Handout title

Patrick D. Elliott

September 26, 2018

1 Introduction

test frame

- 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.

- Fox (2018, 2007), Fox & Hackl (2007), Bar-Lev & Fox (2017), Fox & Spector (2018)

some math

(1) $$[\![\text{and}_{\tau\to\tau\to\tau}]\!] = \begin{cases} \wedge & \tau = t \\ \lambda P_{\rho\to\sigma} \,.\, \lambda Q_{\rho\to\sigma} \,.\, \lambda x_{\rho} \,.\, [\![\text{and}_{\sigma\to\sigma\to\sigma}]\!]\ (P\ x)\,(Q\ x) & \tau = \rho \to \sigma \end{cases}$$

some code

```
newtype CCP a = CCP { (>>-) :: (G Identity a -> G Identity T) -> G Identity T }

instance Functor CCP where
  fmap f cx = CCP $ \k -> cx >>- \x -> k (fmap f x)

instance Applicative CCP where
  pure a = CCP $ \k -> k (pure a)
  cf <*> cx = CCP $ \k -> cf >>- \f -> cx >>- \x -> k (f <*> x)

instance Monad CCP where
  return = pure
  cgx >>= f = CCP $ \k -> cgx >>- \gx -> gx >>= (\x -> f x >>- k)
```

References

Bar-Lev, Moshe E. & Danny Fox. 2017. Universal free choice and innocent inclusion. In *Proceedings of SALT 27*. Linguistic Society of America.

Fox, Danny. 2007. Free choice and the theory of scalar implicatures. In Uli Sauerland & Penka Stateva (eds.), *Presupposition and implicature in compositional semantics*, 71–120. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Fox, Danny. 2018. Partition by exhaustification: comments on Dayal 1996. In Uli Sauerland & Stephanie Solt (eds.), *Proceedings of sinn und bedeutung 22* (ZASPiL 60), 403–434. Berlin: Leibniz-Centre General Linguistics.

Fox, Danny & Martin Hackl. 2007. The universal density of measurement. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 29(5). 537–586.

Fox, Danny & Benjamin Spector. 2018. Economy and embedded exhaustification. *Natural Language Semantics* 26(1). 1–50.