist): so ist doch, wenn nur vom Können die Rede ist, der ertere

1 Akad.-Ausz.: wiedere.
1* Akad.-Ausz.: unendlichen.
correct, for we can always make the line longer, without end. So is it in all cases in which we speak only of the progress, that is, of the advance from the condition to the conditioned: this possible advance proceeds, without end, in the series of appearances. From a given pair of parents the descending line of generation may proceed without end, and we can quite well regard the line as actually so continuing in the world.

For this reason case never requires an absolute totality of the series, since it does not presuppose that totality as a condition and as given (datum), but only as something conditioned, that allows of being given (daâble), and is added to without end.

Quite otherwise is it with the problem: how far the regress extends, when it ascends in a series from something given as conditioned to its conditions. Can we say that the regress is in infinitum, or only that it is indeterminately far extended (in indefinite)? Can we, for instance, ascend from the men now living, through the series of their ancestors, in infinitum; or can we only say that, so far as we have gone back, we have never met with an empirical ground for regarding the series as limited at any point, and that we are therefore justified and at the same time obliged, in the case of every ancestor, to search further for progenitors, though not indeed to presuppose them?

We answer: when the whole is given in empirical intuition, the regress in the series of its inner conditions proceeds in infinitum; but when a member only of the series is given, starting from which the regress has to proceed to absolute totality, the regress is only of indeterminate character (in indefinite). Accordingly, the division of a body, that is, of a portion of matter given between certain limits, must be said to proceed in infinitum. For this matter is given as a whole, and therefore with all its possible parts, in empirical intuition. Since the condition of this whole is its part, and the condition of this part is the part of the part, and so on, and since in this regress of decomposition an unconditioned (indivisible) member of this series of conditions is never met with, not only is there never any empirical ground for stopping in the division, but the further members of any continued division are themselves empirically given prior to the continuation of the division. The division, that is to say, goes on in infinitum. On
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the other hand, since the series of ancestors of any given man is not given in its absolute totality in any possible experience, the regress proceeds from every member in the series of generations to a higher member, and no empirical limit is encountered which exhibits a member as absolutely unconditioned. And since the members, which might supply the condition, are not contained in an empirical intuition of the whole, prior to the regress, this regress does not proceed in infinitum, by division of the given, but only indefinitely far, searching for further members additional to those that are given, and which are themselves again always given as conditioned.

In neither case, whether the regress be in infinitum or in indefinite, may the series of conditions be regarded as being given as infinite in the object. The series are not things in themselves, but only appearances, which, as conditions of one another, are given only in the regress itself. The question, therefore, is no longer how great this series of conditions may be in itself, whether it be finite or infinite, for it is nothing in itself; but how we are to carry out the empirical regress, and how far we should continue it. Here we find an important distinction in regard to the rule governing such procedure. When the whole is empirically given, it is possible to proceed back in the series of its inner conditions in infinitum. When the whole is not given, but has first to be given through empirical regress, we can only say that the search for still higher conditions of the series is possible in infinitum. In the former case we could say: there are always more members, empirically given, than I can reach through the regress of decomposition; in the latter case, however, the position is this: we can always proceed still further in the regress, because no member is empirically given as absolutely unconditioned; and since a higher member is therefore always possible, the enquiry regarding it is necessary. In the one case we necessarily find further members of the series; in the other case, since no experience is absolutely limited, the necessity is that we enquire for them. For either we have no perception which sets an absolute limit to the empirical regress, in which case we must not regard the regress as completed, or we have a perception limiting our series, in which case the perception cannot be part of the series traversed (for that which limits must be distinct from that which is
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Dagegen ist die Reihe der Voreltern zu einem gegebenen Menschen in keiner möglichen Erfahrung, in ihrer absoluten Totalität, gegeben, der Regressus aber geht doch von jedem Gliede; dieser Zeugung zu einem höheren, so daß keine empirische Grenze anzutreffen ist; die ein Glied, als schlecht, unbedingt, darstellte. Da aber gleichwohl auch die Glieder, die hierzu die Bedingung abgeben könnten, nicht in der empirischen Abschauung des Ganzen schon vor dem Regressus liegen: so geht dieser nicht ins Unendliche (der Teilung des Gegebenen), sondern in unbestimmbare Weite; der Aufsuchung mehrerer Glieder zu den gegebenen, die wiederum jederzeit nur bedingt gegeben sind.

|| In keinem von beiden Fällen, sowohl dem regressus in infinitum, als dem in indefinite, wird die Reihe der Bedingungen als unendlich im Objekt gegeben angesehen. Es sind nicht Dinge, die an sich selbst, sondern nur Erscheinungen, die, als Bedingungen von einander, nur im Regressus selbst gegeben werden. Also ist die Frage nicht mehr: Wie groß diese Reihe der Bedingungen an sich selbst sei, ob endlich oder unendlich, denn sie ist nichts an sich selbst, sondern: wie wir den empirischen Regressus anstellen, und wie weit wir ihn fortsetzen sollen. Und da ist denn ein namhafter Unterschied in Ansehung der Regel dieses Fortschritts. Wenn das Ganze empirisch gegeben worden, so ist es möglich, ins Unendliche in der Reihe seiner inneren Bedingungen zurück zu gehen. Ist jenes aber nicht gegeben, sondern soll durch empirischen Regressus allererst gegeben werden, so kann ich, nur sagen: es ist ins Unendliche möglich, zu noch höheren Bedingungen der Reihe fortzugehen. Im ersteren Falle könnte ich sagen: es sind immer mehr Glieder da, und empirisch gegeben, als ich durch den Regressus (der Dekomposition) erreiche; im zweiten aber: ich kann im Regressus noch immer weiter gehen, weil kein Glied als schlecht unbedingt empirisch gegeben ist, und also noch immer ein höheres Glied als möglich und mithin die Nachfrage nach derselben als notwendig zuläßt. Dort war es notwendig, mehr Glieder der Reihe anzutreffen, hier aber ist es immer notwendig, nach mehreren zu fragen, weil keine Erfahrung absolut begrenzt. Denn ihr hat entweder keine Wahrnehmung, die euren empirischen Regressus schlecht hin begrenzt, und denn müßt ihr euren Regressus nicht für vollendet halten, oder habt eine solche eure Reihe begrenzende Wahrnehmung, so kann diese nicht ein Teil eurer zurückgelegten Reihe sein, weil das, was begrenzt, von dem, was dadurch begrenzt wird, unterschieden
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Section 9
THE EMPIRICAL EMPLOYMENT OF THE REGULATIVE PRINCIPLE OF REASON, IN RESPECT OF ALL COSMOLOGICAL IDEAS

We have already, on several occasions, shown that no transcendental employment can be made of the pure concepts either of the understanding or of reason; that the [assertion of] absolute totality of the series of conditions in the sensible world rests on a transcendental employment of reason in which reason demands this unconditioned completeness from what it assumes to be a thing in itself; and that since the sensible world contains no such completeness, we are never justified in enquiring, as regards the absolute magnitude of the series in the sensible world, whether it be limited or in itself unlimited, but only how far we ought to go in the empirical regress, when we trace experience back to its conditions, obeying the rule of reason, and therefore resting content with no answer to its questions save that which is in conformity with the object.

What therefore alone remains to us is the validity of the principle of reason as a rule for the continuation and magnitude of a possible experience; its invalidity as a constitutive principle of appearances [viewed as things] in themselves has been sufficiently demonstrated. If we can keep these conclusions steadily in view, the self-contradiction of reason will be entirely at an end. For not only will this critical solution destroy the illusion which set reason at variance with itself, but will replace it by teaching which, in correcting the misinterpretation that has been the sole source of the conflict, brings reason into agreement with itself. A principle which otherwise would be dialectical will thus be converted into a doctrinal principle. In fact, if this principle can be upheld as determining, in accordance
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with its subjective significance, and yet also in conformity with the objects of experience, the greatest possible empirical use of understanding, the outcome will be much the same as if it were—what is impossible from pure reason—an axiom which determined a priori the objects in themselves. For only in proportion as the principle is effective in directing the widest possible empirical employment of the understanding, can it exercise, in respect of the objects of experience, any influence in extending and correcting our knowledge.

I. Solution of the Cosmological Idea of the Totality of the Composition of the Appearances of a Cosmic Whole

Here, as in the other cosmological questions, the regulative principle of reason is grounded on the proposition that in the empirical regress we can have no experience of an absolute limit, that is, no experience of any condition as being one that empirically is absolutely unconditioned. The reason is this: such an experience would have to contain a limitation of appearances by nothing, or by the void, and in the continued regress we should have to be able to encounter this limitation in a perception—which is impossible.

This proposition, which virtually states that the only conditions which we can reach in the empirical regress are conditions which must themselves again be regarded as empirically conditioned, contains the rule in terminis, that however far we may have advanced in the ascending series, we must always enquire for a still higher member of the series, which may or may not become known to us through experience.

For the solution, therefore, of the first cosmological problem we have only to decide whether in the regress to the unconditioned magnitude of the universe, in time and space, this never limited ascent can be called a regress to infinity, or only an indeterminately continued regress (in indefinitum).

The quite general representation of the series of all past states of the world, as well as of all the things which coexist in cosmic space, is itself merely a possible empirical regress which I think to myself, though in an indeterminate manner. Only in this way can the concept of such a series be possible.
for a given perception arise at all. Now we have the cosmic whole only in concept, never, as a whole, in intuition. We cannot, therefore, argue from the magnitude of the cosmic whole to the magnitude of the regress, determining the latter in accordance with the former; on the contrary, only by reference to the magnitude of the empirical regress am I in a position to make for myself a concept of the magnitude of the world. But of this empirical regress the most that we can ever know is that from every given member of the series of conditions we have always still to advance empirically to a higher and more remote member. The magnitude of the whole of appearances is not thereby determined in any absolute manner; and we cannot therefore say that this regress proceeds to infinity. In doing so we should be anticipating members which the regress has not yet reached, representing their number as so great that no empirical synthesis could attain thereto, and so should be determining the magnitude of the world (although only negatively) prior to the regress—which is impossible. Since the world is not given me, in its totality, through any intuition, neither is its magnitude given me prior to the regress. We cannot, therefore, say anything at all in regard to the magnitude of the world, not even that there is in it a regress in infinitum. All that we can do is to seek for the concept of its magnitude according to the rule which determines the empirical regress in it. This rule says no more than that, however far we may have attained in the series of empirical conditions, we should never assume an absolute limit, but should subordinate every appearance, as conditioned, to another as its condition, and that we must advance to this condition. This is the regressus in infinitum, which, as it determines no magnitude in the object, is clearly enough distinguishable from the regressus in infinitum.

This cosmic series can, therefore, be neither greater nor smaller than the possible empirical regress upon which alone its concept rests. And since this regress can yield neither a determinate infinite nor a determinate finite (that is, anything absolutely limited), it is evident that the magnitude of the world can be taken neither as finite nor as infinite. The regress, through which it is represented, allows of neither alternative.
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I cannot say, therefore, that the world is infinite in space or as regards past time. Any such concept of magnitude, as being that of a given infinitude, is empirically impossible, and therefore, in reference to the world as an object of the senses, also absolutely impossible. Nor can I say that the regress from a given perception to all that limits it in a series, whether in space or in past time, proceeds to infinity; that would be to presuppose that the world has infinite magnitude. I also cannot say that the regress is finite; an absolute limit is likewise empirically impossible. Thus I can say nothing regarding the whole object of experience, the world of sense; I must limit my assertions to the rule which determines how experience, in conformity with its object, is to be obtained and further extended.

Thus the first and negative answer to the cosmological problem regarding the magnitude of the world is that the world has no first beginning in time and no outermost limit in space.

For if we suppose the opposite, the world would be limited on the one hand by empty time and on the other by empty space. Since, however, as appearance, it cannot in itself be limited in either manner—appearance not being a thing in itself—these limits of the world would have to be given in a possible experience, that is to say, we should require to have a perception of limitation by absolutely empty time or space. But such an experience, as completely empty of content, is impossible. Consequently, an absolute limit of the world is impossible empirically, and therefore also absolutely.

The affirmative answer likewise directly follows, namely, that the regress in the series of appearances, as a determination of the magnitude of the world, proceeds in indefinitum.

* It may be noted that this proof is presented in a very different manner from the dogmatic proof of the antithesis of the first antinomy. In that argument we regarded the sensible world, in accordance with the common and dogmatic view, as a thing given in itself, in its totality, prior to any regress; and we asserted that unless it occupies all time and all places, it cannot have any determinate position whatsoever in it. The conclusion also was therefore different from that given above; for in the dogmatic proof we inferred the actual infinity of the world.

ICH KANN DERMACH NICHT SAGEN: DIE WELT IST DER VERGANGENEN ZEIT, ODER DEM RAUM EINE UNENDLICHKEIT; DENN DERSELBEN BEGRIFF VON GRÖßE ALS EINE GEgebene UNENDLICHKEIT IST EMPIRISCH, MITINNACH IN ANSEHUNG DER WELT, ALS EINES GEGENSTANDES DER SINNE, SCHLECHTERDINGS UNMÖGLICH. ICH WERDE AUCH NICHT SAGEN: DER REGRESSUS VON EINER GEGEBENEN WAHRNEHMUNG AN, AN allen dem, was diese im RAUM SO WOHL ALS DER VERGANGENEN ZEIT, IN EINER REIHE BERECHNET, GEHT IN UNENDLICHE; DENN DIESSES SETZT DIE UNENDLICHE WELTGRÖßE VORAUS; AUCH NICHT: SIE IST ENDLICH; Denn die absolute Grenze ist gleichfalls empirisch unmöglich. Demnach werden ich nichts von dem ganzen Gegenstande der Erfahrung (der Sünnenvelt), sondern nur von der Regel, nach welcher Erfahrung, ihrem Gegenstande angegessen, angestellt und fortgesetzt werden soll, sagen können.

Auf die kosmologische Frage also, wegen der Weltgröße, ist die erste und negative Antwort: die Welt hat keinen ersten Anfang der Zeit und keine äußerste Grenze dem Raume nach.

Denn im entgengesetzten Falle würde sie durch die leere Zeit, einer, und durch den leeren Raum, anderer. || Seits, begrenzt sein. Da sie nun, als Erscheinung, keines von beiden an sich selbst sein kann, denn Erscheinung ist kein Ding an sich selbst, so müßte eine Wahrnehmung der Begrenzung durch schlechtin leere Zeit, oder leeren Raum, möglich sein; doch welche diese Weltenden in einer möglichen Erfahrung gegeben wären. Eine solche Erfahrung aber, als völlig leer, ist unmöglich, Also ist eine absolute Weltgrenze empirisch, mithin auch schlechterdings unmöglich.*

Hieraus folgt denn zugleich die bejahende Antwort: der Regressus in der Reihe der Welterscheinungen, als eine Bestimmung der Weltgröße, geht in indefinitum, welches

* Man wird bemerken, daß der Beweis hier auf ganz andere Art geführt worden, als der dogmatische, oben in der Antithese der ersten Antinomie. Deshalb hatten wir die Sünnenvelt, nach der gemein- und dogmatischen Vorstellung, für ein Ding, was an sich selbst, vor allem Regressus, seiner Totalität nach gegeben war, gelten lassen, und hatten ihr, wenn sie nicht alle Zeit und alle Räume einnahmen, überhaupt irgende eine bestimmte Stelle in beiden abgesprochen. Daher war die Folgerung auch anders, als hier; nämlich es wurde auf die wirkliche Unendlichkeit derselben geschlossen.
This is equivalent to saying that, although the sensible world has no absolute magnitude, the empirical regress (through which alone it can be given on the side of its conditions) has its own rule, namely, that it must always advance from every member of the series, as conditioned, to one still more remote; doing so by means either of our own experience, or of the guiding-thread of history, or of the chain of effects and causes. And as the rule further demands, our sole and constant aim must be the extension of the possible empirical employment of the understanding, this being the only proper task of reason in the application of its principles.

This rule does not prescribe a determinate empirical regress that must proceed without end in some one kind of appearance, e.g. that in proceeding from a living person through a series of progenitors we must never expect to meet with a first pair, or that in the series of cosmic bodies we must never admit an outermost sun. All that the rule requires is that the advance from appearances be to appearances; for even if these latter yield no actual perception (as is the case when for our consciousness they are too weak in degree to become experience), as appearances they none the less still belong to a possible experience.

All beginning is in time and all limits of the extended are in space. But space and time belong only to the world of sense. Accordingly, while appearances in the world are conditionally limited, the world itself is neither conditionally nor unconditionally limited.

Similarly, since the world can never be given as complete, and since even the series of conditions for that which is given as conditioned cannot, as a cosmic series, be given as complete, the concept of the magnitude of the world is given only through the regress and not in a collective intuition prior to it. But the regress consists only in the determining of the magnitude, and does not give any determinate concept. It does not, therefore, yield any concept of a magnitude which, in relation to a certain [unit-] measure, can be described as infinite. In other words, the regress does not proceed to the infinite, as if the infinite could be given, but only indeterminately far, in order [by means of the regress] to give that empirical magnitude which first becomes actual in and through this very regress.

eben so viel sagt, als: die Sinnenwelt hat keine absolute Größe, sondern der empirische Regressus (wodurch sie auf der Seite ihrer Bedingungen allein gegeben werden kann) hat seine Regel, nämlich von einem jeden Gliede der Reihe, als einem Bedingten, jederzeit zu einem noch entfernteren (es sei durch eigene Erfahrung, oder ||| den Leitfaden der Geschichte, oder die Kette der Wirkungen und ihrer Ursachen) fortzuschieben, und sich der Erweiterung des möglichen empirischen Gebrauchs seines Verstandes nirgend zu überheben, welches denn auch das eigentliche und einzige Geschäfte der Vernunft bei ihren Prinzipien ist.

Ein bestimmter empirischer Regressus, der in einer ge- wissen Art von Erscheinungen ohne Aufhören fortge- wird hiedurch nicht vorgeschrieben, z. B. dass man von einem lebenden Menschen immer in einer Reihe von Vor- eltern aufwärts, steigen, müsse, ohne ein erstes Paar zu er- warten, oder in der Reihe der Weltkörper, ohne eine äußerste Sonne zuzulassen; sondern es wird nur der Fortschritt von Erscheinungen zu Erscheinungen geboten; sollten diese auch keine wirkliche Wahrnehmung (wenn sie dem Grade nach für unser Bewußtsein zu schwach ist, um Erfahrung zu werden) abgeben, weil sie dem ungeschickt doch zur möglichen Erfahrung gehören.

Aller Anfang ist in der Zeit, und alle Grenze des Aus- gedehnten in den Räume. Raum und Zeit aber sind nur in der Sinnenwelt. Mithin sind nur Erscheinungen in der Welt bedingterweise, die Welt aber selbst weder bedingt, noch auf unbedingte Art begrenzt.

Eben um deswillen, und da die Welt niemals ganz, und selbst die Reihe der Bedingungen zu einem gegebenen Be- dingten nicht, als Weltreihe, ganz gegeben werden kann, ist der Begriff von der Weltgröße nur durch den Re- giressus, und nicht vor demselben in einer kollektiven Anschauung, gegeben. Jener besteht aber immer nur im Be- stimmten der Größe, und gibt also keinen bestimmten Begriff, also auch keinen Begriff von einer Größe, die in Anschauung eines gewissen Maßes unendlich wäre, geht also nicht ins Unendliche (gleichsam gegebene), sondern in unbestimmte Weite, um eine Größe (der Erfahrung) zu geben, die allererst durch diesen Regressus wirklich wird.
II

Solution of the Cosmological Idea of the Totality of Division of a Whole given in Intuition

If we divide a whole which is given in intuition, we proceed from something conditioned to the conditions of its possibility. The division of the parts (subdivisio or decompositio) is a regress in the series of these conditions. The absolute totality of this series would be given only if the regress could reach simple parts. But if all the parts in a continuously progressing decomposition are themselves again divisible, the division, that is, the regress from the conditioned to its conditions, proceeds in infinitum. For the conditions (the parts) are themselves contained in the conditioned, and since this is given complete in an intuition that is enclosed between limits, the parts are one and all given together with the conditioned. The regress may not, therefore, be entitled merely a regress in indefinitum. This was permissible in regard to the first cosmological idea, since it required an advance from the conditioned to its conditions, which, as outside it, were not given through and along with it, but were first added to it in the empirical regress. We are not, however, entitled to say of a whole which is divisible to infinity, that it is made up of infinitely many parts. For although all parts are contained in the intuition of the whole, the whole division is not so contained, but consists only in the continuous decomposition, that is, in the regress itself, whereby the series first becomes actual. Since this regress is infinite, all the members or parts at which it arrives are contained in the given whole, viewed as an aggregate. But the whole series of the division is not so contained, for it is a successive infinite and never whole, and cannot, therefore, exhibit an infinite multiplicity, or any combination of an infinite multiplicity in a whole.

This general statement is obviously applicable to space. Every space intuited as within limits is such a whole, the parts of which, as obtained by decomposition, are always themselves spaces. Every limited space is therefore infinitely divisible.

From this a second application of the statement quite naturally follows, namely, to an outer appearance enclosed

\[ A \text{ 524} \\
\text{B 533} \]
scheinung (Körper). Die Teilbarkeit desselben gründet sich auf die Teilbarkeit des Raumes, der die Möglichkeit des Körpers, als eines ausgedehnten Ganzen, ausmacht. Dieser ist also ins Unendliche teilbar, ohne doch darum aus unendlich viel Teilen zu bestehen.

Es scheint zwar, daß, da ein Körper als Substanz im Raume vorgestellt werden muß, er, was das Gesetz der Teilbarkeit des Raumes betrifft, hierin von diesem unterschieden sein werde; denn man kann es allenfalls wohl zugeben: daß die Dekomposition im letzteren niemals alle Zusammensetzung wegschaffen könne, indem alsdenn so gar aller Raum, der sonst nichts Selbständiges hat, aufhören würde (welches unmöglich ist); allein daß, wenn alle Zusammensetzung der Materie in Gedanken aufgehoben würde, gar nichts übrig bleiben solle, scheint sich nicht mit dem Begriffe einer Substanz vereinigen zu lassen, die eigentlich das Subjekt aller Zusammensetzung sein sollte, und in ihren Elementen übrig bleiben müßte, wenn gleich die Verknüpfung derselben im Raume, dadurch sie einen Körper ausmachen, aufgehoben wäre. Allein mit dem, was in der Erscheinung Substanz heißt, ist es nicht so: bewandt, als man es wohl von einem Ding an sich selbst durch-reinen Verstandsbegriff denken würde. Jenes ist nicht absolutes Subjekt, sondern beharrliches Bild der | Sinnlichkeit und nichts als Anschauung, in der überall nichts Unbedingtes angetroffen wird.

Ob nun aber gleich diese Regel des Fortschritts ins Unendliche: bei der Subdivision einer Erscheinung, als einer bloßen Erfüllung des Raumes, ohne alle Zweideutigkeit findet: so kann sie doch nicht gelten, wenn wir sie auch auf die Menge der auf gewisse Weise in dem gegebenen Ganzen schon abgesonderten Teile, dadurch diese ein Quantum discretem ausmachen, erstrecken wollen. Annehmen, daß in jedem gegliederten (organisierten) Ganzen ein jeder Teil wiederum gegliedert sei, und daß man auf solche Art, bei Zerlegung der Teile ins Unendliche, immer neue Kunstteile antrete, mit einem Worte, daß das Ganze ins Unendliche gegliedert sei, will sich gar nicht denken lassen, obschon wohl, daß die Teile der Materie, bei ihrer Dekomposition ins Unendliche, gegliedert werden könnten. Denn die Unendlichkeit der Teilung einer gegebenen Erscheinung im Raume gründet sich allein darauf, daß durch diese blieb die Teilbarkeit, d. i. eine an sich schlechthin unbestimmte Menge von Teilen gegeben ist, die Teile selbst aber nur durch die Subdivision gegeben und bestimmter werden, kurz, daß das Ganze nicht an sich selbst schon eingeteilt ist.
of parts, therefore, which a division may determine in a whole, will depend upon how far we care to advance in the regress of the division. On the other hand, in the case of an organic body conceived as organised in infinitum the whole is represented as already divided into parts, and as yielding to us, prior to all regress, a determinate and yet infinite number of parts. This, however, is self-contradictory. This infinite involution is regarded as an infinite (that is, never to be completed) series, and yet at the same time as completed in a [discrete] complex.1 Infinite divisibility belongs to appearance only in so far as it is a quantum continuum; it is inseparable from the occupation of space, which is indeed its ground. To view anything as being a quantum discretum, is to take the number of units in it as being determined, and therefore as being in every case equal to some number. How far organisation can go in an organised body, only experience can show; and although, so far as our experience has gone, we may not have arrived with certainty at any inorganic part, the possibility of experiencing such parts must at least be recognised. When, however, we have in mind the transcendentale division of an appearance in general, the question how far it may extend does not await an answer from experience; it is decided by a principle of reason which prescribes that, in the decomposition of the extended, the empirical regress, in conformity with the nature of this appearance, be never regarded as absolutely completed.

Concluding Note on the Solution of the Mathematical-transcendental Ideas, and Preliminary Observation on the Solution of the Dynamical-transcendental Ideas.

In representing the antinomy of pure reason, through all the transcendental ideas, in tabular form, and in showing that the ground of this conflict and the only means of removing it is by declaring both the opposed assertions to be false, we have represented the conditions as, in all cases, standing to the conditioned in relations of space and time. This is the assumption ordinarily made by the common understanding, and to it the conflict is exclusively due. On this view all the dialectical representations of totality, in the series of conditions for a given conditioned, are throughout of the same character. The

1 [Zusammennahme.]
condition is always a member of a series along with the conditioned, and so is *homogeneous* with it. In such a series the regress was never thought as completed, or if it had to be so thought, a member, in itself conditioned, must have been falsely supposed to be a first member, and therefore to be unconditioned; the object, that is, the conditioned, might not always be considered merely according to its magnitude, but at least the series of its conditions was so regarded. Thus arose the difficulty—a difficulty which could not be disposed of by any compromise but solely by cutting the knot—that reason made the series either too long or too short for the understanding, so that the understanding could never be equal to the prescribed idea.

But in all this we have been overlooking an essential distinction that obtains among the objects, that is, among those concepts of understanding which reason endeavours to raise to ideas. According to the table of categories given above, two of these concepts imply a *mathematical*, the other two a *dynamical* synthesis of appearances. Hitherto it has not been necessary to take account of this distinction; for just as in the general representation of all transcendental ideas we have been conforming to conditions within the [field of] appearance, so in the two mathematical-transcendental ideas the only object we have had in mind is object as appearance. But now that we are proceeding to consider how far *dynamical* concepts of the understanding are adequate to the idea of reason, the distinction becomes of importance, and opens up to us an entirely new view of the suit in which reason is implicated. This suit, in our previous trial of it, has been *dismissed* as resting, on both sides, on false presuppositions. But since in the dynamical antimony a presupposition compatible with the pretensions of reason may perhaps be found, and since the judge may perhaps make good what is lacking in the pleas which both sides have been guilty of misstating, the suit may be settled to the satisfaction of both parties, a procedure impossible in the case of the mathematical antinomies.

If we consider solely the *extension*\(^1\) of the series of conditions, and whether the series are adequate to the idea, or the idea too large or too small for the series, the series are indeed in

\[ \textit{Erschöpfung.} \]

\[ \textit{Akad.-Aug.:} \text{wurden,} \]

\[ \textit{Akad.-Aug.:} \text{inden wic, 50,} \]
these respects all homogeneous. But the concept of the understanding, which underlies these ideas, may contain either a synthesis solely of the \textit{homogeneous} (which is presupposed alike in the composition and in the division of every magnitude), or a synthesis of the \textit{heterogeneous}. For the homogeneous can be admitted as at least possible in the case of dynamical synthesis, alike in causal connection and in the connection of the necessary with the contingent.

Hence in the mathematical connection of the series of appearances no other than a \textit{sensible} condition is admissible, that is to say, none that is not itself a part of the series. On the other hand, in the dynamical series of sensible conditions, a heterogeneous condition, not itself a part of the series, but \textit{purely intelligible}, and as such outside the series, can be allowed. In this way reason obtains satisfaction and the unconditioned is set prior to the appearances, while yet the invariably conditioned character of the appearances is not obscured, nor their series cut short, in violation of the principles prescribed by the understanding.

Inasmuch as the dynamical ideas allow of a condition of appearances outside the series of the appearances, that is, a condition which is not itself appearance, we arrive at a conclusion altogether different from any that was possible in the case of the mathematical antinomy.\footnote{Understanding does not admit \textit{among appearances} any condition which can itself be empirically unconditioned. But if for some conditioned in the \textit{field of} appearance we can conceive an \textit{intelligible} condition, not belonging to the series of appearances as one of its members, and can do so without in the least interrupting the series of empirical conditions, such a condition may be accepted as \textit{empirically unconditioned}, without prejudice to the continuity of the empirical regress.}

\footnote{[Reading, with Hartenstein, \textit{der} \textit{mathematischen} \textit{Antinomie} \textit{for} \textit{der} \textit{Antinomie}.]}
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\[B 539\]

\[\text{Schlußanmerkung und Vorherinnerung 487}\]

\[\text{für jene zu groß, oder zu klein sein}.\text{. Allein der Verstands-begriff, der diesen Ideen zum Grunde liegt, enthält entweder lediglich eine Synthesis des Gleichartigen (welches bei jeder Größe, in der Zusammensetzung sowohl als Teilung derselben, vorausgesetzt wird), oder auch des Ungleichartigen, welches in der dynamischen Synthesis, der Kausalverbindung so wohl, als der des Notwendigen mit dem Zufälligen, wenigstens zugelassen werden kann.}\

\[\text{Daher kommt es, daß in der mathematischen Verknüpfung der Reihen der Erscheinungen keine andere als sinnliche Bedingung hinein kommen kann; d. i. eine solche, die selbst ein Teil der Reihe ist; da hingegen die dynamische Reihe sinnlicher Bedingungen—dohch noch—eine ungleichartige Bedingung zuläßt, die nicht ein Teil der Reihe ist},\text{ sondern, als bloß intelligibel, außer der Reihe liegt, wobei durch denn der Vernunft ein Genüge getan und das Unbedingte den Erscheinungen vorgesetzt wird, ohne die Reihe der letzteren, als jederzeit bedingt, dadurch zu verwehren und, den Verstandegrundsätzen zuwider, abzubrechen.}\

\[\text{—Dadurch nun, daß die dynamischen Ideen eine Bedingung der Erscheinungen außer der Reihe derselben, d. i. eine solche, die selbst nicht Erscheinung ist, zulassen, geschieht etwas, was von dem Erfolg der Antinomie gänzlich unterschieden ist. Diese nämlich verursachte, daß beide dialectische Gegenbehauptungen für falsch erklärt werden mußten. Dagegen das Durchgängigbedingte der dynamischen Reihen, welches von ihnen als Erscheinungen unzertrennlich ist, mit der zwar empirisch unbedingten, aber auch nichtsinnlichen Bedingung verknüpft, dem Verstande}\

\[*\text{Denn der Verstand erlaubt unter Erscheinungen keine Bedingung, die selbst empirisch unbedingt wäre. Läßt sich aber eine intelligible Bedingung, die also nicht in die Reihe der Erscheinungen, als ein Glied, mit gehörte, zu einem Bedingten (in der Erscheinung) gedenken, ohne doch dadurch die Reihe empirischer Bedingungen im mindesten zu unterbrechen: so könnte eine solche als empirisch unbedingt zugelassen werden, so daß dadurch dem empirischen kontinuierlichen Regressus nirgend Abbruch geschähöe.}\

\[\text{Akad.-Ausz.:} \text{— Zusatz von B.}\]
arguments, which in one or other way sought unconditioned totality in mere appearances, fall to the ground, and the propositions of reason, when thus given this more correct interpretation, may both alike be true. This can never be the case with those cosmological ideas which refer only to a mathematically unconditioned unity; for in them no condition of the series of appearances can be found that is not itself appearance, and as appearance one of the members of the series.

III

Solution of the Cosmological Idea¹ of Totality in the Derivation of Cosmical Events from their Causes

When we are dealing with what happens there are only two kinds of causality conceivable by us; the causality is either according to nature or arises from freedom. The former is the connection in the sensible world of one state with a preceding state on which it follows according to a rule. Since the causality of appearances rests on conditions of time, and the preceding state, if it had always existed, could not have produced an effect which first comes into being in time, it follows that the causality of the cause of that which happens or comes into being must itself also have come into being, and that in accordance with the principle of the understanding it must in its turn itself require a cause.

By freedom, on the other hand, in its cosmological meaning, I understand the power of beginning a state spontaneously.⁴ Such causality will not, therefore, itself stand under another cause determining it in time, as required by the law of nature. Freedom, in this sense, is a pure transcendental idea, which, in the first place, contains nothing borrowed from experience, and which, secondly, refers to an object that cannot be determined or given in any experience. That everything which happens has a cause is a universal law, conditioning the very possibility of all experience. Hence the causality of the cause, which itself happens or comes to be, must itself in turn have a cause; and thus the entire field of experience, however far it may extend, is transformed into a sum-total of the merely natural. But since in this way no absolute totality of

¹ [Reading, with Erdmann, Idee for Ideen.] ⁴ [von selbst.]
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conditions determining causal relation can be obtained, reason creates for itself the idea of a spontaneity which can begin to act of itself, without requiring to be determined to action by an antecedent cause in accordance with the law of causality.

It should especially be noted that the practical concept of freedom is based on this transcendental idea, and that in the latter lies the real source of the difficulty by which the question of the possibility of freedom has always been beset. Freedom in the practical sense is the will's independence of coercion through sensuous impulses. For a will is sensuous, in so far as it is pathologically affected, i.e. by sensuous motives; it is animal (arbitrium brutum), if it can be pathologically necessitated. The human will is certainly an arbitrium sensitivum, not, however, brutum but liberum. For sensibility does not necessitate its action. There is in man a power of self-determination, independently of any coercion through sensuous impulses.

Obviously, if all causality in the sensible world were mere nature, every event would be determined by another in time, in accordance with necessary laws. Appearances, in determining the will, would have in the actions of the will their natural effects, and would render the actions necessary. The denial of transcendental freedom must, therefore, involve the elimination of all practical freedom. For practical freedom presupposes that although something has not happened, it ought to have happened, and that its cause, [as found in the field of] appearance, is not, therefore, so determining that it excludes a causality of our will—a causality which, independently of those natural causes, and even contrary to their force and influence, can produce something that is determined in the time-order in accordance with empirical laws, and which can therefore begin a series of events entirely of itself.

Here then, as always happens when reason, in venturing beyond the limits of possible experience, comes into conflict with itself, the problem is not really physiological but transcendental. The question as to the possibility of freedom does indeed concern psychology; since it rests on dialectical arguments of pure reason, its treatment and solution belong exclusively to transcendental philosophy. Before attempting  

1 [Willkär]  
2 [Bewegursachen]
this solution, a task which transcendental philosophy cannot decline, I must define somewhat more accurately the procedure of transcendental philosophy in dealing with the problem.

If appearances were things in themselves, and space and time forms of the existence of things in themselves, the conditions would always be members of the same series as the conditioned; and thus, in the present case, as in the other transcendental ideas, the antinomy would arise, that the series must be too large or too small for the understanding. But the dynamical concepts of reason, with which we have to deal in this and the following section, possess this peculiarity that they are not concerned with an object considered as a magnitude, but only with its existence. Accordingly we can abstract from the magnitude of the series of conditions, and consider only the dynamical relation of the condition to the conditioned. The difficulty which then meets us, in dealing with the question regarding nature and freedom, is whether freedom is possible at all, and if it be possible, whether it can exist along with the universality of the natural law of causality. Is it a truly disjunctive proposition to say that every effect in the world must arise either from nature or from freedom; or must we not rather say that in one and the same event, in different relations, both can be found? That all events in the sensible world stand in thoroughgoing connection in accordance with unchangeable laws of nature is an established principle of the Transcendental Analytic, and allows of no exception. The question, therefore, can only be whether freedom is completely excluded by this inviolable rule, or whether an effect, notwithstanding its being thus determined in accordance with nature, may not at the same time be grounded in freedom. The common but fallacious presupposition of the absolute reality of appearances here manifests its injurious influence, to the confounding of reason. For if appearances are things in themselves, freedom cannot be upheld. Nature will then be the complete and sufficient determining cause of every event. The condition of the event will be such as can be found only in the series of appearances; both it and its effect will be necessary in accordance with the law of nature. If, on the other hand, appearances are not taken for more than they actually are; if they are viewed not as things in themselves, but merely as representations, connected accord-
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ing to empirical laws, they must themselves have grounds which are not appearances. The effects of such an intelligible cause appear, and accordingly can be determined through other appearances, but its causality is not so determined. While the effects are to be found in the series of empirical conditions, the intelligible cause, together with its causality, is outside the series. Thus the effect may be regarded as free in respect of its intelligible cause, and at the same time in respect of appearances as resulting from them according to the necessity of nature. This distinction, when stated in this quite general and abstract manner, is bound to appear extremely subtle and obscure, but will become clear in the course of its application. My purpose has only been to point out that since the thoroughgoing connection of all appearances, in a context of nature, is an inexorable law, the inevitable consequence of obstinately insisting upon the reality of appearances is to destroy all freedom. Those who thus follow the common view have never been able to reconcile nature and freedom.

Possibility of Causality through Freedom, in Harmony with the Universal Law of Natural Necessity.

Whatever in an object of the senses is not itself appearance, I entitle *intelligible*. If, therefore, that which in the sensible world must be regarded as appearance has in itself a faculty which is not an object of sensible intuition, but through which it can be the cause of appearances, the *causality* of this being can be regarded from two points of view. Regarded as the causality of a thing in itself, it is *intelligible* in its *action*; regarded as the causality of an appearance in the world of sense, it is *sensible* in its *effects*. We should therefore have to form both an empirical and an intellectual concept of the causality of the faculty of such a subject, and to regard both as referring to one and the same effect. This twofold manner of conceiving the faculty possessed by an object of the senses does not contradict any of the concepts which we have to form of appearances and of a possible experience. For since they are not things in themselves, they must rest upon a transcendental object which determines them as mere representations; and consequently there is nothing to prevent us from ascribing to this transcendental...
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object, besides the quality in terms of which it appears, a causality which is not appearance, although its effect is to be met with in appearance. Every efficient cause must have a character, that is, a law of its causality, without which it would not be a cause. On the above supposition, we should, therefore, in a subject belonging to the sensible world have, first, an empirical character, whereby its actions, as appearances, stand in thoroughgoing connection with other appearances in accordance with unvarying laws of nature. And since these actions can be derived from the other appearances, they constitute together with them a single series in the order of nature. Secondly, we should also have to allow the subject an intelligible character, by which it is indeed the cause of those same actions [in their quality] as appearances, but which does not itself stand under any conditions of sensibility, and is not itself appearance. We can entitle the former the character of the thing in the field of appearance, and the latter its character as thing in itself.

Now this acting subject would not, in its intelligible character, stand under any conditions of time; time is only a condition of appearances, not of things in themselves. In this subject no action would begin or cease, and it would not, therefore, have to conform to the law of the determination of all that is alterable in time, namely, that everything which happens must have its cause in the appearances which precede it. In a word, its causality, so far as it is intelligible, would not have a place in the series of those empirical conditions through which the event is rendered necessary in the world of sense. This intelligible character can never, indeed, be immediately known, for nothing can be perceived except in so far as it appears. It would have to be thought in accordance with the empirical character—just as we are constrained to think a transcendental object as underlying appearances, though we know nothing of what it is in itself.

In its empirical character, therefore, this subject, as appearance, would have to conform to all the laws of causal determination. To this extent it could be nothing more than a part of the world of sense, and its effects, like all other

1 [dadurch] 2 [Charakter] 3 [intellektuell. In all other cases Kant employs the less misleading term intelligibel.]
appearances, must be the inevitable outcome of nature. In proportion as outer appearances are found to influence it, and in proportion as its empirical character, that is, the law of its causality, becomes known through experience, all its actions must admit of explanation in accordance with the laws of nature. In other words, all that is required for their complete and necessary determination must be found in a possible experience.

In its intelligible character (though we can only have a general concept of that character) this same subject must be considered to be free from all influence of sensibility and from all determination through appearances. Inasmuch as it is noumenon, nothing happens in it; there can be no change requiring dynamical determination in time, and therefore no causal dependence upon appearances. And consequently, since natural necessity is to be met with only in the sensible world, this active being must in its actions be independent of, and free from all such necessity. No action begins in this active being itself; but we may yet quite correctly say that the active being of itself begins its effects in the sensible world. In so doing, we should not be asserting that the effects in the sensible world can begin of themselves; they are always predetermined through antecedent empirical conditions, though solely through their empirical character (which is no more than the appearance of the intelligible), and so are only possible as a continuation of the series of natural causes. In this way freedom and nature, in the full sense of these terms, can exist together, without any conflict, in the same actions, according as the actions are referred to their intelligible or to their sensible cause.

*Explanation of the Cosmological Idea of Freedom in its connection with Universal Natural Necessity.*

I have thought it advisable to give this outline sketch of the solution of our transcendental problem, so that we may be the better enabled to survey the course which reason has to adopt in arriving at the solution. I shall now proceed to set forth the various factors involved in this solution, and to consider each in detail.

That everything which happens has a cause, is a law of nature. Since the causality of this cause, that is, the action of

gen, so wie jede andere Erscheinung, aus der Natur unausbleiblich abzulassen. So wie äußere Erscheinungen in dasselbe einfloßen, wie sein empirischer Charakter, d. i. das Gesetz seiner Kausalität, durch Erfahrung erkannt wäre, müßten sich alle seine Handlungen nach Naturgesetzen erklären lassen und alle Requisite zu einer vollkommenen und notwendigen Bestimmung derselben müßten in einer möglichen Erfahrung angetroffen werden.


*Erläuterung der kosmologischen Idee einer Freiheit in Verbindung mit der allgemeinen Naturnotwendigkeit*


Das Naturgesetz, daß alles, was geschieht, eine Ursache habe, daß die Kausalität dieser Ursache, d. i. die Hand-
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the cause, is antecedent in time to the effect which has ensued upon it, it cannot itself have always existed, but must have happened, and among the appearances must have a cause by which it in turn is determined. Consequently, all events are empirically determined in an order of nature. Only in virtue of this law can appearances constitute a nature and become objects of experience. This law is a law of the understanding, from which no departure can be permitted, and from which no appearance may be exempted. To allow such exemption would be to set an appearance outside all possible experience, to distinguish it from all objects of possible experience, and so to make of it a mere thought-entity, a phantom of the brain.

This would seem to imply the existence of a chain of causes which in the regress to their conditions allows of no absolute totality. But that need not trouble us. The point has already been dealt with in the general discussion of the antinomy into which reason falls when in the series of appearances it proceeds to the unconditioned. Were we to yield to the illusion of transcendental realism, neither nature nor freedom would remain. The only question here is this:—Admitting that in the whole series of events there is nothing but natural necessity, is it yet possible to regard one and the same event as being in one aspect merely an effect of nature and in another aspect an effect due to freedom; or is there between these two kinds of causality a direct contradiction?

Among the causes in the [field of] appearance there certainly cannot be anything which could begin a series absolutely and of itself. Every action, [viewed] as appearance, in so far as it gives rise to an event, is itself an event or happening, and presupposes another state wherein its cause is to be found. Thus everything which happens is merely a continuation of the series, and nothing that begins of itself is a possible member of the series. The actions of natural causes in the time-sequence are thus themselves effects; they presuppose causes antecedent to them in the temporal series. An original act, such as can by itself bring about what did not exist before, is not to be looked for in the causally connected appearances.

Now granting that effects are appearances and that their cause is likewise appearance, is it necessary that the causality of their cause should be exclusively empirical? May it not


Unter den Ursachen in der Erscheinung kann sicherlich nichts sein, welches eine Reihe schlechthin und von selbst anfangen könnte: Jede Handlung, als Erscheinung, so fern sie eine Begebenheit hervorbringt, ist selbst Begebenheit, oder Erlebnis, welche einen andern Zustand voraussetzt, darin die Ursache angetroffen werde; und so ist alles, was geschehen, nur eine Fortsetzung der Reihe, und kein Anfang, der sich von selbst zutreffe, in derselben möglich. Also sind alle Handlungen der Naturursachen in der Zeitfolge selbst, wie der Wirkung, die ihre Ursachen eben so wohl in der Zeitreihe voraussetzen. Eine ursprüngliche Handlung, wodurch etwas geschehen, was vorher nicht war, ist von der Kausalverknüpfung der Erscheinungen nicht zu erwarten.

Ist es denn aber auch notwendig, daß, wenn die Wirkungen Erscheinungen sind, die Kausalität ihrer Ursache, die (nämlich Ursache) selbst auch Erscheinung ist, lediglich empirisch sein müßte? und ist es nicht vielmehr möglich,
der Naturursachen im mindesten zu unterbrechen, doch eine Wirkung einer nichtempirischen, sondern intelligiblen Kausalität sein könne? d. i. einer, in Anlehnung der Erscheinungen, ursprünglichen Handlung einer Ursache, die also in so fern nicht Erscheinung, sondern diesem Vermögen nach intelligibel ist, ob sie gleich übrigens gänzlich, als ein Glied der Naturkette, mit zu der Sinnenwelt gezählt werden muß.

Wir bedürfen des Satzes der Kausalität der Erscheinungen untereinander, um von Naturgegebenheiten Naturbedingungen, d. i. Ursachen in der Erscheinung zu suchen und angeben zu können. Wenn dieses eingeräumt und durch keine Ausnahme geschwächt wird, so hat der Verstand, der bei seinem empirischen Gebrauch in allen Erlebnissen nichts als Natur sieht, und dazu auch berechtigt ist, alles, was er fordern kann, und die physischen Erklärungen gehen ihren ungehemmten Gang fort. Nun tut ihm das nicht den mindesten Abbruch, gesetzt daß es übrigens auch bloß erdachtet sein sollte, wenn man annimmt, daß unter den Naturursachen es auch welche gebe, die ein Vermögen haben, welches nur intelligibel ist, indem die Bestimmung desselben zur Handlung niemals auf empirischen Bedingungen, sondern auf bloßen Gründen des Verstandes beruht, so doch, daß die Handlung in der Erscheinung von dieser Ursache aller Gesetzen der empirischen Kausalität gemäß sei. Denn auf diese Art würde das handelnde Subjekt, als causa phaenomenon, mit der Natur in unzertrennter Abhängigkeit aller ihrer Handlungen verketet sein, und nur das phaenomenon dieses Subjekts (mit aller Kausalität desselben in der Erscheinung) würde gewisse Bedingungen enthalten, die, wenn man von dem empirischen Gegenstande zu dem transzendentalen aufsteigen will, als bloß intelligibel müßten angesehen werden. Denn wenn wir nur in dem, was unter den Erscheinungen die Ursache sein mag, der Naturregel folgen, so können wir darüber unbekümmert sein, was in dem transzendenten Subjekt, welches uns empirisch
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unknown to us. This intelligible ground does not have to be considered in empirical enquiries; it concerns only thought in the pure understanding; and although the effects of this thought and action of the pure understanding are to be met with in the appearances, these appearances must none the less be capable of complete causal explanation in terms of other appearances in accordance with natural laws. We have to take their strictly empirical character as the supreme ground of explanation, leaving entirely out of account their intelligible character (that is, the transcendental cause of their empirical character) as being completely unknown, save in so far as the empirical serves for its sensible sign.

Let us apply this to experience. Man is one of the appearances of the sensible world, and in so far one of the natural causes the causality of which must stand under empirical laws. Like all other things in nature, he must have an empirical character. This character we come to know through the powers and faculties which he reveals in his actions.¹ In lifeless, or merely animal, nature we find no ground for thinking that any faculty is conditioned otherwise than in a merely sensible manner. Man, however, who knows all the rest of nature solely through the senses, knows himself also through pure² apperception, and this, indeed, in acts and inner determinations which he cannot regard as impressions of the senses. He is thus to himself, on the one hand, a phenomenon, and on the other hand, in respect of certain faculties the action of which cannot be ascribed to the receptivity of sensibility, a purely³ intelligible object. We entitle these faculties understanding and reason. The latter, in particular, we distinguish in a quite peculiar and special way from all empirically conditioned powers. For it views its objects exclusively⁴ in the light of ideas, and in accordance with them determines the understanding, which then proceeds to make an empirical use of its own similarly pure concepts.

That our reason has causality, or that we at least represent it to ourselves as having causality, is evident from the imperatives which in all matters of conduct we impose as rules upon our active powers. 'Ought' expresses a kind of necessity and of connection with grounds which is found nowhere else in the

¹ [Wirkungen.] ² [blosse] ³ [blosse]
whole of nature. The understanding can know in nature only what is, what has been, or what will be. We cannot say that anything in nature ought to be other than what in all these time-relations it actually is. When we have the course of nature alone in view, 'ought' has no meaning whatsoever. It is just as absurd to ask what ought to happen in the natural world as to ask what properties a circle ought to have. All that we are justified in asking is: what happens in nature? what are the properties of the circle?

This 'ought' expresses a possible action the ground of which cannot be anything but a mere concept; whereas in the case of a merely natural action the ground must always be an appearance. The action to which the 'ought' applies must indeed be possible under natural conditions. These conditions, however, do not play any part in determining the will itself, but only in determining the effect and its consequences in the [field of] appearance. No matter how many natural grounds or how many sensitive impulses may impel me to will, they can never give rise to the 'ought', but only to a willing which, while very far from being necessary, is always conditioned; and the 'ought' pronounced by reason confronts such willing with a limit and an end—nay more, forbids or authorises it. Whether what is willed be an object of mere sensibility (the pleasant) or of pure reason (the good), reason will not give way to any ground which is empirically given. Reason does not here follow the order of things as they present themselves in appearance, but frames for itself with perfect spontaneity an order of its own according to ideas, to which it adapts the empirical conditions, and according to which it declares actions to be necessary, even although they have never taken place, and perhaps never will take place. And at the same time reason also presupposes that it can have causality in regard to all these actions, since otherwise no empirical effects could be expected from its ideas.

Now, in view of these considerations, let us take our stand, and regard it as at least possible for reason to have causality with respect to appearances. Reason though it be, it must none the less exhibit an empirical character. For every cause presupposes a rule according to which certain appearances follow as effects; and every rule requires uniformity in the effects. This uniformity is, indeed, that upon which the
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The concept of cause (as a faculty) is based, and so far as it must be exhibited by mere appearances may be named the empirical character of the cause. This character is permanent, but its effects, according to variation in the concomitant and in part limiting conditions, appear in changeable forms.

Thus the will of every man has an empirical character, which is nothing but a certain causality of his reason, so far as that causality exhibits, in its effects in the [field of] appearance, a rule from which we may gather what, in their kind and degrees, are the actions of reason and the grounds thereof, and so may form an estimate concerning the subjective principles of his will. Since this empirical character must itself be discovered from the appearances which are its effect and from the rule to which experience shows them to conform, it follows that all the actions of men in the [field of] appearance are determined in conformity with the order of nature, by their empirical character and by the other causes which cooperate with that character; and if we could exhaustively investigate all the appearances of men's wills, there would not be found a single human action which we could not predict with certainty, and recognize as proceeding necessarily from its antecedent conditions. So far, then, as regards this empirical character there is no freedom; and yet it is only in the light of this character that man can be studied—if, that is to say, we are simply observing, and in the manner of anthropology seeking to institute a physiological investigation into the motive causes of his actions.

But when we consider these actions in their relation to reason—I do not mean speculative reason, by which we endeavour to explain their coming into being, but reason in so far as it is itself the cause producing them—if, that is to say, we compare them with [the standards of] reason in its practical bearing, we find a rule and order altogether different from the order of nature. For it may be that all that has happened in the course of nature, and in accordance with its empirical grounds must inevitably have happened, ought not to have happened. Sometimes, however, we find, or at least believe that we find, that the ideas of reason have in actual fact proved their causality in respect of the actions of men, as appearances; and that these actions have taken place, not because they were
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determined by empirical causes, but because they were determined by grounds of reason.

Granted, then, that reason may be asserted to have causality in respect of appearance, its action can still be said to be free, even although its empirical character (as a mode of sense\(^1\)) is completely and necessarily determined in all its detail. This empirical character is itself determined in the intelligible character (as a mode of thought\(^2\)). The latter, however, we do not know; we can only indicate its nature by means of appearances; and these really yield an immediate knowledge only of the mode of sense, the empirical character.\(^*\) The action, in so far as it can be ascribed to a mode of thought as its cause, does not follow therefrom in accordance with empirical laws; that is to say, it is not preceded by the conditions of pure reason, but only by their effects in the field of appearance of inner sense. Pure reason, as a purely intelligible faculty, is not subject to the form of time, nor consequently to the conditions of succession in time. The causality of reason in its intelligible character does not, in producing an effect, arise or begin to be at a certain time. For in that case it would itself be subject to the natural law of appearances, in accordance with which causal series are determined in time; and its causality would then be nature, not freedom.

Thus all that we are justified in saying is that, if reason can have causality in respect of appearances, it is a faculty through which the sensible condition of an empirical series of effects first begins. For the condition which lies in reason is not sensible, and therefore does not itself begin to be. And thus what we failed to find in any empirical series is disclosed as being possible, namely, that the condition of a successive series of events may itself be empirically unconditioned.

\(^*\) The real morality of actions, their merit or guilt, even that of our own conduct, thus remains entirely hidden from us. Our imputations can refer only to the empirical character. How much of this character is ascribable to the pure effect of freedom, how much to mere nature, that is, to faults of temperament for which there is no responsibility, or to its happy constitution (merito fortunae), can never be determined; and upon it therefore no perfectly just judgments can be passed.

\(^1\) [Sinnesart.]

\(^2\) [Denkungsart.]
here the condition is outside the series of appearances (in the intelligible), and therefore is not subject to any sensible condition, and to no time-determination through an antecedent cause.

The same cause does, indeed, in another relation, belong to the series of appearances. Man is himself an appearance. His will has an empirical character, which is the empirical cause of all his actions. There is no condition determining man in accordance with this character which is not contained in the series of natural effects, or which is not subject to their law—the law according to which there can be no empirically unconditioned causality of that which happens in time. Therefore no given action (since it can be perceived only as appearance) can begin absolutely of itself. But of pure reason we cannot say that the state wherein the will is determined is preceded and itself determined by some other state. For since reason is not itself an appearance, and is not subject to any conditions of sensibility, it follows that even as regards its causality there is in it no time-sequence, and that the dynamical law of nature, which determines succession in time in accordance with rules, is not applicable to it.

Reason is the abiding condition of all those actions of the will under [the guise of] which man appears. Before ever they have happened, they are one and all predetermined in the empirical character. In respect of the intelligible character, of which the empirical character is the sensible schema, there can be no before and after; every action, irrespective of its relation in time to other appearances, is the immediate effect of the intelligible character of pure reason. Reason therefore acts freely; it is not dynamically determined in the chain of natural causes through either outer or inner grounds antecedent in time. This freedom ought not, therefore, to be conceived only negatively as independence of empirical conditions. The faculty of reason, so regarded, would cease to be a cause of appearances. It must also be described in positive terms, as the power of originating a series of events. In reason itself nothing begins; as unconditioned condition of every voluntary act, it admits of no conditions antecedent to itself in time. Its effect has, indeed, a beginning in the series of appearances, but never in this series an absolutely first beginning.

konnte. Denn hier ist die Bedingung außer der Reihe der Erscheinungen (im Intelligiblen) und mithin keiner sinnlichen Bedingung und keiner Zeitbestimmung durch vorhergehende Ursache unterworfen.

Gleichwohl gehört doch eben dieselbe Ursache in einer andern Beziehung auch zur Reihe der Erscheinungen. Der Mensch ist selbst Erscheinung. Seine Willkür hat einen empirischen Charakter, der die (empirische) Ursache aller seiner Handlungen ist. Es ist keine der Bedingungen, die den Menschen diesem Charakter gemäß bestimmen, welche nicht in der Reihe der Naturwirkungen enthalten wäre und dem Gesetze derselben gehorchte, nach welchem gar keine empirischunbedingte Kausalität von dem, was in der Zeit geschieht, angetroffen wird. Daher kann keine gegebene Handlung (weil sie nur als Erscheinung wahrgenommen werden kann) schlechthin von selbst anfangen. Aber von der Vernunft kann man nicht sagen, daß vor demjenigen Zustande, darin sie die Willkür bestimmt, ein anderer vorhergehe, darin dieser Zustand selbst bestimmt wird. Denn da Vernunft selbst keine Erscheinung und gar keinen Bedingungen der Sinnlichkeit unterworfen ist, so findet in ihr, selbst in Betreff ihrer Kausalität, keine Zeitfolge statt, und auf sie kann also das dynamische Gesetz der Natur, was die Zeitfolge nach Regeln bestimmt, nicht angewandt werden.
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In order to illustrate this regulative principle of reason by an example of its empirical employment—not, however, to confirm it, for it is useless to endeavour to prove transcendental propositions by examples—let us take a voluntary action, for example, a malicious lie by which a certain confusion has been caused in society. First of all, we endeavour to discover the motives to which it has been due, and then, secondly, in the light of these, we proceed to determine how far the action and its consequences can be imputed to the offender. As regards the first question, we trace the empirical character of the action to its sources, finding these in defective education, bad company, in part also in the viciousness of a natural disposition insensitive to shame, in levity and thoughtlessness, not neglecting to take into account also the occasional causes that may have intervened. We proceed in this enquiry just as we should in ascertaining for a given natural effect the series of its determining causes. But although we believe that the action is thus determined, we none the less blame the agent, not indeed on account of his unhappy disposition, nor on account of the circumstances that have influenced him, nor even on account of his previous way of life; for we presuppose that we can leave out of consideration what this way of life may have been, that we can regard the past series of conditions as not having occurred and the act as being completely unconditioned by any preceding state, just as if the agent in and by himself began in this action an entirely new series of consequences. Our blame is based on a law of reason whereby we regard reason as a cause that irrespective of all the above-mentioned empirical conditions could have determined, and ought to have determined, the agent to act otherwise. This causality of reason we do not regard as only a co-operating agency, but as complete in itself, even when the sensuous impulses do not favour but are directly opposed to it; the action is ascribed to the agent’s intelligible character; in the moment when he utters the lie, the guilt is entirely his. Reason, irrespective of all empirical conditions of the act, is completely free, and the lie is entirely due to its default.

Such imputation clearly shows that we consider reason to be unaffected by these sensible influences, and not liable to alteration. Its appearances—the modes in which it manifests
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Um das regulative Prinzip der Vernunft durch ein Beispiel aus dem empirischen Gebrauch desselben zu erläutern, nicht um es zu bestätigen (denn dergleichen Beweise sind zu transzendentalen Behauptungen untauglich), so nehme man eine willkürliche Handlung, z. E. eine boshaute Lüge, durch die ein Mensch eine gewisse Verwirrung in die Gesellschaft gebracht hat, und die man zuerst ihren Bewegursachen nach, woraus sie entstanden, untersucht, und darauf beurteilt, wie sie samt ihren Folgen ihm zugerechnet werden können. In der ersten Absicht geht man seinen empirischen Charakter bis zu den Quellen desselben durch, die man in der schlechten Erziehung, über Gesellschaft, zum Teil auch in der Bösartigkeit eines für Beschämung unempfindlichen Naturells, aufsucht, zum Teil auf den Leichtsinn und Unbesonnenheit schiebt; wobei man denn die veranlassenden Gelegenheitsursachen nicht aus der Acht läßt. In allem diesem verfährt man, wie überhaupt in Untersuchung der Reihe bestimmender Ursachen zu einer gegebenen Naturwirkung. Ob man nun gleich || die Handlung dadurch bestimmt zu sein glaubt: so tadelt man nichts destoweniger den Täter, und zwar nicht wegen seines unglücklichen Naturells, nicht wegen der auf ihn einfließenden Umstände, ja so gar nicht wegen seines vorhergeschrägten Lebenswandels, denn man setzt voraus, man könne es gänzlich bei Seite setzen, wie dieser beschaffen gewesen, und die verflossene Reihe von Bedingungen als ungeschehen, diese Tat aber als gänzlich unbedingt in Ansehung des vorigen Zustandes ansehen, als ob der Täter damit eine Reihe von Folgen ganz von selbst anhebe. Dieser Tadel gründet sich auf ein Gesetz der Vernunft, wobei man diese als eine Ursache ansieht, welche das Verhalten des Menschen, unangesehen aller genannten empirischen Bedingungen, anders habe bestimmen können und sollen. Und zwar sieht man die Kausalität der Vernunft nicht etwa bloß wie Konkurrenz, sondern an sich selbst als vollständig an, wenn gleich die sinnlichen Triebfedern gar nicht dafür, sondern wohl gar wider wären; die Handlung wird seinem intelligiblen Charakter beigemessen, er hat jetzt, in dem Augenblicke, da er lügt, gänzlich Schuld! mithin war die Vernunft, unerachtet aller empirischen Bedingungen der Tat, völlig frei, und ihrer Unterlassung ist diese gänzlich beizumessen.

Man sieht diesem zurechnenden Urteile es leicht an, daß man dabei in Gedanken habe, die Vernunft werde durch alle jene Sinnlichkeit gar nicht affiziert, sie veränderne sich nicht
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itself in its effects—do alter; but in itself [so we consider] there is no preceding state determining the state that follows. That is to say, it does not belong to the series of sensible conditions which render appearances necessary in accordance with laws of nature. Reason is present in all the actions of men at all times and under all circumstances, and is always the same; but it is not itself in time, and does not fall into any new state in which it was not before. In respect to new states, it is determining, not determinable. We may not, therefore, ask why reason has not determined itself differently, but only why it has not through its causality determined the appearances differently. But to this question no answer is possible. For a different intelligible character would have given a different empirical character. When we say that in spite of his whole previous course of life the agent could have refrained from lying, this only means that the act is under the immediate power of reason, and that reason in its causality is not subject to any conditions of appearance or of time. Although difference of time makes a fundamental difference to appearances in their relations to one another—for appearances are not things in themselves and therefore not causes in themselves—it can make no difference to the relation in which the action stands to reason.

A 567
B 385
Thus in our judgments in regard to the causality of free actions, we can get as far as the intelligible cause, but not beyond it. We can know that it is free, that is, that it is determined independently of sensibility, and that in this way it may be the sensibly unconditioned condition of appearances. But to explain why it is determined in the given circumstances the intelligible character should give just these appearances and this empirical character transcends all the powers of our reason, indeed all its rights of questioning, just as if we were to ask why the transcendental object of our outer sensible intuition gives intuition in space only and not some other mode of intuition. But the problem which we have to solve does not require us to raise any such questions. Our problem was this only: whether freedom and natural necessity can exist without conflict in one and the same action; and this we have sufficiently answered. We have shown that since freedom may stand in relation to a quite different kind of conditions from those of natural necessity, the law of the latter does not affect the former, and that both
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wenn gleich ihre Erscheinungen, nämlich die Art, wie sie sich in ihren Wirkungen zeigt, verändern'), in ihr gebe kein Zustand vorher, der den folgenden bestimme, mithin gehöre sie gar nicht in die Reihe der sinnlichen Bedingungen, welche die Erscheinungen nach Naturgesetzen notwendig machen. Sie, die Vernunft, ist allen Handlungen des Menschen in allen Zeitumständen gegenwärtig und einleit, selbst aber ist sie nicht in der Zeit, und gerät etwa in einen neuen Zustand, darin sie vorher nicht war; sie ist bestimmend, aber nicht bestimmbar in Ansehung desselben. Daher kann man nicht fragen: warum hat sich nicht die Vernunft anders bestimmt? sondern nur: warum hat sie die Erscheinungen durch ihre Kausalität nicht anders bestimmt? Darauf aber ist keine Antwort möglich. Denn ein anderer intelligibler Charakter würde einen andern empirischen gegeben haben, und wenn wir sagen, daß, unerachtet dieses ganzen, bis dahin geführten, Lebenswandels, der Täter die Lüge doch hätte unterlassen können, so bedeutet dieses nur, daß sie unmittelbar unter der Macht der Vernunft stehe, und die Vernunft in ihrer Kausalität keinen Bedingungen der Erscheinung und des Zeitlaufs unterworfen ist, der Unterschied der Zeit auch, zwar einen Hauptunterschied der Erscheinungen respektive gegen einander, da diese aber keine Sachen, mithin auch nicht Ursachen an sich selbst sind, keinen Unterschied der Handlung in Beziehung auf die Vernunft machen könne.

Wir können also mit der Beurteilung freier Handlungen, in Ansehung ihrer Kausalität, nur bis an die intelligibele Ursache, aber nicht über dieselbe hinaus kommen; wir können erkennen, daß sie frei, d. i. von der Sinnlichkeit unabhängig bestimmt, und, auf solche Art, die sinnlich-unbedingte Bedingung der Erscheinungen sein könne. Warum aber der intelligibele Charakter? gerade diese Erscheinungen und diesen empirischen Charakter unter vorliegenden Umständen gebe, das überschreitet so weit alles Vermögen unserer Vernunft, es zu beantworten, ja alle Begifnus derselben, nur zu fragen, ob man frichte: woher der transzendentale Gegenstand unserer äußeren sinnlichen Anschauung gerade nur Anschauung im Raume und nicht irgend eine andre gebe'. Allein die Aufgabe, die wir aufzulösen hatten, verbündet uns hierzu gar nicht, denn sie war nur diese: ob Freiheit der Naturnotwendigkeit in einer und derselben Handlung widerstreit, und dieses haben wir hinreichend beantwortet, da wir zeigten, daß, da bei jener eine Beziehung auf eine ganz andere Art von Bedingungen möglich ist, als bei dieser, das Gesetz der letzteren die ersteren

ANTINOMY OF PURE REASON

may exist, independently of one another and without interfering with each other.

The reader should be careful to observe that in what has been said our intention has not been to establish the reality of freedom as one of the faculties which contain the cause of the appearances of our sensible world. For that enquiry, as it does not deal with concepts alone, would not have been transcendental. And further, it could not have been successful, since we can never infer from experience anything which cannot be thought in accordance with the laws of experience. It has not even been our intention to prove the possibility of freedom. For in this also we should not have succeeded, since we cannot from mere concepts a priori know the possibility of any real ground and its causality. Freedom is here being treated only as a transcendental idea whereby reason is led to think that it can begin the series of conditions in the [field of] appearance by means of the sensibly unconditioned, and so becomes involved in an antinomy with those very laws which itself prescribes to the empirical employment of the understanding. What we have alone been able to show, and what we have alone been concerned to show, is that this antinomy rests on a sheer illusion, and that causality through freedom is at least not incompatible with nature.

IV

Solution of the Cosmological Idea of the Totality of the Dependence of Appearances as regards their Existence in general

In the preceding subsection we have considered the changes of the sensible world in so far as they form a dynamical series, each member being subordinate to another as effect to cause. We shall now employ this series of states merely to guide us in our search for an existence that may serve as the supreme condition of all that is alterable, that is, in our search for necessary being. We are concerned here, not with unconditioned causality, but with the unconditioned existence of substance itself. The series which we have in

TRANZENDENTALE DIALEKTIK

nicht aufzieren, mittin beide von einander unabhängig und durch einander ungestört stattfinden können.

Man muß wohl bemerken: daß wir hiedurch nicht die Wirklichkeit der Freiheit, als eines der Vermögen, welche die Ursache von den Erscheinungen unserer Sinnenwelt enthalten, haben dartun wollen. Denn, außer daß dieses gar keine Transzendentale Betrachtung, die bloß mit Begriffen zu tun hat, gewesen sein würde, so könnte es auch nicht gelingen, indem wir aus der Erfahrung niemals auf etwas, was gar nicht nach Erfahrungsgesetzen gedacht werden muß,schließen können. Ferner haben wir auch gar nicht einmal die Möglichkeit der Freiheit beweisen wollen; denn dieses wäre auch nicht gelungen, weil wir überhaupt von keinem Realgrunde und keiner Kausalität, aus bloßen Begriffen a priori, die Möglichkeit erkennen können. Die Freiheit wird hier nur als transzendentale Idee behandelt, wodurch die Vernunft die Reihe der Bedingungen in der Erscheinung durch das Sinnlichunbedingte schlichthin anzuheben denkt, dabei sich aber in eine Antinomie mit ihren eigenen Gesetzen, welche sie dem empirischen Gebräuche des Verstandes vorschreibt, verwickelt. Daß nun diese Antinomie auf einem bloßen Schein beruhe, und, daß Natur der Kausalität aus Freiheit wenigstens nicht widerstreite, das war das einzige, was wir leisten konnten, und woran es uns auch einzig und allein gelegen war.

IV. AUFLÖSUNG DER KOSMOLOGISCHEN IDEE VON DER TOTALITÄT DER ABHÄNGIGKEIT DER ERScheinungen, IHREM DASEIN NACH ÜBERHaupt

In der vorigen Nummer betrachteten wir die Veränderungen der Sinnenwelt in ihrer dynamischen Reihe, da eine jede unter einer andern, als ihrer Ursache, steht. Jetzt dient uns diese Reihe der Zustände nur zur Leitung, um zu einem Dasein zu gelangen, das die höchste Bedingung alles Veränderlichen sein könne, nämlich dem notwendigen Wesen. Es ist hier nicht um die unbedingte Kausalität, sondern die unbedingte Existenz der Substanz selbst zu tun. Also ist die Reihe, welche wir vor uns haben, eigentlich
view is, therefore, really a series of concepts, not a series of intuitions in which one intuition is the condition of the other.

But it is evident that since everything in the sum-total of appearances is alterable, and therefore conditioned in its existence, there cannot be in the whole series of dependent existence any unconditioned member the existence of which can be regarded as absolutely necessary. Hence, if appearances were things in themselves, and if, as would then follow, the condition and the conditioned always belonged to one and the same series of intuitions, by no possibility could a necessary being exist as the condition of the existence of appearances in the world of sense.

The dynamical regress is distinguished in an important respect from the mathematical. Since the mathematical regress is concerned only with the combining of parts to form a whole or the division of a whole into parts, the conditions of this series must always be regarded as parts of the series, and therefore as homogeneous and as appearances. In the dynamical regress, on the other hand, we are concerned, not with the possibility of an unconditioned whole of given parts, or with an unconditioned part for a given whole, but with the derivation of a state from its cause, or of the contingent existence of substance itself from necessary existence. In this latter regress, it is not, therefore, necessary that the condition should form part of an empirical series along with the conditioned.

A way of escape from this apparent antinomy thus lies open to us. Both of the conflicting propositions may be true, if taken in different connections. All things in the world of sense may be contingent, and so have only an empirically conditioned existence, while yet there may be a non-empirical condition of the whole series; that is, there may exist an unconditionally necessary being. This necessary being, as the intelligible condition of the series, would not belong to it as a member, not even as the highest member of it, nor would it render any member of the series empirically unconditioned. The whole sensible world, so far as regards the empirically conditioned existence of all its various members, would be left unaffected. This way of conceiving how an unconditioned

1 (Reading dem for der.)


Es hat aber der dynamische Regressus dieses Eigen tümliche und Unterscheidende von dem mathematischen an sich: daß, da dieser es eigentlich nur mit der Zusammensetzung der Teile zu einem Ganzen, oder der Zerfällung eines Ganzen in seine Teile, zu tun hat, die Bedingungen dieser Reihe immer als Teile derselben, mithin als gleichartig, folglich als Erscheinungen angesehen werden müssen, anstatt daß in jenem Regressus, da es nicht um die Möglichkeit eines unbedingten Ganzen aus gegebenen Teilen, oder eines unbedingten Teils zu einem gegebenen Ganzen, sondern um die Ableitung eines Zustandes von seiner Ursache, oder des zufälligen Daseins der Substanz selbst von der notwendigen zu tun ist, die Bedingung nicht eben notwendig mit dem Bedingten eine empirische Reihe ausmachen dürfte.

Also bleibt uns, bei der vor uns liegenden scheinbaren Antinomie, noch ein Ausweg offen; da nämlich alle beide einander widerstreitende Sätze in verschiedener Beziehung zugleich wahr sein können, so daß alle Dinge der Sinnenwelt durchaus zufällig sind, mithin auch immer nur empirischbedingte Existenz haben, gleichwohl, von der ganzen Reihe, auch eine nichtempirische Bedingung, d. i. ein unbedingtnotwendiges Wesen stattfinde. Denn dieses würde, als intelligible Bedingung, gar nicht zur Reihe als ein Glied derselben (nicht einmal als das oberste Glied) gehören, und auch kein Glied der Reihe empirischunbedingt machen, sondern die ganze Sinnenwelt in ihrem durch alle Glieder gehenden empirischbedingten Dasein lassen. Darin würde sich also diese Art, ein unbedingtes Dasein den Erscheinun-
being may serve as the ground of appearance differs from that which we followed in the preceding subsection, in dealing with the empirically unconditioned causality of freedom. For there the thing itself was as cause (\textit{substantia phaenomenon}) conceived to belong to the series of conditions, and only its \textit{causality} was thought as intelligible. Here, on the other hand, the necessary being must be thought as entirely outside the series of the sensible world (as \textit{ens extramundanum}), and as purely intelligible. In no other way can it be secured against the law which renders all appearances contingent and dependent.

The \textit{regulative principle of reason}, so far as it bears upon our present problem, is therefore this, that everything in the sensible world has an empirically conditioned existence, and that in no one of its qualities can it be unconditionally necessary; that for every member in the series of conditions we must expect, and as far as possible seek, an empirical condition in some possible experience; and that nothing justifies us in deriving an existence from a condition outside the empirical series or even in regarding it in its place within the series as absolutely independent and self-sufficient. At the same time this principle does not in any way debar us from recognising that the whole series may rest upon some intelligible being that is free from all empirical conditions and itself contains the ground of the possibility of all appearances.

In these remarks we have no intention of proving the unconditionally necessary existence of such a being, or even of establishing the possibility of a purely intelligible condition of the existence of appearances in the sensible world. Just as, on the one hand, we limit reason, lest in leaving the guiding-thread of the empirical conditions it should go straying into the \textit{transcendent}, adopting grounds of explanation that are incapable of any representation \textit{in concreto}, so, on the other hand, we limit the law of the purely empirical employment of the understanding, lest it should presume to decide as to the possibility of things in general, and should declare the intelligible to be \textit{impossible}, merely on the ground that it is not of any use in explaining appearances. Thus all that we have shown is that the thoroughgoing contingency of all natural things, and of all their empirical conditions, is quite
consistent with the optional assumption of a necessary, though purely intelligible, condition; and that as there is no real contradiction between the two assertions, both may be true. Such an absolutely necessary being, as conceived by the understanding,¹ may be in itself impossible; but this can in no wise be inferred from the universal contingency and dependence of everything belonging to the sensible world, nor from the principle which interdicts us from stopping at any one of its contingent members and from appealing to a cause outside the world. Reason proceeds by one path in its empirical use, and by yet another path in its transcendental use.

The sensible world contains nothing but appearances, and these are mere representations which are always sensibly conditioned; in this field things in themselves are never objects to us. It is not therefore surprising that in dealing with a member of the empirical series, no matter what member it may be, we are never justified in making a leap out beyond the context² of sensibility. To do so is to treat the appearances as if they were things in themselves which exist apart from their transcendental ground, and which can remain standing while we seek an outside cause of their existence. This certainly would ultimately be the case with contingent things, but not with mere representations of things, the contingency of which is itself merely phenomenon, and can lead to no other regress than that which determines the phenomena, that is, solely to the empirical regress. On the other hand, to think an intelligible ground of the appearances, that is, of the sensible world, and to think it as free from the contingency of appearances, does not conflict either with the unlimited empirical regress in the series of appearances nor with their thoroughgoing contingency. That, indeed, is all that we had to do in order to remove the apparent antinomy; and it can be done in this way only. If for everything conditioned in its existence the condition is always sensible, and therefore belongs to the series, it must itself in turn be conditioned, as we have shown in the antithesis of the fourth antinomy. Either, therefore, reason through its demand for the unconditioned must remain in conflict with itself, or this unconditioned must be posited outside the series, in the intelligible. Its necessity will not then

¹ [Verstandswesen.] ² [außer dem Zusammenhang.]

kurzlichen Voraussetzung einer notwendigen, ob zwar bloß intelligiblen Bedingung zusammen bestehen könne, also kein wahrer Widerspruch zwischen diesen Behauptungen anzutreffen sei, mithin sie beide seitens wahr sein können. Es mag immer ein solches schlechtthinnotwendiges Verstandeswesen an sich unmöglich sein, so kann dieses doch aus der allgemeinen Zufälligkeit und Abhängigkeit alles dessen, was zur Sinnenwelt gehört, ingleichen aus dem Prinzip, bei keinem einzigen Gliede derselben, sofern es zufällig ist, aufzuhören und sich auf eine Ursache außer der Welt zu berufen, keineswegs geschlossen werden. Die Vernunft geht ihren Gang in empirischen und ihren besonderen Gang im transzendenten Gebrauche.

Die Sinnenwelt enthält nichts als Erscheinungen, diese aber sind bloße Vorstellungen, die immer wiederum sinnlich bedingt sind, und, da wir hier niemals Dinge an sich selbst zu unseren Gegenständen haben, so ist nicht zu verwundern, daß wir niemals berechtigt sein, von einem Gliede der empirischen Reihen, welches es auch sei, einen Sprung außer dem Zusammenhange der Sinnlichkeit zu tun, gleich, als wenn es Dinge an sich selbst wären, die außer ihrem transzendenten Grunde existierten, und die man verlassen könnte, um die Ursache ihres Daseins außer ihnen zu suchen; welches bei zufälligen Dingen allerdings endlich geschehen müßte, aber nicht bei bloßen Vorstellungen von Dingen, deren Zufälligkeit selbst nur Phänomen ist, und auf keinen andern Regressus, als denjenigen, der die Phänomena bestimmt, d. i. der empirisch ist, führen kann. Sich aber einen intelligiblen Grund der Erscheinungen, d. i. der Sinnenwelt, und denselben befreit von der Zufälligkeit der letzteren, denken, ist weder dem uneingeschränkten empirischen Regressus in der Reihe der Erscheinungen, noch der durchgängigen Zufälligkeit derselben entgegen. Das ist aber auch das einzige, was wir zu Hebung der scheinbaren Antinomie zu leisten hatten, und was sich nur auf diese Weise tun ließ. Denn, ist die jedesmalige Bedingung zu jedem Bedingten (dem Dasein nach) sinnlich, und eben darum zur Reihe gehört, so ist sie selbst wiederum bedingt (wie die Antithese der vierten Antinomie es ausweist). Es mußte also entweder ein Widerstreit mit der Vernunft, die das Unbedingte fordert, bleiben, oder dieses außer der Reihe in dem Intelligenbelen gesetzt werden, dessen Notwendigkeit
require, or allow of, any empirical condition; so far as appearances are concerned, it will be unconditionally necessary.

The empirical employment of reason, in reference to the conditions of existence in the sensible world, is not affected by the admission of a purely intelligible being; it proceeds, in accordance with the principle of thoroughgoing contingency, from empirical conditions to higher conditions which are always again empirical. But it is no less true, when what we have in view is the pure employment of reason, in reference to ends, that this regulative principle does not exclude the assumption of an intelligible cause which is not in the series. For the intelligible cause then signifies only the purely transcendental and to us unknown ground of the possibility of the sensible series in general. Its existence as independent of all sensible conditions and as in respect of these conditions unconditionally necessary, is not inconsistent with the unlimited contingency of appearances, that is to say, with the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

Concluding Note on the whole Antimony of Pure Reason.

So long as reason, in its concepts, has in view simply the totality of conditions in the sensible world, and is considering what satisfaction in this regard it can obtain for them, our ideas are at once transcendental and cosmological. Immediately, however, the unconditioned (and it is with this that we are really concerned) is posited in that which lies entirely outside the sensible world, and therefore outside all possible experience, the ideas become transcendent. They then no longer serve only for the completion of the empirical employment of reason—an idea of completeness—which must always be pursued, though it can never be completely achieved. On the contrary, they detach themselves completely from experience, and make for themselves objects for which experience supplies no material, and whose objective reality is not based on completion of the empirical series but on pure a priori concepts. Such transcendent ideas have a purely intelligible object; and this object may indeed be admitted as a transcendent object, but only if we likewise admit that, for the rest, we have no know-

1 [Zwecke.]
[Reading, with Erdmann, dis for der.]
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ledge in regard to it, and that it cannot be thought as a determinate thing in terms of distinctive inner predicates. As it is independent of all empirical concepts, we are cut off from any reasons that could establish the possibility of such an object, and have not the least justification for assuming it. It is a mere thought-entity. Nevertheless the cosmological idea which has given rise to the fourth antinomy impels us to take this step. For the existence of appearances, which is never self-grounded but always conditioned, requires us to look around for something different from all appearances, that is, for an intelligible object in which this contingency may terminate. But once we have allowed ourselves to assume a self-subsistent reality entirely outside the field of sensibility, appearances can only be viewed as contingent modes whereby beings that are themselves intelligences represent intelligible objects. Consequently, the only resource remaining to us is the use of analogy, by which we employ the concepts of experience in order to form some sort of concept of intelligible things—things of which as they are in themselves we have yet not the least knowledge. Since the contingent is not to be known save through experience, and we are here concerned with things which are not to be in any way objects of experience, we must derive the knowledge of them from that which is in itself necessary, that is, from pure concepts of things in general. Thus the very first step which we take beyond the world of sense obliges us, in seeking for such new knowledge, to begin with an enquiry into absolutely necessary being, and to derive from the concepts of it the concepts of all things in so far as they are purely intelligible. This we propose to do in the next chapter.

[Reading, with Hartenstein, anzusehen sind for anzusehen.]
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allerdings erlaubt ist, wozu aber; um es als ein durch seine unterscheidende und innere Prädikate bestimmmbares Ding zu denken, wir weder || Gründe der Möglichkeit (als unabhängig von allen Erfahrungsbegriffen), noch die mindeste Rechtfertigung, einen solchen Gegenstand anzunehmen, auf unserer Seite haben, und welches daher ein bloßes Gedankending ist. Gleichwohl dringt uns, unter allen kosmologischen Ideen, diejenige, so die vierte Antinomie veranlaßte, diesen Schritt zu wagen. Denn das in sich selbst ganz und gar nicht gegründete, sondern stets bedingte, Dasein der Erscheinungen fordert uns auf: uns nach etwas von allen Erscheinungen Unterschiedenem, mithin einem intelligiblen Gegenstande umzusehen, bei welchem diese Zufälligkeit aufhöre. Weil aber, wenn wir uns einmal die Erlaubnis genommen haben, außer dem Felde der gesamten Sinnlichkeit eine vor sich bestehende Wirklichkeit anzunehmen, Erscheinungen nur als zufällige Vorstellungsorten intelligrabler Gegenstände, von solchen Wesen, die selbst Intelligenzen sind, anzusehen²: so bleibt uns nichts anders übrig, als die Analogie, nach der wir die Erfahrungsbegriffe nutzen, um uns von intelligrbilen Dingen, von denen wir an sich nicht die mindeste Kenntnis haben, doch irgend einigen Begriff zu machen. Weil wir das Zufällige nicht anders als durch Erfahrung kennen lernen, hier aber von Dingen, die gar nicht Gegenstände der Erfahrung sein sollen, die Rede ist, so werden wir ihre Kenntnis aus dem, was an sich notwendig ist, aus reinen Begriffen von Dingen überhaupt, äbleiten müssen. Daher nötigt uns der erste Schritt, den wir außer der Sinnenwelt tun, || unsere neue Kenntnisse von der Untersuchung des schlechthinnotwendigen Wesens anzufangen, und von den Begriffen desselben die Begriffe von allen Dingen, so fern sie bloß intelligibel sind, abzuleiten, und diesen Versuch wollen wir in dem folgenden Hauptstücke anstellen.

¹ A: ess allerdings. ² Akad.-Ausz.: anzusehen sind.
³ |B 594 |A 566