

B 375 thoroughly determined, and the original causes of things, and only the whole its combination in the totality of a world is fully adequate to its idea. If we abstract from its exaggerated expression, then the philosopher's spiritual flight, which considers the physical copies<sup>a</sup> in the world order, and then ascends to their architectonic connection according to ends, i.e., ideas, is an endeavor that deserves respect and imitation; but in respect of that which pertains to principles<sup>b</sup> of morality, legislation and religion where the ideas first make the experience (of the good) itself possible, even if they can never be fully expressed in experience, perform a wholly unique service, which goes unrecognized precisely because it is judged according to empirical rules, whose validity as principles<sup>c</sup> should be cancelled by those very ideas. For when we consider nature, experience provides us with the rule and is the source of truth; but with respect to moral laws, experience is (alas!) the mother of illusion, and it is most reprehensible to derive the laws concerning what I  
A 319 **ought to do** from what **is done**, or to want to limit it to that.

But instead of these matters, the prosecution of which in fact makes up the proper dignity of philosophy, we now concern ourselves with a labor less spectacular but nevertheless not unrewarding: that of making  
B 376 the terrain for these majestic moral edifices level and firm enough to be built upon; for under this ground there are all sorts of passageways, such as moles might have dug, left over from reason's vain but confident treasure hunting, that make every building insecure. It is the transcendental use of pure reason, of its principles<sup>d</sup> and ideas, whose closer acquaintance we are now obligated to make, in order properly to determine and evaluate the influence and the worth of pure reason. Yet before I conclude this provisional introduction, I entreat those who take philosophy to heart (which means more than is commonly supposed), if they find themselves convinced by this and the following discussion, to take care to preserve the expression **idea** in its original meaning, so that it will not henceforth fall among the other expressions by which all sorts of representations are denoted in careless disorder, to the detriment of science. We are not so lacking in terms properly suited to each species of representation that we have need for one to encroach on the property of another. Here is their progression:<sup>e</sup> The genus is **representation** in general (*repraesentatio*). Under it stands the representation with consciousness (*perceptio*). A **perception**<sup>f</sup> that refers to the subject as a modification of its state is a **sensation** (*sensatio*); an objective percep-

<sup>a</sup> von der copelichen Betrachtung des Physischen

<sup>b</sup> Principien

<sup>c</sup> Principien

<sup>d</sup> Principien

<sup>e</sup> Stufenleiter

<sup>f</sup> Perception

tion<sup>a</sup> is a **cognition** (*cognitio*). The latter is either an **intuition** or a **concept** (*intuitus vel conceptus*). The former is immediately related to the object and is singular; the latter is mediate, by means of a mark, which can be common to several things. A concept is either an **empirical** or a **pure concept**, and the pure concept, insofar as it has its origin solely in the understanding (not in a pure image of sensibility), is called *notio*.<sup>b</sup> A concept made up of notions, which goes beyond the possibility of experience, is an **idea** or a concept of reason. Anyone who has become accustomed to this distinction must find it unbearable to hear a representation of the color red called an idea. It is not even to be called a notion (a concept of the understanding).<sup>16</sup>

B 377

First book of the transcendental dialectic

Second section

On the transcendental ideas.<sup>c</sup>

A 321

The transcendental analytic gave us an example of how the mere logical form of our cognition can contain the origin of pure concepts *a priori*, which represent objects prior to all experience, or rather which indicate the synthetic unity that alone makes possible an empirical cognition of objects. The form of judgments (transformed into a concept of the synthesis of intuitions) brought forth categories that direct all use of the understanding in experience. In the same way, we can expect that the form of the syllogisms, if applied to the synthetic unity of intuitions under the authority of the categories, will contain the origin of special concepts *a priori* that we may call pure concepts of reason or **transcendental ideas**, and they will determine the use of the understanding according to principles<sup>d</sup> in the whole of an entire experience.

B 378

The function of reason in its inferences consisted in the universality of cognition according to concepts, and the syllogism is itself a judgment determined *a priori* in the whole domain of its condition. I can draw the proposition "Caius is mortal" from experience merely through the understanding. But I seek a concept containing the condition under which the predicate (the assertion in general) of this judgment is given (i.e., here, the concept "human"), and after I have subsumed [the predicate] under this condition, taken in its whole domain ("all humans are

A 322

<sup>a</sup> Perception

<sup>b</sup> notion

<sup>c</sup> In his copy of the first edition, Kant inserted these comments:

"In experience we can [encounter] no concepts of reason, e.g., of the simple, which cannot exhibit any experience, the [absolutely] unconditioned of every kind.

"The cosmological ideas, to be sure, pertain to objects [Objecte] of the sensible world, but . . ." (the end of the manuscript is missing) (E CLII, p. 46; 23:38)

<sup>d</sup> Principien