

The `kantlipsum` package

Dummy text in Kantian style*

Enrico Gregorio[†]

Released 2023/11/21

1 Introduction

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

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

2 Example

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

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

*This file describes version v0.8b, last revised 2023/11/21.

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

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

3 Options

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

- par | nopar** With the default **par** all pieces of text will be ended by a `\par` command; specifying **par** is optional; the option **nopar** will not add this `\par` at the end of each fragment of Kantian prose.
- numbers** Each piece of Kantian prose will be preceded by its number (such as in “1 • As any dedicated reader can clearly see...”), which can be useful for better control of what is produced.
- index** Each paragraph will generate an index entry; a `\makeindex` command will be needed, with a suitable package for making the index, and `\printindex` for printing it. However the index entry may be off by one, since the `\index` command is issued at the beginning of the paragraph. Also there is no guarantee that the indexed word really belongs to the paragraph.

4 Commands

The commands provided by the package are:

- \kant** This command takes an optional argument which can be of the form `[42]` (that is, only one integer) or `[3-14]` (that is, two integers separated by a hyphen); as in `lipsum`, `\kant[42]`, `\kant[3-14]` and `\kant` will produce the 42nd pseudokantian paragraph, the paragraphs from the 3rd to the 14th, and those from the 1st to the 7th, respectively.
- \kant*** The same as before, see later for the difference.
- \kantdef** This command takes two arguments, a control sequence and an integer; the call `\kantdef{\mytext}{164}` will store in `\mytext` the 164th paragraph of pseudokantian text provided by this package.

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

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

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

Note

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

Changes from version 0.1

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

Changes from version 0.5

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

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

Changes from version 0.6

Maintenance release with new functions from `exp13`. Now a kernel released on 2017/11/14 or later is required.

Changes from version 0.7

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

Changes from version 0.8

Added a missing `\@@par`:

5 kantlipsum implementation

```

1 <*package>
2 <@@=kg1>
3 \ProvidesExplPackage
4   {kantlipsum}
5   {2023/11/21}
6   {0.8b}

```

```

7 {Generate text in Kantian style}
8 A check to make sure that expl3 is not too old
9 \@ifl@t@r\ExplLoaderFileDate{2022-11-09}
10 {}
11 {%
12   \PackageError { kantlipsum } { Support-package-expl3-too-old }
13   {
14     You~need~to~update~your~installation~of~the~bundles~
15     'l3kernel'~and~'l3packages'.\MessageBreak
16     Loading~kantlipsum~will~abort!
17   }
18   \tex_endinput:D
19 }

```

5.1 Package options and required packages

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

```

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

```

5.2 Messages

We define two messages.

```

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

```

```

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

```

5.3 Variables and constants

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

```

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

```

5.4 User level commands

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

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

```

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

```

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

```

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

```

5.5 Internal functions

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

```

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

```

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

```

99 \cs_new_protected:Nn \_kgl\_print:
100 {
101   \int\_step\_function:nnnN
102     {\l\_kgl\_start\_int} {1} {\l\_kgl\_end\_int} \_kgl\_use:n
103 }
104 \cs_new:Nn \_kgl\_use:n
105 {
106   \int\_compare:nNnF { #1 } > { \seq\_count:N \g\_kgl\_pars\_seq }
107     { \_kgl\_number:n {#1} }
108   \bool\_if:NT \g\_kgl\_makeindex\_bool
109     {
110       \use:x { \exp\_not:N \index{ \seq\_item:Nn \g\_kgl\_words\_seq {#1} } }
111     }
112   \seq\_item:Nn \g\_kgl\_pars\_seq {#1}
113 }
```

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

```

114 \cs_new_protected:Nn \_kgl\_newpara:n
115   { \seq\_gput\_right:Nn \g\_kgl\_pars\_seq {#1\_kgl\_par:} }
```

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

```

116 \cs_new_protected:Nn \_kgl\_newword:n
117   { \seq\_gput\_right:Nn \g\_kgl\_words\_seq {#1} }
```

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

```

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

```

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

```

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

```

5.6 Defining the sentences

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

```

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

```

Then we provide all of the sentences with the pattern `\@@_newpara:n_{<text>}`

```

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

```


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

161

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

175

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

191

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

209

210 _kgl_newpara:n {Therefore, we can deduce that the objects in space and
 211 time (and I assert, however, that this is the case) have lying before
 212 them the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance
 213 of the conditions, it must not be supposed that, then, formal logic
 214 (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true) is a
 215 representation of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 216 conditions, but the discipline of pure reason, in so far as this
 217 expounds the contradictory rules of metaphysics, depends on the
 218 Antinomies. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, therefore, can
 219 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
 220 like the transcendental unity of apperception, they constitute the
 221 whole content for a priori principles; for these reasons, our
 222 experience is just as necessary as, in accordance with the principles
 223 of our a priori knowledge, philosophy. The objects in space and time
 224 abstract from all content of knowledge. Has it ever been suggested
 225 that it remains a mystery why there is no relation between the
 226 Antinomies and the phenomena? It must not be supposed that the
 227 Antinomies (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are
 228 the clue to the discovery of philosophy, because of our necessary
 229 ignorance of the conditions. As I have shown elsewhere, to avoid all
 230 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our understanding
 231 (and it must not be supposed that this is true) is what first gives
 232 rise to the architectonic of pure reason, as is evident upon close
 233 examination.}
 234
 235 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are what first give rise to
 236 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural
 237 reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception
 238 abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these
 239 considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key
 240 to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all
 241 empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our
 242 disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure
 243 logic, in the case of the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from
 244 all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in
 245 accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms,
 246 time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be
 247 treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be
 248 supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise
 249 to the employment of pure reason.}
 250
 251 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all
 252 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the
 253 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a
 254 representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in
 255 themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It
 256 remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series
 257 of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of
 258 the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never
 259 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
 260 architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic
 261 principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time
 262 is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would
 263 thereby be made to contradict the Ideal of practical reason. On the

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

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

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

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

318 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, what we have alone been
 319 able to show is that, in so far as this expounds the universal rules
 320 of our a posteriori concepts, the architectonic of natural reason can
 321 be treated like the architectonic of practical reason. Thus, our
 322 speculative judgements can not take account of the Ideal, since none
 323 of the Categories are speculative. With the sole exception of the
 324 Ideal, it is not at all certain that the transcendental objects in
 325 space and time prove the validity of, for example, the noumena, as is
 326 shown in the writings of Aristotle. As we have already seen, our
 327 experience is the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies; in the
 328 study of pure logic, our knowledge is just as necessary as, thus,
 329 space. By virtue of practical reason, the noumena, still, stand in
 330 need to the pure employment of the things in themselves.}
 331
 332 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that the
 333 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, certainly,
 334 our a priori knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Our faculties
 335 abstract from all content of knowledge; for these reasons, the
 336 discipline of human reason stands in need of the transcendental
 337 aesthetic. There can be no doubt that, insomuch as the Ideal relies
 338 on our a posteriori concepts, philosophy, when thus treated as the
 339 things in themselves, exists in our hypothetical judgements, yet our a
 340 posteriori concepts are what first give rise to the phenomena.
 341 Philosophy (and I assert that this is true) excludes the possibility
 342 of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, as
 343 will easily be shown in the next section. Still, is it true that the
 344 transcendental aesthetic can not take account of the objects in space
 345 and time, or is the real question whether the phenomena should only be
 346 used as a canon for the never-ending regress in the series of
 347 empirical conditions? By means of analytic unity, the Transcendental
 348 Deduction, still, is the mere result of the power of the
 349 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the
 350 soul, but our faculties abstract from all content of a posteriori
 351 knowledge. It remains a mystery why, then, the discipline of human
 352 reason, in other words, is what first gives rise to the transcendental
 353 aesthetic, yet our faculties have lying before them the architectonic
 354 of human reason.}
 355
 356 _kgl_newpara:n {However, we can deduce that our experience (and it
 357 must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our
 358 experience, as we have already seen. On the other hand, it is not at
 359 all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the
 360 practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the
 361 noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first
 362 give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is
 363 necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a
 364 true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural
 365 reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the
 366 writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in
 367 respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space
 368 and time.}
 369
 370 _kgl_newpara:n {Our ideas, in the case of the Ideal of pure reason,
 371 are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time

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

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

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

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

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

431
 432 _kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of our a priori knowledge, our
 433 faculties have nothing to do with our faculties. Pure reason (and we
 434 can deduce that this is true) would thereby be made to contradict the
 435 phenomena. As we have already seen, let us suppose that the
 436 transcendental aesthetic can thereby determine in its totality the
 437 objects in space and time. We can deduce that, that is to say, our
 438 experience is a representation of the paralogisms, and our
 439 hypothetical judgements constitute the whole content of our concepts.
 440 However, it is obvious that time can be treated like our a priori
 441 knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Philosophy has nothing to do
 442 with natural causes.}

443
 444 _kgl_newpara:n {By means of analysis, our faculties stand in need to,
 445 indeed, the empirical objects in space and time. The objects in space
 446 and time, for these reasons, have nothing to do with our
 447 understanding. There can be no doubt that the noumena can not take
 448 account of the objects in space and time; consequently, the Ideal of
 449 natural reason has lying before it the noumena. By means of analysis,
 450 the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to, therefore,
 451 space, yet our sense perceptions exist in the discipline of practical
 452 reason.}

453
 454 _kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal can not take account of, so far as I know,
 455 our faculties. As we have already seen, the objects in space and time
 456 are what first give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of
 457 empirical conditions; for these reasons, our a posteriori concepts
 458 have nothing to do with the paralogisms of pure reason. As we have
 459 already seen, metaphysics, by means of the Ideal, occupies part of the
 460 sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the objects in
 461 space and time in general, yet time excludes the possibility of our
 462 sense perceptions. I assert, thus, that our faculties would thereby
 463 be made to contradict, indeed, our knowledge. Natural causes, so
 464 regarded, exist in our judgements.}

465
 466 _kgl_newpara:n {The never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 467 conditions may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it
 468 may be in contradictions with, then, applied logic. The employment of
 469 the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our
 470 understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It
 471 must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case
 472 of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is
 473 a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
 474 posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes
 475 the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be
 476 shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe
 477 that the things in themselves, in view of these considerations, can be
 478 treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical
 479 sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense

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

484
 485 _kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, in the case
 486 of philosophy, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must
 487 be known a posteriori. Thus, the objects in space and time, insomuch
 488 as the discipline of practical reason relies on the Antinomies,
 489 constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must
 490 be known a priori. Applied logic is a representation of, in natural
 491 theology, our experience. As any dedicated reader can clearly see,
 492 Hume tells us that, that is to say, the Categories (and Aristotle
 493 tells us that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the
 494 transcendental aesthetic. (Because of our necessary ignorance of the
 495 conditions, the paralogisms prove the validity of time.) As is shown
 496 in the writings of Hume, it must not be supposed that, in reference to
 497 ends, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must
 498 be known a priori. By means of analysis, it is not at all certain
 499 that our a priori knowledge is just as necessary as our ideas. In my
 500 present remarks I am referring to time only in so far as it is founded
 501 on disjunctive principles.}

502
 503 _kgl_newpara:n {The discipline of pure reason is what first gives rise
 504 to the Categories, but applied logic is the clue to the discovery of
 505 our sense perceptions. The never-ending regress in the series of
 506 empirical conditions teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
 507 content of the pure employment of the paralogisms of natural reason.
 508 Let us suppose that the discipline of pure reason, so far as regards
 509 pure reason, is what first gives rise to the objects in space and
 510 time. It is not at all certain that our judgements, with the sole
 511 exception of our experience, can be treated like our experience; in
 512 the case of the Ideal, our understanding would thereby be made to
 513 contradict the manifold. As will easily be shown in the next section,
 514 the reader should be careful to observe that pure reason (and it is
 515 obvious that this is true) stands in need of the phenomena; for these
 516 reasons, our sense perceptions stand in need to the manifold. Our
 517 ideas are what first give rise to the paralogisms.}

518
 519 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves have lying before them the
 520 Antinomies, by virtue of human reason. By means of the transcendental
 521 aesthetic, let us suppose that the discipline of natural reason
 522 depends on natural causes, because of the relation between the
 523 transcendental aesthetic and the things in themselves. In view of
 524 these considerations, it is obvious that natural causes are the clue
 525 to the discovery of the transcendental unity of apperception, by means
 526 of analysis. We can deduce that our faculties, in particular, can be
 527 treated like the thing in itself; in the study of metaphysics, the
 528 thing in itself proves the validity of space. And can I entertain the
 529 Transcendental Deduction in thought, or does it present itself to me?
 530 By means of analysis, the phenomena can not take account of natural
 531 causes. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}

532
 533 _kgl_newpara:n {Since some of the things in themselves are a

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

650
 651 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, our understanding is the clue
 652 to the discovery of necessity. On the other hand, the Ideal of pure
 653 reason is a body of demonstrated science, and all of it must be known
 654 a posteriori, as is evident upon close examination. It is obvious
 655 that the transcendental aesthetic, certainly, is a body of
 656 demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a priori; in view
 657 of these considerations, the noumena are the clue to the discovery of,
 658 so far as I know, natural causes. In the case of space, our
 659 experience depends on the Ideal of natural reason, as we have already
 660 seen.}

661
 662 _kgl_newpara:n {For these reasons, space is the key to understanding
 663 the thing in itself. Our sense perceptions abstract from all content
 664 of a priori knowledge, but the phenomena can never, as a whole,
 665 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they are
 666 just as necessary as disjunctive principles. Our problematic
 667 judgements constitute the whole content of time. By means of
 668 analysis, our ideas are by their very nature contradictory, and our a
 669 posteriori concepts are a representation of natural causes. I assert
 670 that the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
 671 contradict, so far as regards the thing in itself, the Transcendental
 672 Deduction; in natural theology, the noumena are the clue to the
 673 discovery of, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction.}

674
 675 _kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
 676 explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the
 677 transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet
 678 the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental
 679 Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would
 680 thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our
 681 ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the
 682 validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings
 683 of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that,
 684 inasmuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories,
 685 the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to
 686 contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 687 conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our
 688 faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the
 689 writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands
 690 in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.}

691
 692 _kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the
 693 case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural
 694 theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the
 695 content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural

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

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

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

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

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

754

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

773

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

795

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

915

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

936

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

954

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

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

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

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

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

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

1023

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

1039

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

1057

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

1074
1075 _kgl_newpara:n {The Antinomies have nothing to do with our faculties.
1076 As is shown in the writings of Hume, we can deduce that, on the
1077 contrary, the empirical objects in space and time prove the validity
1078 of our ideas. The manifold may not contradict itself, but it is still
1079 possible that it may be in contradictions with our a posteriori
1080 concepts. For these reasons, the transcendental objects in space and
1081 time (and it is obvious that this is the case) have nothing to do with
1082 our faculties, as will easily be shown in the next section. What we
1083 have alone been able to show is that the phenomena constitute the
1084 whole content of the Antinomies; with the sole exception of
1085 philosophy, the Categories have lying before them formal logic. Since
1086 knowledge of the Antinomies is a posteriori, it remains a mystery why
1087 the Antinomies (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) prove
1088 the validity of the thing in itself; for these reasons, metaphysics is
1089 the mere result of the power of the employment of our sense
1090 perceptions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. As I
1091 have elsewhere shown, philosophy proves the validity of our sense
1092 perceptions.}
1093
1094 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
1095 phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our
1096 concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo
1097 tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to
1098 contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our
1099 judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to
1100 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
1101 in space and time exclude the possibility of, insomuch as pure logic
1102 relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of
1103 apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been
1104 suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the
1105 reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection
1106 between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it remains a
1107 mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated
1108 science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be
1109 shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us
1110 suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because
1111 of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of
1112 empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have
1113 some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of
1114 empirical conditions.}
1115
1116 _kgl_newpara:n {To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
1117 explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human
1118 reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to
1119 do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge
1120 and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our
1121 experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural
1122 causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of
1123 our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what
1124 first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena
1125 have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close
1126 examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation
1127 of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise

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

1130

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

1142

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

1155

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

1176

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

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

1202
 1203 _kgl_newpara:n {We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as
 1204 necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in
 1205 space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do
 1206 with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the
 1207 noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of
 1208 the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul.
 1209 Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in
 1210 themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
 1211 transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the
 1212 phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions,
 1213 yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
 1214 demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole
 1215 content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense
 1216 perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with
 1217 the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility
 1218 of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is
 1219 still possible that it may be in contradictions with, thus, our sense
 1220 perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
 1221 that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all
 1222 empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.}

1223
 1224 _kgl_newpara:n {It remains a mystery why our sense perceptions prove
 1225 the validity of our a priori concepts. The objects in space and time,
 1226 then, exist in metaphysics; therefore, the things in themselves can
 1227 not take account of the transcendental aesthetic. The Ideal of pure
 1228 reason can thereby determine in its totality, that is to say, our
 1229 ideas, and space constitutes the whole content for the discipline of
 1230 human reason. The paralogisms of pure reason are just as necessary
 1231 as, in all theoretical sciences, our knowledge. The things in
 1232 themselves constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of
 1233 this body must be known a posteriori.}

1234
 1235 _kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1356

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

1374

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

1393

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

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

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

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

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

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

1460
 1461 _kgl_newpara:n {Necessity, as I have elsewhere shown, is the mere
 1462 result of the power of the architectonic of practical reason, a blind
 1463 but indispensable function of the soul. The paralogisms of pure
 1464 reason are the clue to the discovery of the practical employment of
 1465 the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the never-ending
 1466 regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it the
 1467 paralogisms of human reason; with the sole exception of the
 1468 architectonic of pure reason, transcendental logic is just as
 1469 necessary as, then, our judgements. What we have alone been able to
 1470 show is that our synthetic judgements have lying before them, when
 1471 thus treated as space, our knowledge, by means of analysis. By virtue
 1472 of natural reason, the transcendental aesthetic can be treated like
 1473 general logic, yet the objects in space and time are just as necessary
 1474 as the noumena. }

1475
 1476 _kgl_newpara:n {In view of these considerations, let us suppose that
 1477 the Categories exclude the possibility of the never-ending regress in
 1478 the series of empirical conditions. The manifold occupies part of the
 1479 sphere of the thing in itself concerning the existence of the things
 1480 in themselves in general, and formal logic, indeed, would be
 1481 falsified. It is not at all certain that, in reference to ends, the
 1482 discipline of practical reason, for example, occupies part of the
 1483 sphere of the discipline of practical reason concerning the existence
 1484 of our ampliative judgements in general, yet general logic is by its
 1485 very nature contradictory. Since all of our judgements are a priori,
 1486 there can be no doubt that, in the full sense of these terms, the
 1487 phenomena can not take account of the transcendental objects in space
 1488 and time. The architectonic of pure reason (and it is not at all
 1489 certain that this is true) stands in need of the things in themselves.
 1490 Philosophy is the key to understanding, thus, our sense perceptions.
 1491 This is what chiefly concerns us.}

1492
 1493 _kgl_newpara:n {Our understanding would thereby be made to contradict,
 1494 so far as regards the Ideal, necessity. Our faculties, as I have
 1495 elsewhere shown, are the mere results of the power of time, a blind
 1496 but indispensable function of the soul. Time, with the sole exception
 1497 of formal logic, would be falsified, but the Ideal can not take
 1498 account of our sense perceptions. It is not at all certain that the
 1499 Antinomies are what first give rise to our experience; thus, our a
 1500 posteriori concepts are the clue to the discovery of, so regarded, the
 1501 practical employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Natural causes
 1502 occupy part of the sphere of practical reason concerning the existence
 1503 of the paralogisms of pure reason in general; in view of these
 1504 considerations, the noumena exclude the possibility of the employment
 1505 of the objects in space and time. The manifold is what first gives

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

1509

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

1536

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

1555

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

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

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

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

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

1614 principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy,
 1615 our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in
 1616 natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still
 1617 possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The
 1618 thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.)
 1619 Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose
 1620 that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the
 1621 things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from
 1622 all content of a priori knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole
 1623 content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the
 1624 necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the
 1625 transcendental aesthetic. }
 1626
 1627 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, Aristotle tells us that, when
 1628 thus treated as the phenomena, the transcendental unity of
 1629 apperception can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of human
 1630 reason. There can be no doubt that natural causes can not take
 1631 account of, certainly, the phenomena, since none of the paralogisms
 1632 are hypothetical. We can deduce that the transcendental aesthetic is
 1633 a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori.
 1634 Hume tells us that, for example, our a posteriori knowledge
 1635 constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, yet the
 1636 discipline of pure reason, when thus treated as our understanding,
 1637 constitutes the whole content for the empirical objects in space and
 1638 time. The discipline of pure reason occupies part of the sphere of
 1639 the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
 1640 concerning the existence of the things in themselves in general;
 1641 consequently, the architectonic of natural reason (and what we have
 1642 alone been able to show is that this is true) is the clue to the
 1643 discovery of the objects in space and time.}
 1644
 1645 _kgl_newpara:n {In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas
 1646 would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects
 1647 in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery
 1648 why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the
 1649 Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of
 1650 empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not
 1651 take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would
 1652 thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in
 1653 natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation
 1654 of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our
 1655 concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the
 1656 Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to
 1657 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects
 1658 in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore,
 1659 necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere
 1660 of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the
 1661 intelligible objects in space and time in general.}
 1662
 1663 _kgl_newpara:n {Still, time is by its very nature contradictory. The
 1664 paralogisms of practical reason constitute a body of demonstrated
 1665 doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; for these
 1666 reasons, the noumena are the mere results of the power of the
 1667 transcendental aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the

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

1677

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

1697

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

1719

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

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

1739
 1740 _kgl_newpara:n {Our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the
 1741 employment of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 1742 conditions, but our a priori concepts can never, as a whole, furnish a
 1743 true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, they would
 1744 thereby be made to contradict problematic principles. What we have
 1745 alone been able to show is that our sense perceptions have nothing to
 1746 do with, certainly, the Transcendental Deduction. As any dedicated
 1747 reader can clearly see, it is obvious that the objects in space and
 1748 time constitute the whole content of metaphysics; still, the things in
 1749 themselves are the clue to the discovery of pure reason. The Ideal
 1750 (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is a representation of
 1751 our faculties. The discipline of practical reason is a representation
 1752 of, in other words, the Ideal of pure reason. It is not at all
 1753 certain that the things in themselves have lying before them the
 1754 Antinomies; certainly, the employment of our sense perceptions
 1755 abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. The paralogisms of
 1756 pure reason should only be used as a canon for time.}

1757
 1758 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the
 1759 paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive
 1760 judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural
 1761 reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The
 1762 discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and
 1763 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it
 1764 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive
 1765 principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone
 1766 been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole
 1767 content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should
 1768 only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes,
 1769 consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in
 1770 itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since
 1771 knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us
 1772 suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the
 1773 things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of
 1774 pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense
 1775 perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts

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

1778

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

1797

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

1816

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

1830 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, when thus
 1831 treated as the objects in space and time, constitutes the whole
 1832 content for the Ideal.}
 1833
 1834 _kgl_newpara:n {It is not at all certain that, so far as regards the
 1835 manifold and our ideas, the Categories are just as necessary as, in
 1836 the study of the architectonic of pure reason, the discipline of human
 1837 reason. It must not be supposed that metaphysics is the mere result
 1838 of the power of the Ideal of practical reason, a blind but
 1839 indispensable function of the soul; in the study of human reason, the
 1840 phenomena are a representation of metaphysics. Our understanding
 1841 proves the validity of the transcendental unity of apperception;
 1842 therefore, human reason depends on natural causes. In the study of
 1843 the architectonic of natural reason, what we have alone been able to
 1844 show is that our judgements constitute the whole content of, on the
 1845 other hand, our inductive judgements, as we have already seen. }
 1846
 1847 _kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time should only be used as a
 1848 canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all
 1849 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just
 1850 as necessary as pure logic; however, natural causes exist in the Ideal
 1851 of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have
 1852 lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the
 1853 ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction,
 1854 irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the
 1855 Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to
 1856 contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the
 1857 conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our
 1858 experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy
 1859 part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the
 1860 noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo
 1861 tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can
 1862 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like
 1863 philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is
 1864 the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.}
 1865
 1866 _kgl_newpara:n {Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when
 1867 thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any
 1868 dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes
 1869 exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a
 1870 body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a
 1871 posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline
 1872 of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori
 1873 concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the
 1874 contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal
 1875 logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in
 1876 general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms
 1877 of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge.
 1878 Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which
 1879 involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements?
 1880 By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
 1881 explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never
 1882 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it
 1883 excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1998
 1999 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a
 2000 priori, it remains a mystery why, in reference to ends, the phenomena
 2001 prove the validity of the paralogisms. As is proven in the
 2002 ontological manuals, the empirical objects in space and time would
 2003 thereby be made to contradict the empirical objects in space and time;
 2004 in the study of the transcendental unity of apperception, the
 2005 Categories exist in our a priori concepts. Because of the relation
 2006 between space and our analytic judgements, the reader should be
 2007 careful to observe that the Categories (and I assert that this is the
 2008 case) can not take account of the discipline of pure reason; in the
 2009 study of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2010 conditions, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and
 2011 demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it is just as necessary
 2012 as problematic principles. In the case of general logic, space (and
 2013 it is obvious that this is true) is just as necessary as the things in
 2014 themselves. By means of analytic unity, I assert, in view of these
 2015 considerations, that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our
 2016 speculative judgements (and it is obvious that this is the case) are
 2017 what first give rise to the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
 2018 the next section, it remains a mystery why our ideas would thereby be
 2019 made to contradict our judgements; therefore, our sense perceptions,
 2020 certainly, exclude the possibility of the noumena. As is shown in the
 2021 writings of Galileo, the objects in space and time exclude the
 2022 possibility of our ideas; thus, the objects in space and time, for
 2023 these reasons, are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies.}

2024
 2025 _kgl_newpara:n {With the sole exception of the never-ending regress in
 2026 the series of empirical conditions, it is not at all certain that the
 2027 noumena, in so far as this expounds the practical rules of the
 2028 paralogisms of pure reason, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and
 2029 demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, they
 2030 are just as necessary as ampliative principles, as will easily be
 2031 shown in the next section. As is evident upon close examination, the
 2032 objects in space and time constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
 2033 and all of this body must be known a posteriori, but the architectonic
 2034 of practical reason would be falsified. Because of our necessary
 2035 ignorance of the conditions, it is not at all certain that, then, our
 2036 understanding proves the validity of, on the contrary, formal logic.
 2037 With the sole exception of the Ideal of natural reason, the Categories
 2038 exist in the paralogisms, since knowledge of the Antinomies is a
 2039 posteriori. Since knowledge of our ideas is a priori, it must not be
 2040 supposed that the manifold, as I have elsewhere shown, abstracts from
 2041 all content of knowledge; in the study of the Ideal of practical
 2042 reason, our concepts are the clue to the discovery of our experience.}

2043
 2044 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that the
 2045 Categories would be falsified. Consequently, there can be no doubt

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2274
2275 _kgl_newpara:n {Space may not contradict itself, but it is still
2276 possible that it may be in contradictions with, for these reasons, the
2277 phenomena; with the sole exception of metaphysics, our ideas exclude
2278 the possibility of, in natural theology, the thing in itself. What we
2279 have alone been able to show is that, for example, the Ideal excludes
2280 the possibility of time, yet the noumena (and I assert, in view of
2281 these considerations, that this is the case) are just as necessary as
2282 the objects in space and time. Because of the relation between
2283 metaphysics and the paralogisms, the Categories are the mere results
2284 of the power of the discipline of natural reason, a blind but
2285 indispensable function of the soul. The objects in space and time, in
2286 other words, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental
2287 aesthetic, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since
2288 knowledge of our faculties is a priori, what we have alone been able
2289 to show is that necessity, in reference to ends, constitutes the whole
2290 content for metaphysics; still, our understanding (and we can deduce
2291 that this is true) excludes the possibility of our experience. As
2292 will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed
2293 that, even as this relates to philosophy, the phenomena (and I assert,
2294 with the sole exception of metaphysics, that this is the case) are a
2295 representation of the objects in space and time, but the Antinomies
2296 should only be used as a canon for our knowledge. But we have fallen
2297 short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we
2298 speak of necessity.}

2299
2300 _kgl_newpara:n {The objects in space and time are the mere results of
2301 the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the
2302 soul; in the study of our a posteriori knowledge, the manifold, so far
2303 as I know, proves the validity of the Ideal. Hume tells us that, so
2304 far as regards time, the phenomena, in view of these considerations,
2305 stand in need to the thing in itself. There can be no doubt that the
2306 things in themselves, in respect of the intelligible character, can be
2307 treated like our ideas; as I have elsewhere shown, our concepts have
2308 lying before them the phenomena. As is proven in the ontological
2309 manuals, there can be no doubt that the phenomena, in all theoretical
2310 sciences, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this
2311 body must be known a priori. As is evident upon close examination,
2312 the architectonic of natural reason, so regarded, is by its very
2313 nature contradictory; for these reasons, the phenomena are a
2314 representation of time. In natural theology, the Antinomies (and it
2315 remains a mystery why this is the case) constitute the whole content

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

2319

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

2331

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

2349

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

2363

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

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

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

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

2424 _kgl_newpara:n {Since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori, it
 2425 is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception is the mere
 2426 result of the power of the never-ending regress in the series of
 2427 empirical conditions, a blind but indispensable function of the soul;
 2428 in all theoretical sciences, natural causes exclude the possibility of
 2429 the noumena. Let us suppose that the transcendental objects in space
 2430 and time would thereby be made to contradict, so regarded, natural
 2431 causes. There can be no doubt that our understanding is the clue to
 2432 the discovery of the Ideal. Because of the relation between the Ideal
 2433 of pure reason and the Antinomies, the transcendental unity of
 2434 apperception, as I have elsewhere shown, can be treated like the
 2435 paralogisms, yet the phenomena are the clue to the discovery of the
 2436 Ideal. As I have elsewhere shown, I assert, in view of these
 2437 considerations, that our faculties, even as this relates to the thing
 2438 in itself, occupy part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction
 2439 concerning the existence of the Categories in general.}
 2440
 2441 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain
 2442 that, that is to say, the Transcendental Deduction is the clue to the
 2443 discovery of, in particular, our knowledge, yet the thing in itself
 2444 would thereby be made to contradict our faculties. As is proven in
 2445 the ontological manuals, it is obvious that, when thus treated as our
 2446 understanding, the Categories have nothing to do with our
 2447 understanding, yet the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2448 conditions occupies part of the sphere of the architectonic of human
 2449 reason concerning the existence of the paralogisms in general. As
 2450 will easily be shown in the next section, general logic has nothing to
 2451 do with, in the full sense of these terms, the discipline of pure
 2452 reason. As is evident upon close examination, the Ideal of human
 2453 reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may
 2454 be in contradictions with the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in
 2455 the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that, even
 2456 as this relates to the transcendental unity of apperception, the
 2457 Categories, certainly, should only be used as a canon for the thing in
 2458 itself. This is not something we are in a position to establish.}
 2459
 2460 _kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that space depends on the things in
 2461 themselves. There can be no doubt that, in particular, the Ideal, in
 2462 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the phenomena, is just
 2463 as necessary as the transcendental unity of apperception. There can
 2464 be no doubt that the manifold can not take account of, so far as
 2465 regards the architectonic of human reason, the things in themselves.
 2466 Thus, it remains a mystery why space depends on the manifold. To
 2467 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our
 2468 understanding (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
 2469 explain that this is true) is a representation of the Antinomies.}
 2470
 2471 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of natural reason, the Antinomies are a
 2472 representation of metaphysics; in the case of the practical employment
 2473 of the transcendental aesthetic, the Categories are by their very
 2474 nature contradictory. It is not at all certain that the phenomena
 2475 have lying before them the objects in space and time, because of our
 2476 necessary ignorance of the conditions. Because of the relation
 2477 between applied logic and our faculties, it remains a mystery why our

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

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

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

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

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

2537
 2538 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves are just as necessary as the
 2539 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. As any
 2540 dedicated reader can clearly see, the architectonic of natural reason
 2541 (and it remains a mystery why this is true) can thereby determine in
 2542 its totality general logic. As will easily be shown in the next
 2543 section, natural causes are a representation of, on the contrary, the
 2544 Ideal of pure reason; as I have elsewhere shown, the things in
 2545 themselves, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,
 2546 and none of this body must be known a priori. As we have already
 2547 seen, our ideas are the clue to the discovery of our faculties.
 2548 Whence comes applied logic, the solution of which involves the
 2549 relation between the noumena and the Transcendental Deduction?
 2550 Therefore, it is obvious that the empirical objects in space and time
 2551 can not take account of the noumena, because of our necessary
 2552 ignorance of the conditions. It is not at all certain that the
 2553 manifold stands in need of, for these reasons, the Antinomies, by
 2554 virtue of human reason.}

2555
 2556 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of practical reason, there can be no doubt
 2557 that our experience, still, occupies part of the sphere of the
 2558 manifold concerning the existence of our analytic judgements in
 2559 general; as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories can never, as a
 2560 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the
 2561 never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, they are a
 2562 representation of synthetic principles. As is proven in the
 2563 ontological manuals, the Categories are what first give rise to,
 2564 consequently, our faculties. We can deduce that, inasmuch as the
 2565 discipline of practical reason relies on our ideas, necessity can be
 2566 treated like the thing in itself, yet the noumena can never, as a
 2567 whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time,
 2568 they are a representation of problematic principles. However, let us
 2569 suppose that the things in themselves are the clue to the discovery
 2570 of, consequently, our judgements, as we have already seen. Whence
 2571 comes time, the solution of which involves the relation between the
 2572 phenomena and the noumena? In the study of our experience, I assert
 2573 that the Ideal can not take account of the discipline of practical
 2574 reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The reader should be
 2575 careful to observe that the phenomena are what first give rise to the
 2576 Categories, by virtue of natural reason. As is proven in the
 2577 ontological manuals, the Ideal is a body of demonstrated science, and
 2578 some of it must be known a priori. This may be clear with an
 2579 example.}

2580
 2581 _kgl_newpara:n {The transcendental unity of apperception, so far as
 2582 regards the Ideal of practical reason and the noumena, abstracts from
 2583 all content of a posteriori knowledge, by virtue of human reason. To
 2584 avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, that is to
 2585 say, our inductive judgements have nothing to do with, in the case of

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

2601
 2602 _kgl_newpara:n {In the case of philosophy, the Transcendental
 2603 Deduction proves the validity of necessity, by means of analysis. Our
 2604 sense perceptions have lying before them, certainly, our experience.
 2605 There can be no doubt that space (and it remains a mystery why this is
 2606 true) stands in need of the noumena. As I have elsewhere shown, the
 2607 transcendental unity of apperception has lying before it, irrespective
 2608 of all empirical conditions, the Transcendental Deduction. The
 2609 objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of our
 2610 faculties, but the thing in itself, in accordance with the principles
 2611 of our experience, can be treated like the paralogisms. As is proven
 2612 in the ontological manuals, space has nothing to do with, thus, our
 2613 ideas, yet the things in themselves, in natural theology, can be
 2614 treated like the transcendental aesthetic.}

2615
 2616 _kgl_newpara:n {As is shown in the writings of Galileo, it remains a
 2617 mystery why, so far as I know, the phenomena are the mere results of
 2618 the power of the Ideal of pure reason, a blind but indispensable
 2619 function of the soul, but the paralogisms (and there can be no doubt
 2620 that this is the case) exclude the possibility of the transcendental
 2621 aesthetic. Our experience, in accordance with the principles of
 2622 transcendental logic, occupies part of the sphere of the manifold
 2623 concerning the existence of the Categories in general. Our sense
 2624 perceptions can not take account of the Ideal, by virtue of natural
 2625 reason. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the
 2626 objects in space and time (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
 2627 necessary to explain that this is the case) would thereby be made to
 2628 contradict the pure employment of space; in the case of the discipline
 2629 of human reason, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of the
 2630 transcendental aesthetic. Has it ever been suggested that, as we have
 2631 already seen, it remains a mystery why there is a causal connection
 2632 between the Ideal of human reason and the Ideal of human reason? What
 2633 we have alone been able to show is that the Antinomies, for these
 2634 reasons, stand in need to our judgements. Let us suppose that, in
 2635 accordance with the principles of the Ideal of practical reason, the
 2636 Antinomies prove the validity of space, but natural causes (and I
 2637 assert, for these reasons, that this is the case) would thereby be
 2638 made to contradict the transcendental unity of apperception. But the
 2639 proof of this is a task from which we can here be absolved. }

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

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

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

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

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

2707
 2708 _kgl_newpara:n {By virtue of human reason, the Ideal of pure reason,
 2709 in the full sense of these terms, is by its very nature contradictory,
 2710 yet necessity is the key to understanding metaphysics. The Categories
 2711 have nothing to do with, therefore, the phenomena. We can deduce that
 2712 our experience can be treated like our a priori knowledge; certainly,
 2713 the objects in space and time are what first give rise to philosophy.
 2714 Because of the relation between the architectonic of natural reason
 2715 and the Antinomies, space has nothing to do with our ideas, but the
 2716 manifold occupies part of the sphere of the transcendental aesthetic
 2717 concerning the existence of the phenomena in general. The paralogisms
 2718 of human reason are the clue to the discovery of, on the contrary, our
 2719 understanding.}

2720
 2721 _kgl_newpara:n {There can be no doubt that, in reference to ends, the
 2722 thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and
 2723 time, but the discipline of human reason is by its very nature
 2724 contradictory. It is obvious that, in other words, the manifold, in
 2725 so far as this expounds the practical rules of the thing in itself, is
 2726 the clue to the discovery of the things in themselves, yet our
 2727 experience has lying before it space. Our ideas would be falsified,
 2728 yet the thing in itself is just as necessary as the Antinomies.
 2729 Metaphysics exists in our speculative judgements. By means of
 2730 analysis, the phenomena are a representation of our faculties.}

2731
 2732 _kgl_newpara:n {The phenomena stand in need to our sense perceptions,
 2733 but our concepts are the clue to the discovery of formal logic. The
 2734 objects in space and time have nothing to do with the things in
 2735 themselves, as is evident upon close examination. Time teaches us
 2736 nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the noumena. It is not at
 2737 all certain that, so far as regards the manifold and the objects in
 2738 space and time, the Transcendental Deduction, therefore, occupies part
 2739 of the sphere of pure logic concerning the existence of natural causes
 2740 in general, but the things in themselves, consequently, are a
 2741 representation of the intelligible objects in space and time. The
 2742 Transcendental Deduction (and to avoid all misapprehension, it is
 2743 necessary to explain that this is true) depends on necessity, as we
 2744 have already seen. Consequently, it remains a mystery why our a
 2745 priori concepts, on the other hand, are what first give rise to the
 2746 Ideal of human reason, as any dedicated reader can clearly see.}

2747

2748 _kgl_newpara:n {What we have alone been able to show is that, then,
 2749 the Ideal of human reason, in reference to ends, is the mere result of
 2750 the power of practical reason, a blind but indispensable function of
 2751 the soul, but the Ideal (and the reader should be careful to observe
 2752 that this is true) has lying before it our ideas. In the study of the
 2753 thing in itself, I assert, with the sole exception of the manifold,
 2754 that the Ideal of human reason is the clue to the discovery of the
 2755 practical employment of the Ideal of natural reason. As will easily
 2756 be shown in the next section, our ideas have lying before them the
 2757 Ideal of natural reason; thus, the Antinomies are what first give rise
 2758 to, indeed, the noumena. We can deduce that the Categories (and it is
 2759 obvious that this is the case) would thereby be made to contradict our
 2760 faculties. As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
 2761 natural causes occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of
 2762 natural reason concerning the existence of natural causes in general;
 2763 for these reasons, our ideas, in natural theology, occupy part of the
 2764 sphere of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2765 conditions concerning the existence of our judgements in general. Yet
 2766 can I entertain the transcendental aesthetic in thought, or does it
 2767 present itself to me? In the study of the Ideal, the Ideal of pure
 2768 reason depends on time. However, our a priori judgements have lying
 2769 before them the employment of necessity, by means of analytic unity.
 2770 }
 2771
 2772 _kgl_newpara:n {As will easily be shown in the next section, it is not
 2773 at all certain that the transcendental unity of apperception is the
 2774 key to understanding the things in themselves; certainly, the
 2775 Categories prove the validity of our faculties. Let us suppose that
 2776 the paralogisms of natural reason (and we can deduce that this is the
 2777 case) are a representation of the discipline of human reason. It
 2778 remains a mystery why practical reason can be treated like the
 2779 phenomena. (As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, there can be no
 2780 doubt that the Categories, in the study of the discipline of human
 2781 reason, exclude the possibility of the Categories.) As will easily be
 2782 shown in the next section, our ideas stand in need to our knowledge.
 2783 As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Antinomies exist in our a
 2784 posteriori concepts, yet the thing in itself can not take account of,
 2785 as I have elsewhere shown, the Categories. The question of this
 2786 matter's relation to objects is not in any way under discussion.}
 2787
 2788 _kgl_newpara:n {It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our
 2789 experience, in particular, can thereby determine in its totality our
 2790 analytic judgements, yet necessity has nothing to do with, in
 2791 reference to ends, the discipline of human reason. It is not at all
 2792 certain that the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2793 conditions would thereby be made to contradict, in particular, pure
 2794 logic; with the sole exception of the Ideal, our ideas, that is to
 2795 say, should only be used as a canon for our judgements. Since some of
 2796 the Antinomies are disjunctive, the Transcendental Deduction can be
 2797 treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical
 2798 conditions. In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, it is not at
 2799 all certain that the Ideal of natural reason, in view of these
 2800 considerations, can be treated like the architectonic of human reason.
 2801 The Antinomies (and Aristotle tells us that this is the case) exclude

2802 the possibility of the Ideal of human reason; in the case of the
 2803 discipline of natural reason, necessity would thereby be made to
 2804 contradict, so far as I know, the Ideal of pure reason.
 2805 Transcendental logic is a representation of the Transcendental
 2806 Deduction; by means of the transcendental aesthetic, the thing in
 2807 itself can thereby determine in its totality the Ideal of pure reason.
 2808 In my present remarks I am referring to the never-ending regress in
 2809 the series of empirical conditions only in so far as it is founded on
 2810 hypothetical principles.}

2811
 2812 _kgl_newpara:n {The things in themselves prove the validity of, on the
 2813 other hand, transcendental logic; therefore, necessity has lying
 2814 before it, indeed, the paralogisms. What we have alone been able to
 2815 show is that our ideas constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and
 2816 all of this body must be known a priori. Our understanding has lying
 2817 before it, for these reasons, our ampliative judgements. Because of
 2818 our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it is obvious that time may
 2819 not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
 2820 contradictions with, in view of these considerations, our ideas;
 2821 still, the practical employment of the transcendental objects in space
 2822 and time, that is to say, has lying before it the things in
 2823 themselves. Natural causes prove the validity of necessity.}

2824
 2825 _kgl_newpara:n {The reader should be careful to observe that our a
 2826 priori concepts, in other words, can never, as a whole, furnish a true
 2827 and demonstrated science, because, like general logic, they prove the
 2828 validity of hypothetical principles, by virtue of human reason. There
 2829 can be no doubt that, indeed, the Antinomies, in other words, would be
 2830 falsified, and the phenomena constitute the whole content of the
 2831 discipline of natural reason. The phenomena can not take account of,
 2832 in natural theology, the Ideal of practical reason. Time can never
 2833 furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, it
 2834 has nothing to do with a posteriori principles; in view of these
 2835 considerations, our a priori concepts stand in need to the discipline
 2836 of pure reason. Our ideas constitute the whole content of the objects
 2837 in space and time, but the Ideal, indeed, is the key to understanding
 2838 our understanding.}

2839
 2840 _kgl_newpara:n {As we have already seen, it is not at all certain that
 2841 the Ideal of pure reason is just as necessary as natural causes; in
 2842 the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our faculties, in natural
 2843 theology, abstract from all content of knowledge. The Categories can
 2844 never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because,
 2845 like the manifold, they have lying before them a posteriori
 2846 principles, but time is by its very nature contradictory. We can
 2847 deduce that the Categories, so regarded, are by their very nature
 2848 contradictory; for these reasons, time is what first gives rise to our
 2849 ideas. Still, is it the case that pure logic constitutes the whole
 2850 content for the Transcendental Deduction, or is the real question
 2851 whether the paralogisms exist in our experience? Still, natural
 2852 reason, so far as I know, would be falsified, because of our necessary
 2853 ignorance of the conditions. Our faculties would be falsified.}

2854
 2855 _kgl_newpara:n {The Ideal proves the validity of the objects in space

2856 and time. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain
 2857 that our judgements are a representation of, however, the manifold.
 2858 The objects in space and time exclude the possibility of necessity.
 2859 The reader should be careful to observe that the Ideal, consequently,
 2860 abstracts from all content of knowledge. There can be no doubt that,
 2861 indeed, the objects in space and time would thereby be made to
 2862 contradict human reason.}
 2863
 2864 _kgl_newpara:n {It is obvious that the transcendental unity of
 2865 apperception can be treated like the Ideal. I assert that applied
 2866 logic (and it is not at all certain that this is true) stands in need
 2867 of the objects in space and time; certainly, the Ideal of practical
 2868 reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. On the other hand,
 2869 our experience (and it remains a mystery why this is true) stands in
 2870 need of the transcendental unity of apperception. It remains a
 2871 mystery why the Antinomies prove the validity of metaphysics. There
 2872 can be no doubt that, in particular, the architectonic of pure reason,
 2873 in all theoretical sciences, can never furnish a true and demonstrated
 2874 science, because, like the manifold, it teaches us nothing whatsoever
 2875 regarding the content of hypothetical principles, but the phenomena,
 2876 with the sole exception of the transcendental aesthetic, have nothing
 2877 to do with philosophy. It is obvious that our understanding, that is
 2878 to say, is the mere result of the power of space, a blind but
 2879 indispensable function of the soul, by means of analytic unity. Since
 2880 knowledge of our sense perceptions is a priori, we can deduce that our
 2881 experience is what first gives rise to the architectonic of practical
 2882 reason. This may be clear with an example. }
 2883
 2884 _kgl_newpara:n {I assert, consequently, that the Transcendental
 2885 Deduction would thereby be made to contradict our faculties, as will
 2886 easily be shown in the next section. Let us suppose that our ideas,
 2887 in the full sense of these terms, occupy part of the sphere of formal
 2888 logic concerning the existence of the noumena in general. To avoid
 2889 all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the
 2890 Transcendental Deduction, so far as I know, occupies part of the
 2891 sphere of the architectonic of practical reason concerning the
 2892 existence of the Antinomies in general; certainly, the paralogisms
 2893 occupy part of the sphere of the architectonic of natural reason
 2894 concerning the existence of our ideas in general. To avoid all
 2895 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the pure employment
 2896 of the architectonic of practical reason, still, is by its very nature
 2897 contradictory; consequently, the intelligible objects in space and
 2898 time would thereby be made to contradict the transcendental objects in
 2899 space and time. We can deduce that the thing in itself exists in the
 2900 Antinomies. As is evident upon close examination, the never-ending
 2901 regress in the series of empirical conditions depends on, therefore,
 2902 necessity. I assert that our judgements are a representation of the
 2903 noumena; on the other hand, the transcendental unity of apperception
 2904 teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, then, the
 2905 Ideal of pure reason.}
 2906
 2907 _kgl_newpara:n {As is evident upon close examination, the things in
 2908 themselves are the clue to the discovery of the phenomena, and
 2909 philosophy (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3054
Now we define the sequence of index words.

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

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

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


```

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

```

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

```

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

```

Index

The italic numbers denote the pages where the corresponding entry is described, numbers underlined point to the definition, all others indicate the places where it is used.

Symbols

@@par commands:

\@@par: **365**

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

