

[Intro (§1)]

- | | |
|--|--|
| §1.1: Intuition: sensibility vs. u'ing | §1.4: Pure intuition |
| §1.2: Appearances | §1.5: T. Aesthetic |
| §1.3: Appearances: form vs. matter | §1.6: Pure intuition through isolation |

Space: Metaphysical exposition (§2)

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| §2.1: Space, time; big questions; What is M.E.? | |
| Arg. 1: S not derived from outer exp. | <i>a priori</i> , not empirical |
| Arg. 2: S ground of outer exp. | |
| Arg. 3: S is single. | intuition, not concept |
| Arg. 4: S is infinite. | |

Space: Transcendental exposition (§3)

- §3.1: What is T.E.?
§3.2: Geometry's SAPCs require S to be an *a priori* intuition.
§3.3: Only explanation for this? S is form of outer sense.
§3.4: Only K's explanation works for geometry's SAPCs.

Conclusions

- a*: Others are wrong: S is not an absolute or relative determination, independent of subjective conditions of sensible intuition (SCoSI). That can't account for *a priori* intuition.
- b*: Here's what's right: S is the form of SCofSI. That can account for *a priori* intuition.
- C.1: S is meaningless outside of humans. TiTs vs. APPs. (Un)conditional validity. Emp. R/I vs. Trans. R/I. Emp. R = Objective.
- C.2: Different from 2qs. S and 2qs are all subjective, but only S delivers SAPCs, possesses "ideality", is "*a priori* objective".
- C.3: Emp. TiT/APP vs. Trans. TiT/APP. A rose is *empirically* a TiT, whereas its color isn't. But *transcendentally* nothing intuited in S is a TiT.

Time: Metaphysical exposition (§4)

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Arg. 1: T not derived from outer exp. | <i>a priori</i> , not empirical |
| Arg. 2: T ground of outer exp. | |
| Arg. 3: This grounds axioms of T. | |
| Arg. 4: T is single. Also, synthetic T prop. | intuition, not concept |
| Arg. 5: T is infinite. | |

Time: Transcendental exposition (§5)

Arg. 3 above. Also: alteration, motion, the general theory of motion's SAPCs require T to be an *a priori* intuition.

Conclusions (§6)

- a*: Others are wrong: T neither subsists nor attaches objectively (so as to remain upon SC-abstraction).
- b*: Here's what's right: T is the form of inner sense. T isn't outer, but we use outer analogies (a line) to represent its relations.
- c*: T is the condition of *all* appearances: (imm'ly) inner and (mediately) outer.

- C.1: Objective validity, subjective condition. (Un)conditional validity(?)
- C.2: Emp. R/I vs. Trans. I/Abs. R. Also TiTs/APPs. Different from 2qs.

Elucidation (§7)

- §7.1: Alteration objection wrt T. Reply: Both T and A are real (empirical reality), but would be nothing absent SC (no absolute reality).
- 2: They assumed inner sense outdid outer sense wrt unquestionable reality. But both admit of a TiT/APP distinction.
- §7.3: SAPCs but limited to experience. Others (Abs. R) run into trouble: Newtonians get *a priori* mathematics but confusedly go beyond experience. Leibnizians have trouble with *a priori* mathematics.
- §7.4: Only S and T are pure. Other concepts presuppose something empirical: e.g., *motion* something experienced in space, *alteration* something experienced in time.

General remarks (§8)

- §8.I.1: Explain form of sensibility to head off misinterpretation.
- §8.I.2: 1st: Disappearance. TiTs unknown. *A priori* form vs. *A posteriori* matter. Even ultra-distinct intuition doesn't get at TiTs.
- 3: Leibnizian view—more or less confused intellection of TiTs, sensibility vs. understanding a matter of mere *logical* degree—wrong. It's a matter of *content*: e.g., the concept *right* involves non-sensible intellection of TiTs no matter how common and unconscious, the intuition *body* involves sensible appearances no matter how well and thoroughly represented.
- 4: S vs. U is transcendental (origin, content), not logical (distinctness).
- 5: Emp. TiT/APP needs also Trans. TiT/APP: rainbow, raindrops.
- §8.I.6: 2nd: Show T.A. with *certainty* (as suits an organon).
- 7: Geometry SAPCs: Not empirical. Not conceptual. *A priori* intuition. Only via subjective conditions.
- §8.II: *Relations*: Intuitive cognitions give us only relations, never relata. Represents nothing until something is posited. Only passive (self-affected) intuition.
- §8.III: *Illusions*: Apps and their props are *really* given, they don't merely *seem* to be given. But others who give S/T objective reality run into such absurdities that Berkeley can be forgiven for making them illusions.
- §8.IV.1: *God*: If S/T were objective forms, how dare we remove them from divine cognition (God's original/intellectual intuition)? But then they are subjective forms of our non-original/sensible intuition.
- 2: Perhaps also of other finite thinking beings. But still non-original.

Conclusion

- General problem: How are SAPCs possible?
- Piece of the solution: *Pure a priori intuitions* (S/T) provide what it takes to go beyond the concept *a priori*.
- Limitation: These SAPCs can never go beyond objects of possible experience.