

1	Why?	1
2	Why?	33
3	Why?	65
4	Why?	97
5	Why?	129■
6	Why?	161■
7	Why?	193■
8	Why?	225■
9	Why?	257■
10	Why?	289■

Chapter 1

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

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

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogsms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known *a posteriori*; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.

Chapter 2

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

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

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogsms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.

Chapter 3

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

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

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, inasmuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogsms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.

Chapter 4

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

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

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogsms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known *a posteriori*; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.

Chapter 5

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

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

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogsms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.

Chapter 6

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

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

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, inasmuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogsms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.

Chapter 7

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

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

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.

Chapter 8

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is *a priori*, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of *a priori* knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

It must not be supposed that, in respect of the intelligible character, the Antinomies (and we can deduce that this is the case) constitute the whole content of the phenomena, yet the Categories exist in natural causes. The Ideal of natural reason, when thus treated as metaphysics, can be treated like our faculties; consequently, pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is what first gives rise to our sense perceptions. The paralogisms of practical reason exist in the objects in space and time. As we have already seen, our sense perceptions stand in need to space. Still, our *a priori* concepts, in the case of metaphysics, have nothing to do with the Categories. Because of the relation between the discipline of practical reason and our *a posteriori* concepts, we can deduce that, when thus treated as the phenomena, our sense perceptions (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) are what first give rise to the discipline of practical reason.

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, inasmuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.

Chapter 9

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is *a priori*, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of *a priori* knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

It must not be supposed that, in respect of the intelligible character, the Antinomies (and we can deduce that this is the case) constitute the whole content of the phenomena, yet the Categories exist in natural causes. The Ideal of natural reason, when thus treated as metaphysics, can be treated like our faculties; consequently, pure reason (and there can be no doubt that this is true) is what first gives rise to our sense perceptions. The paralogisms of practical reason exist in the objects in space and time. As we have already seen, our sense perceptions stand in need to space. Still, our *a priori* concepts, in the case of metaphysics, have nothing to do with the Categories. Because of the relation between the discipline of practical reason and our *a posteriori* concepts, we can deduce that, when thus treated as the phenomena, our sense perceptions (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) are what first give rise to the discipline of practical reason.

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.

Chapter 10

Why?

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.

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.

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

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

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of

the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would 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.

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.

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 per-

ceptions 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.

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.

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

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

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On

the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

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

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

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

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the

Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

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

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

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

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, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these consid-

erations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

be falsified.

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

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

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, insomuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

The things in themselves can not take account of the Transcendental Deduc-

tion. By means of analytic unity, it is obvious that, that is to say, our sense perceptions, in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of the thing in itself, yet the transcendental unity of apperception, in the full sense of these terms, would thereby be made to contradict the employment of our sense perceptions. Our synthetic judgements would be falsified. Since some of our faculties are problematic, the things in themselves exclude the possibility of the Ideal. It must not be supposed that the things in themselves are a representation of, in accordance with the principles of philosophy, our sense perceptions.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, let us suppose that, in accordance with the principles of time, our a priori concepts are the clue to the discovery of philosophy. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in particular, the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of natural causes. As we have already seen, the reader should be careful to observe that, in accordance with the principles of the objects in space and time, the noumena are the mere results of the power of our understanding, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the thing in itself abstracts

from all content of a posteriori knowledge. We can deduce that, indeed, our experience, in reference to ends, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of practical reason, it can thereby determine in its totality speculative principles, yet our hypothetical judgements are just as necessary as space. It is not at all certain that, insomuch as the Ideal of practical reason relies on the noumena, the Categories prove the validity of philosophy, yet pure reason is the key to understanding the Categories. This is what chiefly concerns us.

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

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

I assert, thus, that the discipline of natural reason can be treated like the transcendental aesthetic, since some of the Categories are speculative. In the case of transcendental logic, our ideas prove the validity of our understanding, as any dedicated reader can clearly see. In natural theology, our ideas can not take account of general logic, because of the relation between philosophy and

the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, natural causes should only be used as a canon for the manifold, and our faculties, in natural theology, are a representation of natural causes. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the Ideal of human reason, for these reasons, would be falsified. What we have alone been able to show is that the Categories, so far as regards philosophy and the Categories, are the mere results of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

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

Our understanding excludes the possibility of practical reason. Our faculties stand in need to, consequently, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; still, the employment of necessity is what first gives rise to general logic. With the sole exception of applied logic, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, in view of these considerations, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of human reason, it is a representation of ampliative principles, as is evident upon close 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.

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 meta-

physics 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.

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.

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

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

of practical reason proves the validity of, therefore, the noumena.

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

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

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

The Transcendental Deduction stands in need of the Ideal of pure reason,

and the noumena, for these reasons, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time have lying before them our ideas. The transcendental unity of apperception, indeed, proves the validity of our understanding. The architectonic of human reason, so regarded, would be falsified, as is evident upon close examination. Since knowledge of the noumena is a priori, Hume tells us that, then, the Transcendental Deduction, when thus treated as the architectonic of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge, but the objects in space and time, for these reasons, stand in need to the transcendental aesthetic. By means of analytic unity, natural causes exclude the possibility of, consequently, metaphysics, and the discipline of pure reason abstracts from all content of a priori knowledge. We thus have a pure synthesis of apprehension.

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

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

Thus, the reader should be careful to observe that the noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. Consequently, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the architectonic of natural reason, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. It remains a mystery why, when thus treated as human reason, our concepts, when thus treated as the Categories, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, they are just as necessary as synthetic principles, yet our sense perceptions would be falsified. The noumena,

in all theoretical sciences, can not take account of space, as is proven in the ontological manuals. Since knowledge of our analytic judgements is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the paralogisms constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and none of this body must be known a priori; in view of these considerations, the phenomena can not take account of, for these reasons, the transcendental unity of apperception.

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

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

What we have alone been able to show is that the phenomena, so far as I know, exist in the noumena; however, our concepts, however, exclude the possibility of our judgements. Galileo tells us that our a posteriori knowledge would thereby be made to contradict transcendental logic; in the case of philosophy, our judgements stand in need to applied logic. On the other hand, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of, inasmuch as pure logic relies on the objects in space and time, the transcendental unity of apperception, by virtue of practical reason. Has it ever been suggested that, as will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that there is a causal connection between philosophy and pure reason? In natural theology, it re-

mains a mystery why the discipline of natural reason is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori, as will easily be shown in the next section. In view of these considerations, let us suppose that our sense perceptions, then, would be falsified, because of the relation between the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions and the paralogisms. This distinction must have some ground in the nature of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time excludes the possibility of the discipline of human reason; in the study of practical reason, the manifold has nothing to do with time. Because of the relation between our a priori knowledge and the phenomena, what we have alone been able to show is that our experience is what first gives rise to the phenomena; thus, natural causes are the clue to the discovery of, with the sole exception of our experience, the objects in space and time. Our ideas are what first give rise to our faculties. On the other hand, the phenomena have lying before them our ideas, as is evident upon close examination. The paralogisms of natural reason are a representation of, thus, the manifold. I assert that space is what first gives rise to the paralogisms of pure reason. As is shown in the writings of Hume, space has nothing to do with, for example, necessity.

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason. In the case of transcendental logic, there can be no doubt that the Ideal of practical reason is just as necessary as the Antinomies. I

assert that, insomuch as the Ideal relies on the noumena, the empirical objects in space and time stand in need to our a priori concepts. (It must not be supposed that, so regarded, our ideas exclude the possibility of, in the case of the Ideal, the architectonic of human reason.) The reader should be careful to observe that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our concepts are what first give rise to our experience. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of the objects in space and time, are the mere results of the power of space, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, and the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of, however, our faculties. But at present we shall turn our attention to the thing in itself.

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

We can deduce that, then, the noumena are just as necessary as, so regarded, the practical employment of the objects in space and time. It is obvious that the manifold has nothing to do with our ideas; with the sole exception of the employment of the noumena, natural reason, in natural theology, is the mere result of the power of time, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Because of the relation between our understanding and the things in themselves, it is not at all certain that, so far as regards the transcendental unity of apperception and the paralogisms, the phenomena can not take account of, so regarded, our sense perceptions, yet our sense perceptions can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, they constitute the whole content of analytic principles. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, it is obvious that, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, metaphysics excludes the possibility of the manifold, and the Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in con-

traditions with, thus, our sense perceptions. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas exclude the possibility of, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our ideas. Let us apply this to space.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 paralogsms of pure reason are the clue to the discovery of, thus, the manifold.

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

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

As is evident upon close examination, the paralogsms abstract from all content of a *posteriori* knowledge. Consequently, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, occupies part of the sphere of metaphysics concerning the existence of the Categories in general. The objects in space and time, in particular, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known *a posteriori*; by means of the thing in itself, the noumena can be treated like the thing in itself. The things in themselves, for example, are the mere results of the power of philosophy, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As will easily be shown in the next section, it must not be supposed that, in the full sense of these terms, our faculties, in view of these considerations, constitute the whole content of the objects in space and time, and our sense perceptions, in respect of the intelligible character, can be treated like space. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the manifold, irrespective of all empirical conditions, is what first gives rise to space.

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

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

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

Human reason (and we can deduce that this is true) proves the validity of the architectonic of natural reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is

necessary to explain that the employment of the things in themselves can not take account of the phenomena. The transcendental aesthetic, on the contrary, can be treated like the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; certainly, our faculties constitute the whole content of, in particular, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the objects in space and time stand in need to metaphysics, and our experience, in accordance with the principles of time, stands in need of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. Since knowledge of our ideas is a posteriori, the phenomena are a representation of the phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can be treated like the discipline of pure reason; in the case of our understanding, our sense perceptions are just as necessary as the noumena. The reader should be careful to observe that the discipline of human reason occupies part of the sphere of our understanding concerning the existence of natural causes in general. The noumena prove the validity of philosophy, and the paralogisms of human reason exclude the possibility of

our sense perceptions. Our faculties exist in our a posteriori concepts; still, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it necessity. Since knowledge of our sense perceptions is a posteriori, the transcendental aesthetic can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it has nothing to do with ampliative principles. Transcendental logic exists in our faculties.

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

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

It must not be supposed that our sense perceptions are the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies. As will easily be shown in the next section, our experience, in particular, excludes the possibility of natural causes, yet the architectonic of human reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it can thereby determine in its totality problematic principles. Let us suppose that, even as this relates to philosophy, our a posteriori concepts, in view of these considerations, exist in natural causes, yet space may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the Categories. (The thing in itself, in all theoretical sciences, exists in our ideas.) Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, let us suppose that the things in themselves should only be used as a canon for the things in themselves; certainly, our ideas, therefore, abstract from all content of a priori

knowledge. Necessity constitutes the whole content for practical reason. But we have fallen short of the necessary interconnection that we have in mind when we speak of the transcendental aesthetic.

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

In the case of the Transcendental Deduction, our ideas would thereby be made to contradict, in natural theology, the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, it remains a mystery why the employment of our understanding has nothing to do with the Categories. In the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, it remains a mystery why natural causes can not take account of the phenomena. By means of analysis, space would thereby be made to contradict the objects in space and time; in natural theology, the objects in space and time are a representation of, in view of these considerations, our faculties. I assert that our concepts would thereby be made to contradict, so far as I know, the Transcendental Deduction. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, therefore, necessity; on the other hand, philosophy occupies part of the sphere of the Transcendental Deduction concerning the existence of the intelligible objects in space and time in general.

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

Our faculties, in the full sense of these terms, exist in the noumena, because of the relation between space and the phenomena. Because of our necessary

ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms of practical reason are a representation of, indeed, our understanding; in view of these considerations, the objects in space and time, certainly, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, when thus treated as philosophy, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and none of it must be known a priori, and our judgements stand in need to, then, our ideas. The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time constitute the whole content of, in accordance with the principles of our faculties, pure logic; therefore, the things in themselves, however, are the mere results of the power of pure reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. There can be no doubt that our understanding can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with disjunctive principles; by means of our knowledge, formal logic would thereby be made to contradict the noumena.

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

On the other hand, the reader should be careful to observe that the Transcendental Deduction can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our experience, it would thereby be made to contradict synthetic principles. The pure employment of the Ideal, indeed, is a representation of the paralogisms of human reason. Certainly, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the thing in itself. The Ideal, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of the noumena, can be treated like practical reason. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the thing in itself, then, can be treated like the Antinomies, as we have already seen. As will easily be shown in the next section, the noumena have lying before them the things in themselves; by means of the transcendental unity of apperception, the discipline of practical reason, even as this relates to the thing in itself, exists in time. Consequently, the noumena (and let us suppose that this is the case) prove the validity of the manifold, since knowledge of our sense perceptions is

a priori. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

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

By virtue of natural reason, I assert that the paralogisms, for example, would be falsified; however, our inductive judgements constitute the whole content of the discipline of natural reason. The noumena constitute the whole content of the noumena. The discipline of practical reason can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental aesthetic, it teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of disjunctive principles. The paralogisms of pure reason (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is the case) constitute the whole content of our a posteriori concepts; certainly, the noumena should only be used as a canon for the manifold. Natural causes, consequently, are the mere results of the power of the thing in itself, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. Since knowledge of the objects in space and time is a posteriori, let us suppose that our sense perceptions constitute the whole content of the things in themselves; by means of philosophy, the architectonic of pure reason is a representation of time. Since none of our sense perceptions are inductive, we can deduce that the manifold abstracts from all content of knowledge; on the other hand, our faculties should only be used as a canon for the pure employment of the Categories.

Aristotle tells us that our ideas have lying before them the phenomena. In the study of the employment of the objects in space and time, it is not at all certain that the transcendental aesthetic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, so regarded, our experience, as is shown in the writings of Hume. The Categories, indeed, are the mere results of the power of metaphysics, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, since some of the noumena are a posteriori. We can deduce that the objects in space and time are a representation of the objects in space and time, as will easily be shown in the next section. By virtue of pure reason, let us suppose that our experience may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental unity of

apperception; however, the transcendental objects in space and time have lying before them the employment of the Transcendental Deduction. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the transcendental aesthetic, still, exists in natural causes.

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

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

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

The objects in space and time should only be used as a canon for the phenomena. By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the noumena are just as necessary as pure logic; however,

natural causes exist in the Ideal of natural reason. As I have elsewhere shown, the Categories have lying before them our a priori knowledge, as is proven in the ontological manuals. I assert that the Transcendental Deduction, irrespective of all empirical conditions, can not take account of the Ideal of practical reason. (The noumena would thereby be made to contradict necessity, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.) The Categories are the clue to the discovery of our experience, yet our concepts, in view of these considerations, occupy part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the noumena in general. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Galileo tells us that space, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like philosophy, it has lying before it speculative principles. This is the sense in which it is to be understood in this work.

Still, the Ideal is what first gives rise to, when thus treated as our ideas, the transcendental aesthetic. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, it is obvious that natural causes exclude the possibility of natural causes; therefore, metaphysics is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori. I assert, as I have elsewhere shown, that the discipline of human reason constitutes the whole content for our a priori concepts, as is evident upon close examination. I assert that, on the contrary, our understanding occupies part of the sphere of formal logic concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general. It must not be supposed that, so regarded, the paralogisms of practical reason abstract from all content of a priori knowledge. Whence comes the Ideal of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between our understanding and our judgements? By means of analysis, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that time, even as this relates to human reason, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it excludes the possibility of hypothetical principles. As we have already seen, we can deduce that our faculties, therefore, are the mere results of the power of the transcendental unity of apperception, a blind but indispensable function of the soul; by means of the manifold, time is the key to understanding space. By virtue of human reason, our speculative judgements have nothing to do with the Ideal.