

Early Modern Philosophy



55

**UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN
DIRECTORATE OF AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONS
BIGARD MEMORIAL SEMINARY, ENUGU**

BMS/IB/13019

Candidate's Number (write very clearly)

300

Level of Study

ARTS

Faculty/College

PHILOSOPHY

Department/Course

EARLY MODERN PHILOSOPHY

Title of Paper

03 - 02 - 2024

Date

75%

75

Examination (insert official title)
of the Examination for which you
have entered, as it appears at
the head of the question paper

DIRECTIONS TO CANDIDATES

1. Write on both sides of the pages (except in Mathematics)
2. Begin each answer on a fresh page
3. Write the number of each question at the top of each page.
4. All rough work must be crossed through, and enclosed within this cover.
5. If supplementary books are used, they must be fastened a; together at the end of this book and inside the cover. Answers must not be written on the supplementary books unless all the leaves in this book have already been used.
6. In your own interest you should enter in the space provided below, the numbers of the questions which you have attempted (with sub-sections where necessary).
7. In no circumstances must answer books used or unused, be removed from the Examination Room by a Candidate.
8. Candidates are warned that importance is attached by the examination to accuracy and clearness of expression.
9. Please note that there is severe penalty for cheating at any examination.

NUMBERS OF THE ANSWERS

in the order in which they have been written.

1, 4, 5

All students of the University of Ibadan are expected to show academic integrity at all times.
Understanding this, I solemnly declare that I shall not be involved in any malpractice including
soliciting, giving, receiving or using unauthorised aid in this examination.

Signature of student

For Examiner's
Use Only

Question No.	Mark
1	15
4	12
5	14
CA	34

Total...

NUMBER ONE.

THE PROBLEM OF MIND AND BODY ACCORDING TO
DESCARTES, SPINOZA AND LEIBNIZ.

Introduction.

The ~~the~~ Continental rationalist philosophers, Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz tries to proffer solution to the problem of mind and body. A prennial problem in the history of philosophy.

This problem of mind and body became a major issue from the time of René Descartes. Hence we are going to examine his views and how Leibniz and Spinoza attempted to solve the problem.

THE NOTION OF MIND AND BODY PROBLEM

The mind and body problem is a prennial problem in philosophy about the relationship between the mind and body. Various philosopher has tried to proffer solution as such leading various schools of thought such as Monism, dualism, interactionism and forms of materialism.

René Descartes argued that the mind and body interact in the pineal gland which is located at the innermost part of the brain.

Baruch Spinoza on Mind and body problem preferred solution using his pantheistic view of the world.

Leibniz attempted a solution to this problem in his doctrine of monads.

Hence we are going to examine the ideas of these three philosophers on the mind and body problem.

RENE DESCARTES

Rene Descartes on the problem of mind and body argued that although the mind and body are two different substances they interact. He argued that man is essentially a thinking being which implies that man is essentially the mind.

According to him, although man has a body, the body is not part of his essence as man, as such there is no interaction with the mind.

He explains that when I am hurt, I feel pain and the mind reacts essentially to the body. This means that the body influences the mind, but also the mind influences the body.

Descartes argued that the mind and body interact in the pineal gland which is located at the inner most part of the brain. It is here that the body comes in contact with the mind through the animal spirit.

It is important to note that animals do not possess these qualities because they are not thinking things.

Arnold Geulincx a disciple of Descartes was not satisfied with the answer of Descartes hence he posited Occasionalism.

One substance, since they are two sides of the same coin. He argued that mental and bodily events are the effect of the causal laws of nature.

Spinoza further argued that just as God and the physical universe & *Natura Naturans*, *Natura Naturata* are one and the same thing as seen and known in the universe in terms of thought and extension, matter and form so too are the mind and body one and the same as seen in the terms of matter and form.

This is Spinoza solution to mind and body which is different from that of Descartes. We are then going to see that of Leibniz.

LEIBNIZ

Leibniz posited a solution to mind and body problem in his doctrine and idea of monads.

According to Leibniz, Most Monads are substances which form the basic elements of which all things are made. Monads are units of itself and does not relate to other monads. They are self contained and windowless entity.

For Leibniz, all things consist an infinite number of monads that do not interact with themselves. However there is a monad that predominates. This dominate monad is the mind. This implies that the mind and body are two distinct monads.

For Leibniz, there is no interaction between the mind and body but the harmonious mechanism of the universe gives the impression that they interact & that one acts or

ARNOLD GEULINEX CRITICISM.

Arnold Geulinex disagreed with Descartes. For him there is no contact between the mind and body, that is that they do not interact.

He explains that the mind seems to move the body on the occasion of the mind will or desiring something. For instance; the mind will something and the body moving in response to it.

To explain the relationship between mind and body he used the theory called Occasionalism. In this theory it states that it is God that moves the body on the occasion of the mind willing or desiring something.

He used the example of two clock arranged by a clock maker in such a way that ^{when} one clock ^{points} at the hour the other one strikes.

SPINOZA

Baruch Spinoza introduced the solution to mind and body in his Metaphysics.

Spinoza's philosophy is both pantheistic and determinist. For him the mind and body are two different ways of viewing the divine nature of God. For him the mind and body are like God or nature.

According to Spinoza, there is only one substance in reality, this substance is infinite, perfect and divine. This substance is called God or Nature (Nature & Nature's laws are Nature).

For him there are two ways of viewing the same reality, and everything proceeds from this reality.

Thus, both the material and spiritual substances are

Question.....

1

Write on both sides of the paper

Do not write
on either
margin

causes the other). To explain the harmonious mechanism of the universe, Leibniz used the example of several clocks arranged in such a way that they keep time. These clocks do not interact and are not connected to each other but their ~~poor~~ perfect arrangement gives the impression that they interact.

CONCLUSION.

From this ~~explain~~^{explanation} of mind and body according to Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz, we come to view the mind and body problem from different perspectives since each of them posited a unique solution to the mind and body problem.

NUMBER FOUR THE PROBLEM OF EVIL IN LEIBNIZ PHILOSOPHY

INTRODUCTION.

Leibniz a Continental rationalist philosopher argued that God does the best and the most perfect things, hence the world which God created is the best possible world he could of created.

Since the world is the best possible world, how then is there evil. Leibniz has to explain how there is evil in the best possible world that God created.

In dealing with the problem of evil, Leibniz distinguishes between three kinds of evil. These are:-

1. Metaphysical Evil
2. Physical Evil
3. Moral Evil

...

METAPHYSICAL EVIL.

Metaphysical evil is due to the imperfection of creatures as finite beings which makes them liable to error and as such make evil possible. This imperfection of creature is Metaphysical evil.

Metaphysical evil is inseparable from the nature of creature as imperfect and finite beings. Metaphysical evil is inevitable so long as there are finite creature since no creature is perfect.

The only alternative to the existence of Metaphysical evil is the non-existence of finite creatures. But it is better to exist than not to exist. Hence, God who

always does the best things, chooses the best of this two alternatives. For it is better for creature to exist as imperfect beings than not to exist. God cannot create perfect creatures because they would be infinite and they would be God, whereas there can be only one God.

PHYSICAL EVIL

Physical evil is part of the mechanism of the universe. It is part of what constitutes order and harmony in the system of the universe. Even suffering, calamities and disasters all form part of the system of the universe and sometimes lead to good ends.

Thus, the bases of physical evil (including diseases, sickness and hunger, and all kinds of suffering) are in fact metaphysical evil, that is the imperfection of creatures which is part of what constitute the universe.

MORAL EVIL

In the deterministic metaphysical world view of Leibniz, Human freedom cannot easily find a place. Hence, the explanation of Moral evil becomes difficult since moral evil presupposes freedom.

For Leibniz the universe works like several clocks or a huge machine with several parts. This universe is mechanistic and deterministic. Every substance in this universe is a subject that contains within itself all its predicates.

The human person is included, hence the human person is

a subject that contains within itself all its predicates. These predicates includes all that constitute man; his past, present and future actions. These are all of the parts of an individual person. As a result all his future actions must take place since they are part of him and a full view of him will see these actions as part of him and coming necessarily from him.

From this, it means that man is not free in his choice of actions. In fact he does not choose his actions because they are part of him just as the predicate is already part of the subject in an analytic proposition.

However, Leibniz went further to argue that God is reprehensible to moral evil. This therefore means that God rewards the good and punishes the bad. It presupposes that every man is free in his choice of actions.

Leibniz cannot defend this doctrine and at the same time deny human freedom. In fact he affirms positively that man is free in his choice of actions and denies that his metaphysical view of the world negates human freedom. He explains that when he says that man is not free it is naturally determined in his choice of actions he is in fact referring to metaphysical necessity and not moral necessity.

To clarify this difficulty Leibniz distinguishes Metaphysical necessity and Moral necessity. Metaphysical necessity refers to absolute necessity and does not give room for freedom while moral necessity is not incompatible with freedom. It inclines or prompts the will while still leaving room for freedom.

Conclusion.

The problem of evil in Leibniz enables us to understand the three kinds of evil. It also explains evil from a different perspective than that of St. Augustines evil as a privation. It also tries to reconcile the idea of human freedom and the deterministic notion of the world.

NUMBER FIVE

"Hume's Ethics; an attempt to explain how man actually behaves not how he ought to behave"

INTRODUCTION.

Man is a social being, as such he continually relates with his fellow counterparts. Hume, however discussed at length on the notion of ethics and morality that is seen in how rightness or wrongness of an action.

We going to examine Humes ethics, from his idea of morality, virtue, motive and human freedom.

HUMES NOTION OF MORALITY.

Morality according to David Hume is not based on reason. It is based on sentiments, natural feeling, natural inclinations and passion.

According to Hume, Reason is not concerned with Morality; rather it is concerned with speculative truths as that seen in mathematics and physics. It is also concerned with abstractness and physical properties. For Hume the function of reason on morality is that of a slave. That is, a slave to passions.

Moral judgement, Moral approval and disapproval here are not based on rational speculations but on sentiments, natural feelings and emotions.

Actions which please us are held to be morally good, while actions that displease us are held to be morally bad. They are as a result of our natural feeling, natural inclinations and tendencies and not based on reason.

Hence morality is not a function of reason.
If actions which

If the moral judgment about the rightness or wrongness of an action is determined by our feelings as to whether the ~~or not~~ the actions in question pleases or displeases us. Where is the moral judgement regarding actions done to others. Or where do we base the moral judgement regarding actions done to others.

Hume in response to the question above, that ^{is} on the actions done to others said that the moral judgement regarding actions done to others is based on sympathy. He went further to argue that Man by nature has sympathy. This sympathy is therefore very important in moral judgement. Hence we consider or disapprove as wrong, those actions that displease others and approve as right those actions that please others.

Furthermore, Hume traced the origin of the sense of justice in terms of sympathy. Prior to the formation of civil societies and laws, Man discovered that if everyone is allowed to exercise his freedom as he likes everything would be at stake. Hence they formulated laws to limit their freedom and enhance self interest.

Finally, although self interest ~~lead~~ to the formation of civil societies, laws and obligation. Sympathy enables the individual to rise above self interest and disapprove any breach of the sense of justice.

MOTIVE OF AN ACTION

From a moral point of view, the most important

aspects of an action according to David Hume is Motive.

Hume argued that when we blame a man for performing a wrong action, we are in fact blaming him for not being influenced by the right motive whereas when we praise a man for performing a good deed, we are praising him for being influenced by the right motive.

Right motive is distinguished from the wrong motive.

Right motive is the motive that conforms to man's natural inclination whereas wrong motive is the motive which is at variance with man's natural inclination.

Having explained motive we ^{are} going to explain his criterion for utility virtue.

CRITERION FOR VIRTUE.

According to David Hume, the criterion for virtue is utility. This means that for something to be considered a virtue it must be useful and promote the well-being of man, even if not it is not considered a virtue.

Going further Hume denied celibacy, penance, fasting, mortification, silence and solitude as ~~virtue~~ because they do not contribute to man's well-being. Hence they are not virtue.

On the notion of human freedom, Hume denied that man is free. He argued that man is determined in his choice of action.

Hume explains freedom in terms of cause and effect.



UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN
DIRECTORATE OF AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONS
BIGARD MEMORIAL SEMINARY, ENUGU

03 FEB 2024

BMS/IB/2965 Candidate's Number (write very clearly)
300 Level of Study
ART Faculty/College
PHILO SO PHY Department/Course

EARLY MODERN Title of Paper
3-2-2024 Date

Examination (insert official title) of the Examination for which you have entered, as it appears at the head of the question paper

DIRECTIONS TO CANDIDATES

1. Write on both sides of the pages (except in Mathematics).
2. Begin each answer on a fresh page.
3. Write the number of each question at the top of each page.
4. All rough work must be crossed through, and enclosed within this cover.
5. If supplementary books are used, they must be fastened a; together at the end of this book and inside the cover. Answers must not be written on the supplementary books unless all the leaves in this book have already been used.
6. In your own interest you should enter in the space provided below, the numbers of the questions which you have attempted (with sub-sections where necessary).
7. In no circumstances must answer books used or unused, be removed from the Examination Room by a Candidate.
8. Candidates are warned that importance is attached by the examination to accuracy and clearness of expression.
9. Please note that there is severe penalty for cheating at any examination.

For Examiner's Use Only	
Question No.	Mark
4	15
5	13
6	14
CA	33
Total...	75

NUMBERS OF THE ANSWERS

in the order in which they have been written.

4, 5, 6

All students of the University of Ibadan are expected to show academic integrity at all times.
Understanding this, I solemnly declare that I shall not be involved in any malpractice including
soliciting, giving, receiving or using unauthorised aid in this examination.

Signature of student

PROBLEM OF EVIL IN LEIBNIZ'S PHILOSOPHY

Anybody who believes that this world is the best of all possible world that could exist has to face the stark reality of the existence of so much evil in this best of all possible world. Leibniz believes and even argues that this world is the best of all possible world, and he has to explain how there can be evil or why there is evil in this best of all possible world. Leibniz's explanation is far from being satisfactory.

Leibniz distinguished between three kinds of evil, namely;

- a. Metaphysical evil.
- b. Physical evil.
- c. Moral evil.

a. METAPHYSICAL EVIL

Metaphysical evil is due to the imperfection and finitude of creatures which render ~~able~~ to error and makes evil possible. This very imperfection of creatures is metaphysical evil. Metaphysical evil is inseparable from the nature of creatures as finite and imperfect beings. It is therefore inevitable, for no finite creature can be perfect. The only alternative to the existence of metaphysical evil would be non-existence of creatures in the universe. But it is better to exist than not to exist. God (who always acts for the best) has chosen between the two choices. It is better to exist as imperfect

of him would see his actions as part of him, and coming necessarily from him. From this, it follows that man is not free in his choice of actions; in fact he is not free to choose his action since they are part of him as predicates are part of subjects in analytic propositions.

Leibniz however says that moral evil is reprehensible and will be punished by God. That God will reward those who do good and punish those who do bad. This supposes that man is free to choose his actions. Leibniz can not affirm this doctrine and at the same time deny human freedom. In fact, he affirmed man is free in his actions but denies that his metaphysical view of the universe rules out human freedom. He explained that when he says that man is necessarily determined by nature to do certain things, he is not talking of metaphysical necessity, but of moral necessity. Thus, to get out of his difficulty, he resorts to the subtle distinction between moral necessity and metaphysical necessity. Metaphysical necessity, according to Leibniz, is absolute necessity, which leaves no room for human freedom. Moral necessity is not incompatible with human freedom. Moral necessity inclines the will, that is, it prompts the will while still leaving it free.

Creatures than not to exist at all. God cannot create perfect creatures, for they would become infinite and therefore be God. There can only be one God.

b. PHYSICAL EVIL

Physical evil is part of the mechanism of the universe. It is part of what constitutes the order and harmony in the system of universe. Even sufferings, disaster or calamities are all part of the system of the universe, and often lead to good result. Thus, the basis of physical evil (sickness, hunger, disease, all kind of disaster) is in fact the metaphysical evil, that is, the imperfection of creatures that constitute the system of the universe.

c. MORAL EVIL

In his explanation of moral evil, Leibniz finds himself in a difficult position. In the first place, moral evil suggests freedom on the part of human beings. But human freedom cannot find a place in the deterministic metaphysical worldview of Leibniz. A universe that operates like several clocks or a huge machine with numerous parts is mechanic and deterministic. Every substance that exists in the universe is a subject and contains within himself, all his predicates, including his past, present and future actions. These are the notion of any individual man. The future actions of man have to take place since they are part of him, and the full view

HUME'S ETHICS

David Hume tries to base his ethics on experimental psychology and he explained morality as away no more than one's acting of sentiments, natural inclination or tendencies. His ethics is an attempt to give a psychological account or explanation of man's choices, decisions and behaviours. Hume is not concerned with how men are ought to behave but how they do in fact behave. Hume is concerned with this and not with ought, with fact and value judgement. He knows the difference between the two choices and was the only philosophy to point it out. He also remarked that writers on ethics often discuss matters of fact, changing suddenly from statement of fact to value judgement.

Morality according to Hume is not based on reason but on natural feelings, inclinations and the passion. Reason is not concerned with morality but with speculative terms such as mathematics and physics. Reason is concerned with abstraction, not with physical matters, nor can it move a man into actions. What move man into actions are the passions, his natural tendencies, feelings and inclination. These determine our choices, decisions and move us into actions. The role of reason in morality is that of slave; slave to passions. "Reason is and ought to be slave to passions; and cannot be other thing or pretend an office than to serve and obey them", says Hume. Moral judgement, that is, moral approval

and disapproval are not based on rational calculations but natural feeling, inclination and emotion. We approve as morally good those actions we have natural inclination with and they please us. And we disapprove as bad, those actions that displeases and to which we do not have any natural inclination with. Thus, morality, according to Hume is a matter of natural feelings, tendencies or inclinations, and not a question of reason. If reason comes in, it is only to serve passions. If we base moral judgement on regarding actions as wrong or right depending on our feeling of whether the action pleases us or displeases, on what do we base the moral judgement of actions done to others?

According to Hume, moral judgement regarding the actions done to others is based on sympathy. Man by nature has sympathy and it plays a vital role in moral judgement. Man's natural human sympathy enables him to share in the feeling of others. Consequently, we approve ideas of pleasure by others, and disapprove the ideas of displeasure to people. We therefore approve as good those actions that please people, and disapprove as wrong those actions that cause displeasure to people.

Hume explained the origin of sense of justice in terms of sympathy. Here, he proposed his version of state of nature prior to the formation of civil society and establishment of rule of conduct. Men in

State of nature soon realised that if everybody should use his freedom as it pleases him, many things would be at stake. They therefore felt that it would be in their interest to make rules of conduct to limit their freedom in order to protect their interests and properties. They did, and this was the origin of rules of conduct, and the notions of justice and injustice, right and obligation. Although that the motive or what led to the formation of rules of conduct was self-interest, sympathy came in and helped them to rise above this self-interest and disapprove of wrong any breach on the rules of conduct. Hence, without sympathy, there would be no sense of justice and we can never rise above our self-interests.

The most important aspect of an action, from the moral point of view is motive. If we blame a person for being wrong, we are actually blaming him for being influenced by the wrong motive. Again, if we praise a person for being good, we are actually praising him for being influenced by the right motive. Right motive is the motive that conforms with man's actions, while wrong motive is the motive that is at variance with man's actions. Hume, for example, says, if we blame a man for not taking care of his child, we are actually blaming him for not being influenced by man's natural inclination, that is man's natural affection. Hence, he is considered wrong and blamed for it.

The criterion for virtue, according to Hume is utility. For anything to be called a virtue, it must be useful and promote man's well being. Public utility and human well being is the basis for anything to be called virtue. The circumstances of public utility is ever principally in view., anything that promotes the happiness of the society approves our approval and goodwill. Here, lies the great part for morality. Hume therefore dismisses celibacy, silence, humility, mortification, fasting and all monkish train of practice as virtues. For him, there are no virtues because they serve no useful purpose. This, was no doubt, an attack on the monastic tradition flourishing in Europe in Hume's time.

David Hume denies human freedom and maintained that human actions are determined. He explained human action in terms of cause and effect, for every action is an effect off of a cause. The cause of action is the motive of the action. Actions are caused by motives, since there is no action without motive, it follows that there is no action without a cause. To say that human actions are free is another way of saying that there is no cause, and it implies that they are problem of chance. But no action is caused by chance, every action has a cause. Consequently, necessity is an essential part of causation, and also liberty, to remove necessity, one removes also cause, and this is the same with chance. chance is known for contradiction,

Passed		6	2	75	E	3	
Passed		6	7	9	E	3	

Question.....

Write on both sides of the paper

Do not
on ei
mar

is contrary to experience; and this can also be seen in free will or liberty. Hume therefore argues that human actions are not free but are the effects of causes.

Hume was obviously wrong because he equates free decisions to chance. Actions that result from free decisions are not problem of chance. Also, to say that an action is free does not mean it has no cause. Hume was right in saying that every action has a cause but was wrong in saying that freedom removes causality. Freedom is not opposed to causality. Between the cause of an action and execution of action, there is free decision from where comes action. Here, causality and freedom remains

and that motive is the cause of every action. Since every action has a motive, it presupposes that every action is caused.

Hume equates freedom with chance. However to say that an action is free, is not to say that it is the result of chance. Hume, however is not wrong in saying that ~~every~~ event has a cause, but he is wrong in saying that causality removes freedom. There is freedom between the cause of an action and the actual execution of the action. For instance "I am hungry therefore I eat". The cause of eating is hunger but eating is a free choice and I can as well choose not to eat.

CONCLUSION.

From Hume's ethics we notice that he describes man as he actually behaves and not as man ought to behave. It describes man as how he is in his relationship with his fellow human beings.

POSSIBILITY OF SYNTHETIC A PRIORI JUDGEMENT BY KANT

Empiricists say that all knowledge comes from experience while the rationalist assert that knowledge is from reason. Kant, however tried to reconcile both by arguing that we cannot have knowledge without experience and also reason.

KINDS OF KNOWLEDGE

- a- A priori proposition: This is the kind of knowledge that is independent of experience. It has necessity and is universal.
- b- A posteriori proposition: Here, knowledge is derived from experience. It is contingently true.
- c- Analytic proposition: Here, the predicates are contained in the subject and no new knowledge is added to both proposition and human mind.
- d- Synthetic proposition: Here, the predicates are not contained in the subjects. New knowledge is added to proposition and also enriches human knowledge.

Before Kant, some philosophers like Leibniz held that analytic propositions can only be priori,

but disagrees with them that all knowledge is derived from experience. Some propositions are prior to experience, not analytic, not tautological and cannot be contradicted by experience but experience confirms to it. This, Kant calls synthetic a priori propositions. They can be seen in mathematics. An example: $7 + 5 = 12$, geometry, for example: straight line is the shortest distance between two points.

KANT'S COPERNICAN REVOLUTION

Before Copernicus (1473 - 1543), it was believed that the earth is at the center of universe but Copernicus showed that it is the sun that is at the center of the universe and Earth and other planet revolve around it.

Kant believed he has carried out a revolution in philosophy. Before Kant, it was believed that it is the human mind that confirms to object of knowledge. If this hypothesis is true, it means that all knowledge is derived from experience and synthetic a priori proposition can not be explained with this hypothesis. Kant is convinced that there is synthetic a priori propositions. He therefore reversed the hypothesis, and it implies that it is the objects of knowledge that confirm to the structures of human mind. It implies that we cannot know anything in themselves but as they ~~are~~ our minds makes them appear to us. It can be compared to

Question

While synthetic propositions must be ^{eg} posteriori.
But Kant argues that there are synthetic propositions that are ^{a-e} priori, hence, there is synthetic ^{a priori} ^ proposition.

Kant used an example, the proposition, "every event has a cause". Before Hume, it was generally said to be analytic. But Hume denied this and argued that the idea of causality cannot be contained in the idea of event since we cannot observe an event. It is therefore said that ^{an} event has no cause. Hume also said that the idea "every event has a cause" is just a habit of associating event with cause.

Kant agrees with Hume that the idea of causality is not contained in the idea of habit but disagrees with Hume in considering the idea "every event has a cause" as just a matter of associating of event with ~~cause~~ cause. He also disagrees with the empiricist who said that the idea "every event has a cause" is a generalization of proposition of some experience being caused, which means that it is from induction.

Kant's own explanation is that the idea "every event has a cause" is not analytic, and not denied from experience, and can not be contradicted or disproved by experience. This, Kant says, is an example of synthetic a priori proposition. Kant agrees with the empiricists that knowledge begins with experience.

Question.....

Write on both sides of the paper

a person wearing a blue spectacles, which makes everything appear blue to him. He cannot see the real colour of things but only as the blue spectacles make things appear to him. This notion implies that we cannot really know what things are in themselves.

Also, in space and time, a priori forms a sense of perception and nothing can be known outside space and time.