Immanuel Kant,² born in Königsberg, Prussia, 1724, was the son of plain people. His paternal grandparents emigrated to Germany from the fatherland of Hume. After pursuing his studies at the University of his native city (1740-1746), Kant became a private tutor, then a Privatdocent in the University of Königsberg (1755), where he taught logic, ethics, metaphysics, mathematics, cosmography, and geography. He was made full Professor in 1770, and continued his lectures until 1797. In 1804 he died, rich in honors and in years. Kant never left his native province, and never married. He enjoyed good health, was absolutely regular in his daily habits, free from the cares of family-life, and, for three-quarters of a century, devoted to science and intellectual pleasures. Thus he realized, in a certain measure, the ideal of the philosophers of Athens and Rome; but his cheerful temperament and sociable disposition softened the harshness in the character of the Stoic sage. When we remember, besides, that he was a reformer in philosophy, it will hardly surprise us to hear that history likens him to Socrates.

His philosophical writings may be divided into two separate classes. Those of his dogmatic period³ betray the disciple of Leibniz and Wolff; though anticipating, especially his Träume eines Geistersehers (1766), the teachings of his maturer years. Those of his second period (1770-1804), during which the influence of Hume led him to break with dogmatism, present a new philosophy. Chief among them are: De mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis forma et principii ⁴ (1770); Kritik der reinen Vernunft (1781; 2d edition, revised, 1787);⁵ his master-work, which forms the basis of the following: Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik⁶ (1783); Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten⁷ (1785); Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft⁸ (1786); Kritik der praktischen Vernunft⁹ (1788); Kritik der Urteilskraft¹⁰ (1790); Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft¹¹ (1793).

Our age, as Kant often says, is the age of criticism; and by that word he understands the philosophy which, before affirming, weighs, and, before assuming to know, inquires into the conditions of knowledge. Not only is the philosophy of Kant criticism in this general sense; it is also criticism in the special sense of being a theory of ideas; it is critical, as distinguished from the extreme theories of Leibniz and Locke, in that it discriminates (discernere), in the formation of ideas, between the product of sensation and the product of the spontaneous activity of pure reason. It acknowledges with sensationalism that the matter of our ideas is furnished by the senses; with idealism it claims that their form is the work of reason, - that reason, by its own laws, transforms into ideas the given manifold of sensation. Criticism neither aims to be sensationalistic nor intellectualistic in the extreme sense of these terms, but transcendental; i.e., going beyond (transcendens) the sensationalistic and idealistic doctrines, it succeeds in reaching a higher standpoint, which enables it to appreciate the relative truth and falsehood in the theories of dogmatism. It is a method rather than a system, an introduction to philosophy rather than a finished system. Its motto is th[at] of Socrates . . .: Before constructing any system whatever, reason must inquire into its resources for constructing it.

In its examination of reason, criticism carefully separates the different elements of this faculty, and, true to the critical spirit whence it springs, distinguishes between the theoretical
order, the practical order, and the æsthetical order. Reason resembles a queen, who, under three different names, governs three separate states, each having its own laws, customs, and tendencies. In the theoretical sphere, it manifests itself as the faculty of knowing, or the sense of truth; in the practical sphere, as the active faculty, or the sense of goodness; in the æsthetical sphere, as the sense of beauty and teleological fitness. The Kantian philosophy gives each of these three spheres its due, examining one after another, without prejudice or dogmatic prepossessions.

I. Critique of Pure Reason

And, first of all, it asks: What is knowledge?

An idea taken by itself (man, earth, heat) is not knowledge; in order to become knowledge, the ideas of man, earth, and heat must be combined with other ideas; there must be a subject and a predicate, i.e., a judgment. Examples: Man is a responsible being; the earth is a planet; heat expands bodies. Hence, all knowledge is formulated into propositions; all knowledge is judgment, but not every judgment is knowledge.

There are analytic judgments and synthetic judgments. The former merely analyze an idea, without adding anything new to it. Example: Bodies are extended. The predicate extended adds nothing to the subject that is not already contained in it. This judgment tells me nothing new; it does not increase my knowledge. When, on the other hand, I say: The earth is a planet, I make a synthetic judgment, i.e., I join to the idea of the earth a new predicate, the idea of a planet, which cannot be said to be inseparable from the idea of the earth; nay, it has taken man thousands of years to connect it with the latter. Hence, synthetic judgments enrich, extend, and increase my knowledge, and alone constitute knowledge; which is not the case with analytic judgments.

But here Kant makes an important reservation. Not every synthetic judgment is necessarily scientific knowledge. In order to constitute real scientific knowledge, with which alone we are here concerned, a judgment must be true in all cases; the union which it establishes between subject and predicate should not be accidental, but necessary. “It is warm,” is undoubtedly a synthetic judgment, but it is accidental and contingent, for it may be cold tomorrow; hence it is not a scientific proposition. Whenever, however, you say: Heat expands, you state a fact which will be as true to-morrow and a thousand years from now as it is to-day; you state a necessary proposition and a concept properly so-called.

But what right have I to affirm that this proposition is necessary, universal, true in every instance? Does experience reveal to me all cases, and are there no possible cases, beyond our observation, in which heat does not expand the bodies which it usually expands? Hume is right on this point. Since experience always furnishes only a limited number of cases, it cannot yield necessity and universality. Hence, a judgment a posteriori, i.e., one based solely on experience, cannot constitute scientific knowledge. In order to be necessary, or scientific, a judgment must rest on a rational basis; it must be rooted in reason as well as in observation; it must be a judgment a priori. Now, mathematics, physics, and metaphysics consist of synthetic judgments a priori. Hence, to sum up: Knowledge may be defined as synthetic judgment a priori. This is Kant's answer to his preliminary question: What is knowledge?

How can we form synthetic judgments a priori? In other terms: Under what conditions is knowledge possible? This is the fundamental problem which Kantian criticism undertakes to solve.

It is possible, Kant answers, provided the senses furnish the materials for a judgment, and reason the cement needed to unite them. Take the proposition already cited: Heat expands bodies. This proposition contains two distinct elements: (1) the elements furnished by sensation: heat, expansion, bodies; (2) an element not given by sensation, but derived solely from the intellect: the causal relation which the sentence in question establishes between heat and the expansion of bodies. What is true of our example is true of every scientific judgment. Every scientific
judgment necessarily contains sensible elements and pure or rational elements. In denying the 
former, idealism ignores the fact that persons born blind have no idea of color, and, consequently, 
no notion of light; in denying the rational, innate, \textit{a priori} element, sensationalism forgets that 
the most refined senses of the idiot are incapable of suggesting a scientific notion to him. The 
critical philosophy occupies a place between these two extreme theories, and recognizes both 
the role of sensibility and that of pure reason in the formation of our judgments.

But we must make a more penetrating analysis of the faculty of knowledge. As we have just 
seen, it is divided into two sub-faculties, one of which furnishes the materials of our knowledge, 
while the other fashions them, or makes concepts of them. Hence, our examination of reason, in 
the broad sense of faculty of knowledge, will take up: (1) the sensibility (intuitive reason) and 
(2) the understanding proper.\footnote{16}

\textbf{1. Critique of Sensibility, or Transcendental Æsthetic}

We now know in a general way that knowledge is the common product of sensibility and the 
understanding. But what are the conditions of sense-perception, or, to use Kant’s language, 
intuition (\textit{Anschauung})?

Sensibility, we said, furnishes the understanding with the materials of its knowledge. But 
the materials themselves, of which the garment is to be made, already have a certain shape; 
they are no longer absolutely raw materials: the latter have been subjected to the preliminary 
processes of spinning and weaving. Or, in other words, our sensibility is not purely passive; 
it does not turn over to the understanding the materials which the latter needs, without adding 
something of its own; it impresses its stamp, its own forms, upon things; or, as one might say, 
it marks the perceived object just as the outline of our hands is traced upon a handful of snow. 
It is in particular what the faculty of knowledge is in general: both receptive and active; it 
receives a mysterious substance from without, and makes an intuition of it. Hence, there are, 
in every intuition, two elements: a \textit{pure} or \textit{a priori} element and an \textit{a posteriori} element, form 
and matter, something that reason produces spontaneously and something, I know not what, 
derived elsewhere.

What is this form? What are the \textit{a priori} elements which our sensibility does not receive, but 
draws from its own nature and adds to each of its intuitions, just as the digestive apparatus adds 
its juices to the swallowed food, in order to transform it into chyle? These \textit{a priori} intuitions, 
which sensationalism denies, and whose existence the \textit{Critique of Pure Reason} proves, are 
\textit{space}, the form of the outer sense, and \textit{time}, the form of the inner sense. \textit{Space and time are 
original intuitions of reason, prior to all experience:} this is the immortal discovery of Kant, and 
one of the fundamental teachings of the critical philosophy.\footnote{17}

The following proofs may be offered in support of the view that space and time come from 
reason and not from experience: (1) Although the infant has no accurate notion of distance, it 
tends to withdraw from disagreeable objects and to approach such as give it pleasure. Hence 
it knows \textit{a priori} that such objects are in front of it, by the side of it, beyond it, etc. Prior to all 
other intuitions, it has the idea of \textit{before, beside, beyond}, i.e., the idea of space, of which these 
are but particular applications. The same is true of time. Prior to all perception, the child has 
a feeling of \textit{before} and \textit{after}, without which its perceptions would be a confused, disordered, 
disconnected mass. That is, prior or \textit{a priori} to every other intuition, it has the idea of time.

(2) Another proof that space and time are \textit{a priori} intuitions: Thought may abstract from 
everything that fills space and time; in no case can it abstract from space and time themselves. 
This proves that these intuitions, instead of coming from without, are, so to say, of a piece with 
reason; that they are, in the inaccurate language of dogmatic philosophy, \textit{innate}, that they are, 
in the last analysis, identical with reason.

(3) But the decisive proof of the a-priority of the ideas of space and time is furnished by 
mathematics. Arithmetic is the science of duration, the successive moments of which constitute number. Geometry is the science of space. Now arithmetical and geometrical truths possess
the character of absolute necessity. No one would seriously maintain: My previous experience teaches me that three times three are nine, or that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, etc., for everybody knows that such truths are independent of experience. Experience, being restricted to a limited number of cases, cannot give a truth the absolute and unquestionable character possessed by the axioms of mathematics; these truths do not spring from experience but from reason: hence the sovereign authority which characterizes them, and the impossibility of doubting them for a single instant. But such truths are concerned with space and time. Hence, space and time are intuitions a priori.

Shall we call them general ideas formed by comparison and abstraction? But an idea thus formed necessarily contains fewer characteristics than the particular idea; the idea of man is infinitely less comprehensive and poorer than the particular idea of Socrates, Plato, or Aristotle. Now, who would be bold enough to assert that universal space contains less than a particular space, or, infinite time, less than a fixed period of time? The ideas of space and time are, therefore, not the results of an intellectual operation, of the comparison of different spaces, from which the general idea of space is derived; or of a comparison of moments of duration, whence arises the general idea of time. They are not results, but principles, conditions a priori and sine quibus non of perception. The common man imagines that he perceives space and time, that space and time are, just like their contents, objects of perception. But as a matter of fact, it is as impossible for them to be perceived as it is for the eye to see itself (its image in the mirror is not the eye itself). We see all things in space, but we cannot see space itself, nor perceive duration independently of its content. All perception presupposes the ideas of space and time; and unless we had these ideas a priori, unless reason created them prior to all its intuitions, unless they pre-existed as original and inalienable forms, sense-perception could never take place.

We now know the conditions under which sense-perception operates. It depends on the a priori ideas of space and time, which are, as it were, the prehensile organs of sensibility. These ideas are not images corresponding to external objects. There is no object called space, nor an object called time. Time and space are not objects of perception, but modes of perceiving objects, instinctive habits, inhering in the thinking subject.

The transcendental ideality of space and time: such is the important conclusion reached by the critical examination of sensibility, the mene thekel of dogmatism. Let us see what this conclusion implies. If neither space nor time exists independently of reason and its intuitive activity, then things, considered in themselves and independently of the reason which thinks them, have no existence in time or space. Hence, if sensibility, in consequence of an instinctive and inevitable habit, shows us things in time and space, it does not show them as they are in themselves, but as they appear to it through its spectacles, one of whose glasses is called time; the other, space. As they appear to it! which means that sensibility gives us appearances and that it is incapable of giving us the thing-in-itself. And since the understanding obtains the materials which it needs exclusively from the senses, since there is no other channel through which the materials can come, it is evident that it always and necessarily operates upon phenomena, and that the mystery concealed beneath the phenomenon forever baffles it, as it forever baffles the senses.

2. Critique of the Understanding, or Transcendental Logic

Kant distinguishes, in the general faculty of knowledge, between sensibility, which produces intuitions or sensible ideas, and the understanding, which elaborates them. In the understanding he again distinguishes between the faculty of judgment, i.e., the faculty of connecting the intuitions with each other according to certain a priori laws (Verstand), and the faculty of arranging our judgments under a series of universal Ideas (Vernunft, reason, in the narrowest sense of the word). The inquiry concerning the understanding is therefore subdivided into the critique of the faculty of judgment (Verstand) and the critique of reason proper (Vernunft), or,
to use Kant’s own language, into the Transcendental Analytic and the Transcendental Dialectic.

A. TRANSCENDENTAL ANALYTIC

Just as the intuitive faculty perceives all things in time and space, reason moulds its judgments according to certain forms or general concepts, which, in philosophy, have been called categories, ever since the days of Aristotle. Kant agrees with Hume that the highest category, the idea of cause, conceived as the necessary relation between two phenomena, is not derived from experience. Hume, however, regards it as the result of our habit of seeing certain facts constantly conjoined together, and consequently considers it as a prejudice useful to science, but without metaphysical value. Kant, on the other hand, defends its validity; and from the impossibility of deriving it from experience, infers that it is innate. The idea of cause and all other categories are, according to him, a priori functions of the understanding, means of knowledge and not objects of knowledge, just as time and space are, according to the same philosopher, modes of seeing (intuendi) and not objects of intuition.

Not content with proving, against empiricism, that the categories are innate, Kant attempts to make out an inventory of them, and to deduce them from a principle. He gives us a complete list; indeed, far too complete a list. His love of symmetry impels him to add a category of limitation (which Schopenhauer ingeniously calls a false window), and a category of being and non-being (Dasein und Nichtsein), which he erroneously distinguishes from the concepts of reality and negation. As far as the logical deduction of a priori ideas is concerned, we must confess that it is merely a pium desiderium; no one before Hegel has really made a serious attempt to solve this problem.

The theory of judgment which Kant finds in traditional logic, serves as his guide in the discovery and classification of the categories. Indeed, he says, the judgment is the highest function of the understanding. Now the categories are the forms according to which we judge. Hence there are as many categories as there are kinds of judgments. Logic enumerates twelve of them: (1) the universal judgment (All men are mortal); (2) the particular judgment (Some men are philosophers); (3) the singular judgment (Peter is a mathematician); (4) the affirmative judgment (Man is mortal); (5) the negative judgment (The soul is not mortal); (6) the limiting judgment (The soul is immortal); (7) the categorical judgment (God is just); (8) the hypothetical judgment (If God is just, he will punish the wicked); (9) the disjunctive judgment (Either the Greeks or the Romans are the leading nation of antiquity); (10) the problematical judgment (The planets are, perhaps, inhabited); (11) the assertory judgment (The earth is round); (12) the apodictic judgment (God must be just). The first three express totality, plurality, and unity, i.e., in a word, the idea of quantity; the fourth, fifth, and sixth express reality, negation, and limitation, or, the idea of quality; the seventh, eighth, and ninth express substantiality and inherence, causality and dependence, and reciprocity, or, in short, relation; finally, the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth express possibility and impossibility, being and non-being, necessity and contingency, i.e., the idea of modality.

There are, therefore, twelve categories, arranged in threes, under four groups or fundamental categories: quantity, quality, relation, and modality. One of these, relation, governs and embraces all the rest. It is the highest category, since every judgment, whatever it may be, expresses a relation. From these four cardinal categories four rules or principles necessarily follow, which are, therefore, also a priori:

1. From the standpoint of quantity, every phenomenon, i.e., everything presented by the intuitive faculty as existing in space and in time, is a quantity, i.e., a fixed extent and a fixed duration. This principle excludes the hypothesis of atoms.

2. From the standpoint of quality, every phenomenon has a certain content, a certain degree of intensity. This principle excludes the hypothesis of the void.

3. From the standpoint of relation, all phenomena are united by the tie of causality; which excludes the hypothesis of chance; there is, moreover, a reciprocal action between the effects
and their causes; which excludes the idea of fatum.

(4) From the standpoint of modality, every phenomenon is possible that conforms to the laws of space and time, and every phenomenon is necessary, the absence of which would imply the suspension of these laws; which excludes miracles.

The first and second of these principles constitute the law of continuity; the third and fourth, the law of causality.

These categories and the principles which follow from them form the pure, innate, a priori element, and, as it were, the patrimony of the understanding (Verstand). The latter does not receive them; it draws them from its own inner nature; it does not find them in the phenomenal world; it imposes them upon it. These conclusions of the transcendental logic are of the highest importance. But, before we develop them, we must, in a few words, explain what Kant means by the schematism of pure reason.

The analysis of the faculty of knowledge has outlined the boundaries between sensibility and the intellect (sensibility receives the impressions, co-ordinates them, and makes intuitions of them; the intellect synthesizes the intuitions, i.e., judges and reasons). We discriminated, in sensibility, between a posteriori intuitions and the a priori intuitions of space and time; in the understanding we discovered a number of a priori concepts, which are so many compartments, as it were, in which reason stores and elaborates the products of experience. But though containing many elements, the faculty of knowledge is, nevertheless, a unity. This essential unity of reason in the diversity of its operations is the ego, the feeling or apperception of which accompanies all intellectual phenomena, and constitutes their common bond, so to speak. Kant is not satisfied with a mere analysis; not only does he take apart the knowledge-machine, as we might say, he also attempts to explain how it works, and to show how the parts fit into each other. He, therefore, imagines the categories of limitation, reciprocity or concurrence, and reality, as connecting links between affirmation and negation, substantiality and causality, possibility and necessity: fictions which gave rise to the triads of Fichte and Hegel (thesis, antithesis, and synthesis). It is owing to the same demand for synthesis that he raises the question: How can reason act upon the data of sensibility; by what means, by what arm, as it were, does it lay hold of sensible intuitions and make notions of them?

This operation is, in his opinion, effected by means of the idea of time, the natural intermediary between intuitions and concepts. Though time, like space, belongs to the domain of sensible things, it is less material than space, and partakes more of the entirely abstract nature of the categories. Owing to its resemblance to the categories, the idea of time serves as an image or symbol to express the a priori notions in terms of sense, and becomes a kind of interpreter between the intuitive faculty and the understanding, which, without it, cannot assist in the formation of the judgment.

Considered as a series of moments, or as number, time expresses the idea of quantity: The image of universality is the totality of moments of time; the particular is expressed by a certain number of moments; the singular, by one moment. The content of time symbolizes the idea of quality (reality is expressed by a time filled with events; negation, by a time in which nothing happens). Time likewise symbolizes the idea of relation: Permanence in time represents the idea of substance; succession of moments, the idea of cause and effect; simultaneity, the idea of reciprocity and concurrence. Finally, time is the image of the categories of modality: That which corresponds to the conditions of time is possible; that which exists at a definite time is real or actual; that which is eternal is necessary. Hence, the idea of time serves as a scheme for the a priori concepts of the understanding; it is a framework, so to speak, of the ideal constructions, for which the senses furnish the stones, and reason the mortar. Reason uses the idea of time as an interpreter between itself and sensibility; and this operation is called, in the pedantic language of criticism, the schematism of pure reason.

The conclusion of the critique of the intellect merely corroborates the sceptical and subjectivistic results of the Transcendental Æsthetic.

The critique of the intuitive faculty has demonstrated that we see things through colored glasses (space and time), i.e., otherwise than they are in themselves. The examination of the
understanding shows that we communicate with them through an entire system of glasses. Sensibility perceives them, but in doing this, it impresses its forms upon them, i.e., it transforms them. We do not perceive them as they are, but as they appear to us, that is, as we make them. When we perceive them, they have already been stamped; indeed, they are perceived by the very forms inhering in sensibility (space and time). They are no longer things; they are nothing but phenomena. Hence the phenomenon may be defined as the thing transformed by the mould of the intuitive faculty. What constitutes it is, on the one hand, the thing which impresses the senses, but above everything else, the sensibility itself, or reason in the broad sense of the term: it is ourselves; it is the I, the perceiving and thinking subject, that makes the phenomenon. The phenomenon is the product of reason; it does not exist outside of us, but in us; it does not exist beyond the limits of intuitive reason.

Now, while the Ästhetic brings us to the threshold of subjective idealism, the Transcendental Logic carries us right into it, in spite of Kant’s protests against our confounding him with Berkeley. Not only, he tells us, does reason, as an intuition, constitute, produce, or create the phenomenon, but reason, in the form of the understanding, also determines the reciprocal relations of sensible phenomena. Reason makes them a priori quantities, qualities, causes, and effects, and thus impresses upon them the seal of its legislative power; it is through reason that the things become quantities, qualities, effects, and causes, which they are not in themselves. Hence we may say without exaggeration that it is reason which prescribes its laws to the sensible universe; it is reason which makes the cosmos.

Such are Kant’s own words, and we emphasize these memorable theses because they form the immediate basis of the systems of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. And yet the latter are called the apostates of criticism, whom Kant himself repudiates! Nevertheless, the man who said that reason, — and human reason, nota bene, — prescribes its laws to the universe, is the father of Hegelian panlogism. But, we must add, he is so, in spite of himself; the bent of his philosophy is essentially different from that of his successors. Instead of deifying the human understanding, he claims to limit it, — to force the overflowing river into its natural channel, the phenomenal world, and to exclude forever the sphere of the absolute. When Kant says that reason creates the universe, or at least assists in its creation, he means the phenomenal universe, the totality of phenomena, and he very candidly admits that there may be, beyond the phenomenal world, a world of noumena or realities which cannot be perceived, which are inaccessible and consequently superior to reason. Kant is far from being a panlogist in the Hegelian sense of the term; nay, the very object of the entire second part of his critique of the understanding, the Transcendental Dialectic, is to demonstrate the incompetence of theoretical reason beyond the domain of experience, and the futility of metaphysics considered as the science of the absolute.

B. TRANSCENDENTAL DIALECTIC

From the faculty of judgment (Verstand) Kant distinguishes that of embracing the totality of our judgments under certain general points of view, which he calls Ideas. This faculty, the highest of all in the intellectual sphere, is reason in the narrow sense of the term. The concepts of “reason,” or Ideas, are: the thing-in-itself, or the absolute, the universe, the soul, and God. Their function is similar to that of the a priori intuitions (space and time), and that of the categories. Just as the former arrange the impressions of sense, and the latter, the intuitions, so the Ideas arrange the infinite mass of judgments and reduce them to a system. Hence “reason,” which fashion them, is the highest synthetic faculty, the systematic and scientific faculty. Thus, from the co-operation of sensibility, judgment, and “reason” arise the sciences. For example: The outer sense, by means of it’s a priori intuitions of space and time, furnishes us with a series of phenomena; the understanding, with the help of its categories, makes concepts, judgments, and scientific propositions of them; finally, “reason” embraces these disjecta membra under the idea of the cosmos, and makes a science of them. So, too, the inner sense furnishes us with a series of facts; the understanding makes concepts of them; and “reason” combines these
concepts into the Idea of the soul, and produces the science of psychology. By viewing the
totality of phenomena from the standpoint of the absolute or of God, reason creates theology.

The “Ideas” and “reason,” as a separate faculty of the understanding, seem to be superfluities
in the Kantian system. The Idea of the cosmos is nothing but the category of totality; the Idea
of the soul and the Idea of God are the categories of substance and cause, applied to inner
facts (soul) and to the sum-total of phenomena (God). “Reason,” consequently, is not a faculty
distinct from the understanding; it is merely its complete development. But we shall not insist
on this critical detail. Let us rather hasten to discuss the most important topic of the Dialectic:
the doctrine of the a-priority of the Ideas.

Just as space and time are not perceived objects, but modes of perceiving objects; just
as the categories of quantity, quality, and relation are means, not objects, of knowledge, so,
too, the universe, the soul, and God are a priori syntheses of reason and not beings existing
independently of the thinking subject. At least, it is impossible for reason to demonstrate their
objective existence. Reason, as Kant insists, really knows nothing but phenomena, and receives
the matter of all its operations from sensibility alone. Now the universe, as absolute totality,
the soul, and God are not phenomena; the Ideas — in this, says Kant, they differ from the
categories — do not receive any content from sensibility; they are supreme norms, regulative
points of view, no more, no less. Old metaphysics erred in regarding them as anything else.

Dogmatism deludes itself when it claims to know the absolute. It resembles the child that
sees the sky touching the horizon, and imagines that it can reach the sky by moving towards
the seeming line of intersection. The sky is the thing-in-itself, the absolute, which by a kind of
optical illusion, seems to us to be an object that can be studied and experienced; the horizon,
which recedes as the child advances, is experience, which seems to attain the absolute, and
which, in reality, cannot approach it; the child itself is the dogmatic metaphysician. Let us say,
to be just, that the illusion is common to all intellects, just as the illusion that the heaven bounds
the earth is shared by all. But there is this difference between the dogmatic philosopher and
the critical philosopher. The former, like the child, is the dupe of his illusion, while the latter
explains it and takes it for what it is worth. Kant might have summed up his entire critique
as follows: Knowledge is relative; a known absolute signifies a relative absolute; which is
contradictory.

What is true of traditional ontology is true of psychology, cosmology, and theology.
Rational psychology, as Descartes, Leibniz, and Wolff conceived it, rests on a paralogism.29 “I
think,” says Descartes, “therefore I am” - and mentally adds: a substance. Now, that is just what,
he has no right to do. I think, means: I am the logical subject of my thought. But have I the right
to infer from this that I am a substance in the sense which Cartesian metaphysics attaches to the
term? A logical subject is one thing, a metaphysical subject is quite another. When I express the
judgment: The earth is a planet, the logical subject of this proposition is the ego that formulates
it; while the earth is the real subject. The celebrated thesis of Descartes is a paralogism, because
it confuses the I, the logical subject, with the I, the real subject. Metaphysically, I do not know
the ego, and I shall never know it, except as the logical subject, as an Idea inseparable from my
judgments, as the premise and necessary concomitant of all my intellectual operations. I shall
never know more. As soon as I make a substance of it, I make it the object of a judgment, which is,
according to Kant, as absurd as though I pretended to see space and time. Space and time
are a priori ideas which serve as a framework for sensible ideas, without being objects of the
senses themselves. So, too, the cogito is an a priori judgment, preceding all other judgments
as a conditio sine qua non, without, however, in any way anticipating the nature of the ego. I
cannot judge metaphysically concerning the ego, because it is I who am judging: one cannot
be both judge and litigant, as they say in law; or subject of the discourse and the real subject,
as they say in logic.

If it is not possible to prove that the ego exists as a substance, the doctrines of the simplicity,
immateriality, and immortality of the human soul cannot stand.

From the existence of simple ideas it does not necessarily follow that the soul is a simple
substance, for there are also collective ideas. To conclude from the simplicity of ideas the
simplicity of the “spiritual substance” would be equivalent to inferring the simplicity of the cosmical substance from the simplicity of weight, or the unity of motive force from the simplicity of what mechanics calls the resultant.

Suppose, however, the soul were a simple substance; simplicity is not immortality. We must remember that, from Kant’s point of view, bodies are phenomena, i.e., facts produced by sensibility, the sensible subject or the ego, with the co-operation of an absolutely unknown cause. The phenomenon — we must always return to this fundamental thesis of criticism — the phenomenon is nothing external to the sensible subject; heat, light, and color, although called forth by an external, wholly mysterious, solicitation, are products of sensibility, inner facts, — in short, ideas.

Kant, it is true, seeks to draw a line of demarcation between the phenomenon and the intuition or idea, between what happens at the boundary of the ego and the non-ego, and what is entirely subjective; but with indifferent success. The phenomenon takes place in us and is consequently identical with the idea. Hence, in so far as they are phenomena, bodies are ideas. Why, then, should not the bodies, on the one hand, and the intuitions properly so-called, the categories, and the judgments, on the other, have a common substance? Why should not that which we call matter be an immaterial thing, and what we call mind or soul, be a material thing?

Immortality, therefore, likewise ceases to be a self-evident doctrine. According to the supporters of this dogma, the soul is not only an indestructible substance, but preserves, in death, the consciousness of self. Now, we discover, in inner perception, infinite degrees of intensity, and may conceive a descending scale that culminates in complete destruction.

By showing us the possibility of what dogmatism had previously affirmed in Spinoza, viz., the identity of spiritual substance and material substance, criticism does away with the hypotheses of influxus, divine assistance, and pre-established harmony. These theories lose their raison d'être as soon as it is proved that the “substances” of Descartes and the “monads” of Leibniz are nothing but phenomena, derived, perhaps, from a common source. The problem is no longer to explain the reciprocal action of soul and body, but to ascertain how the same reason, the same ego, can produce phenomena as diametrically opposed as material facts and intellectual facts, extension and thought. In this new form, the question retains all its importance and mysterious fascination for Kant. He touched upon it, as we saw, in connection with the idea of time and its function as an intermediary between the intuitions and the categories, but he could not penetrate more deeply into the subject without contradicting his premises. To attempt to solve it meant to state what sensibility is in itself, what the understanding is in itself; it meant to make the thing-in-itself an object of metaphysical knowledge.

After overthrowing rational psychology, Kant undertakes to demolish rational cosmology in the Wolffian sense. Instead of confining itself to the domain of experience, this alleged science makes an Idea, the cosmos, the object of its speculations. When it considers this Idea from the standpoint of quantity, quality, relation, and modality, it necessarily becomes involved in antinomies. Antinomies are theories which contradict each other, each one, at the same time, being as capable of demonstration as the other.

ANTINOMY OF QUANTITY

We can demonstrate, with the same show of reason, that the universe is a limited quantity, and that it is unlimited in space and time, i.e., infinite and eternal.

(1) The universe is limited in time and in space. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that it is not. The universe, as a whole, is composed of parts which exist simultaneously. Now, I cannot conceive it as a whole except by a mental addition, a successive synthesis of its parts. But, by hypothesis, these parts are infinite in number. Hence their successive addition requires an infinite time. Consequently, the idea of the universe, the result of this addition, presupposes that an infinite time has elapsed to form it. But elapsed time is not infinite time. To reach a sum, the number of parts to be added must be limited: we cannot add an infinite number of parts. Now, the idea of the universe is a synthesis, the result of an addition. Hence, the universe has
a limited extent (Aristotle). Let us likewise assume that it has no limit in time, that it has no beginning. On this hypothesis, an infinite number of moments have elapsed up to a given time. But an infinite lapse (i.e., finitude) of time is a contradiction in terms. The universe, therefore, is limited in space and in time (Plato).

(2) The universe is unlimited in space and in time. Otherwise, there would be, beyond its limits, an infinite space (for the idea of space does not admit of limits); hence there would be space by the side of things, and we might speak of a relation between the universe and the infinite space surrounding it, i.e., of a relation between objects and something which is not an object; for we now know that space is not an object. But a relation between an object and something that is not an object is impossible; a relation may obtain between things in space; there can be none between things and the space in which they exist. Hence the universe is unlimited. If it had had a beginning, it would have been preceded by time without content, i.e., by nothing, for time without content is equal to nothing. Now ex nihilo nihil. Hence the universe is eternal (Parmenides, Aristotle).

ANTINOMY OF QUALITY

Considered from the standpoint of quality (i.e., of its inner nature), is cosmical matter composed of atoms or elements which are, in turn, composite? Both the thesis and the antithesis may be proved with equally cogent reasons.

Thesis: Matter is composed of simple elements, or atoms. Let us assume that the opposite theory is true, and that matter is composed of parts, in turn composed of parts divisible into parts, and so on to infinity. If, in this hypothesis, we abstract from the idea of composition and decomposition, nothing whatever is left; now, out of nothing nothing can be composed. Every composite thing presupposes simple constitutive elements. Hence, matter is composed of indivisible elementary substances, monads, or atoms.

The antithesis, according to which matter is infinitely divisible, is equally easy of proof. In so far as the assumed atoms are material, they are extended. Now, that which is extended is divisible. Inextended particles are no longer matter. Hence, there are no simple material elements.

ANTINOMY OF RELATION

Does the universe, considered as an order of things, embrace free causes, or is it governed, without exception, by necessity? Metaphysicians have demonstrated both the thesis and the antithesis.

The thesis, which affirms that there are free causes, is proved as follows: Let us suppose that all things are connected with each other by a necessary nexus. If, on this hypothesis, we desire to pass from an effect to its first cause, it will be found that this first cause does not exist, or at least that the cause which seems to be the first is not really the first, but merely a link in the infinite chain of events. Now, according to the principle of sufficient reason, in order that an event be produced, all the causes necessary to its production must exist, and all the conditions which it presupposes must be satisfied. If one of these conditions is absent, the event cannot be produced. But, on the hypothesis of an infinite chain, there is no first cause or condition of a given event. If this cause is lacking, the occurrence cannot take place. Now, it does take place; hence, there is a first cause, that is, a cause that is not again the necessarily predetermined effect of a previous cause, or, finally, a free cause. Hence, there are in the world, besides necessary occurrences, free occurrences and free causes.

According to the antithesis, everything is necessary connection, and liberty is merely an illusion. Let us assume a free cause. This cause necessarily exists prior to its effects, and, moreover, it pre-exists in a different state from that which it assumes when the effect is produced; first, it exists as a virgin, then, when the effect is produced, as a mother, so to speak. Thus we have, in the cause in question, two successive states without a causal tie, which is
contrary to the principle recognized by the critique, that every phenomenon is an effect. Hence, liberty in the indeterministic sense is impossible.

ANTINOMY OF MODALITY

According to the thesis, there exists either in the world or beyond it, a necessary being, an absolute cause of the universe. The demonstration is similar to the proof of the existence of free causes. The world is a series of effects. Each effect, to be produced, presupposes a determined series of causes or conditions, and, consequently, a first cause or condition, an existence that is no longer contingent but necessary.

According to the antithesis, there is no necessary being, either in the universe as an integral part of the cosmos, or beyond it, as the cause of the world.

Now, if there is, in the world and as part of it, something necessary, this can only be conceived in two ways: (1) it exists at the beginning of the world; or (2) it coincides with the whole series of phenomena constituting it. Now, every beginning is a moment of time. Hence, an absolute beginning would be a moment of time without a preceding moment; which is inconceivable, for the idea of time admits of no limits. Hence, there is no necessary being at the origin of things. But it is also incorrect to say with Spinoza and the pantheists, that the whole of things and the totality of the moments of time, i.e., the universe, is necessary and absolute being. For, however immeasurable it may be, a totality of relative and contingent beings will no more constitute an absolute and necessary being than a hundred thousand idiots will constitute one intelligent man. Hence, there is nothing necessary in the world.

Nor is there anything necessary beyond the universe. For if the necessary being exists outside of the world, it exists outside of time and space. Now it is, by hypothesis, the principle, the source, the beginning of things. As their beginning, it constitutes a moment of time. But it is outside of time. That is to say, the necessary being cannot be conceived either in the form of immanency or in that of transcendency.

The fourth antinomy is not so much concerned with cosmology as with rational theology, the futility of which it shows in advance. Nevertheless, Kant devotes eighty-eight pages to the critique of the theodicy and the proofs of the existence of God.32

The ontological proof (Anselm, Descartes) concludes from the idea of God the objective existence of a supreme being, and has no more value than the following reasoning of a poor man: I have the idea of a hundred thalers, hence these hundred thalers exist in my purse. This is the same objection which Gaunilo of Marmoutiers had urged against St. Anselm.

The cosmological argument (a contingentia mundi) falsely assumes that there can be no infinite series of causes and effects without a first cause.33 By connecting the series of contingent things with a first and necessary cause, it imagines that it closes the series, while, in reality, there still remains, between this alleged first cause and the following cause, the yawning chasm which separates the necessary from the contingent, and the absolute from the relative. But even granting the cogency of the proof, it would not follow that the necessary being, whose existence it claims to establish, is the personal being which theology calls God.

The teleological or physico-theological proof infers from the finality revealed in nature the existence of an intelligent creator. This argument has the advantage that it makes a deep impression on the mind, and the preacher is free to use it in preference to all other reasonings. But from the scientific point of view it has no value; for (1) it passes from sensible data to something that does not fall within the scope of the senses; (2) it professes to establish the existence of a God who is the creator of matter; (3) with what right, moreover, does it compare the universe to a clock or a house? Is the world necessarily a work presupposing a workman? Why, instead of being a machine begun at a given time, could it not be an eternal reality? (4) Besides, what is finality? Is it inherent in the things themselves? or is not rather our own caprice which confers upon them their teleological character, according as they please us or displease us (Spinoza)?

The moral proof, which is based on the purposiveness in the moral order, on the existence
of the moral law, on the phenomenon of moral conscience and the feeling of responsibility, is peremptory from the standpoint of practical reason, but from the standpoint of pure theory it shares the weakness of the teleological proof, of which it is, at bottom, merely a variation.\textsuperscript{34}

In short, the critique of the faculty of knowledge does not culminate in atheism, but neither does it lead to theism; it does not lead to materialism, nor does it infer the spirituality of the soul and freedom. Enclosed within the magic circle of our intuitions, our concepts, our \textit{a priori} Ideas, we perceive, we judge, we know, but we know phenomena merely, i.e., relations existing between an object absolutely unknown in itself and a thinking subject, which we know only by its phenomena, and whose essence is shrouded in eternal mystery. What we call the world is not the world in itself; it is the world remodelled and transformed by sensibility and thought; it is the result of the combined functions of our intellectual faculties and a something, we know not what, which arouses them; it is the relation of two unknowns, the hypothesis of an hypothesis, the “dream of a dream.”

\textbf{II. Critique of Practical Reason}\textsuperscript{35}

Although the \textit{Critique of Pure Reason} reduces us to a scepticism which is all the more absolute because it is reasoned, proved, scientifically established, and legitimized, it would be a grave mistake to consider the sage of Königsberg as a sceptic in the traditional sense, and to impute to him a weakness for the materialism of his age. Scepticism is the upshot of the \textit{Critique of Pure Reason}; it is not, however, the ultimatum of Kantianism. To assert the contrary is completely to misunderstand the spirit of the philosophy of Kant and the final purpose of his critique. This is by no means hostile to the moral faith and its transcendent object, but wholly in its favor. It is, undoubtedly, not Kant’s intention to “humiliate” reason, as Tertullian and Pascal had desired to do, but to assign to it its proper place among all our faculties, its true role in the complicated play of our spiritual life. Now, this place is, according to Kant, a subordinate one; this function is regulatory and modifying, not constitutive and creative. The \textit{WILL}, and not reason, forms the \textit{basis of our faculties and of things}: that is the leading thought of Kantian philosophy. While reason becomes entangled in inevitable antinomies and involves us in doubts, the will is the ally of faith, the source, and, therefore, the natural guardian of our moral and religious beliefs. Observe that Kant in no wise denies the existence of the thing-in-itself, of the soul, and of God, but only the possibility of proving the reality of these Ideas, by means of reasoning. True, he combats spiritualistic dogmatism, but the same blow that brings it down overthrows materialism; and though he attacks theism, be likewise demolishes the dogmatic pretensions of the atheists. What he combats to the utmost and pitilessly destroys is the dogmatism of \textit{theoretical} reason, under whatever form it may present itself, whether as theism or atheism, spiritualism or materialism; is its assumption of authority in the system of our faculties; is the prejudice which attributes metaphysical capacity to the understanding, \textit{isolated from the will and depending on its own resources}. By way of retaliation — and here he reveals the depth of his philosophic faith — he concedes a certain metaphysical capacity to practical reason, i.e., to will.

Like the understanding, the will has its own character, its original forms, its particular legislation, a legislation which Kant calls “practical reason.” In this new domain, the problems raised by the \textit{Critique of Pure Reason} change in aspect; doubts are dissipated, and uncertainties give way to practical certainty. The moral law differs essentially from physical law, as conceived by theoretical reason. Physical law is irresistible and inexorable; the moral law does not compel, but bind; \textit{hence it implies freedom}. Though freedom cannot be proved theoretically, it is not in the least doubtful to the will: it is a \textit{postulate} of practical reason, an immediate fact of the moral consciousness.\textsuperscript{36}

Here arises one of the great difficulties with which philosophy is confronted: How can we reconcile the postulate of practical reason with the axiom of pure reason that every occurrence in the phenomenal order is a necessary effect, that the phenomenal world is governed by another
absolute determinism? Kant, whose belief in free-will is no less ardent than his love of truth, cannot admit an absolute incompatibility between natural necessity and moral liberty. The conflict of reason and conscience, regarding freedom, can only be a seeming one; it must be possible to resolve the antinomy without violating the rights of the intelligence or those of the will.

The solution would, undoubtedly, be impossible, if the Critique of Pure Reason absolutely denied liberty, but the fact is, it excludes freedom from the phenomenal sphere only, and not from the intelligible and transcendent world, which exists behind the phenomenon, though it is unknowable. Theoretical reason declares: Freedom, though impossible in the phenomenal world, is possible in the absolute order; it is conceived as a noumenon; it is intelligible; and practical reason adds: it is certain. Hence, there is no real contradiction between the faculty of knowledge and of will. Our acts are determined, in so far as they occur in time and in space, indetermined and free, in so far as the source whence they spring, our intelligible character, is independent of these two forms of sensibility.

This would not be a solution if time and space were objective realities, as dogmatic philosophy conceives them. From that point of view, Spinoza is right in denying freedom. However, as soon as we agree with criticism, that space and, above all, time are modes of seeing things, and do not affect the things themselves, determinism is reduced to a mere theory or general conception of things, a theory or conception which reason cannot repudiate without abdicating, but which by no means expresses their real essence.

The Kantian solution of the problem of freedom at first sight provokes a very serious objection. If the soul, as intelligible character, does not exist in time, if it is not a phenomenon, we can no longer subsume it under the category of causality, since the categories apply only to phenomena and not to “noumena.” Hence it ceases to be a cause and a free cause. Nor can we apply to it the category of unity. Hence it ceases to be an individual apart from other individuals: it is identified with the universal, the eternal, and the infinite. Fichte, therefore, consistently deduces his doctrine of the absolute ego from Kantian premises. Our philosopher, however, does not seem to have the slightest suspicion that this is the logical conclusion of his theory. Nay, he postulates, always in the name of practical reason, individual immortality as a necessary condition of the solution of the moral problem, and the existence of a God apart from the intelligible ego, as the highest guarantee of the moral order and the ultimate triumph of the good. It is true, Kant’s theology is merely an appendix to his ethics, and is not to be taken very seriously. It is no longer, as in the Middle Ages, the queen of the sciences, but the humble servant of independent ethics. This personal God, afterwards postulated by the Critique of Practical Reason, forcibly reminds us of the celebrated epigram of a contemporary of our philosopher: “If there were no God, we should have to invent one.”

The real God of Kant is Freedom in the service of the ideal, or the good Will (der gute Wille).

His conviction in this matter is most clearly expressed by the doctrine of the primacy of practical reason, i.e., of the will. Theoretical reason and practical reason, though not directly contradicting each other, are slightly at variance as to the most important questions of ethics and religion, the former tending to conceive liberty, God, and the absolute as ideals having no demonstrable objective existence, the latter affirming the reality of the autonomous soul, responsibility, immortality, and the Supreme Being. The consequences of this dualism would be disastrous if theoretical reason and practical reason were of equal rank and they would be still more disastrous, were the latter subordinated to the former. But the authority of practical reason is superior to that of theoretical reason, and in real life the former predominates. Hence we should, in any case, act as if it were proved that we are free, that the soul is immortal, that there is a supreme judge and rewarder.

In certain respects, the dualism of understanding and will is a happy circumstance. If the realities of religion, God, freedom, and the immortality of the soul, were self-evident truths, or capable of theoretical proof, we should do the good for the sake of future reward, our will
would cease to be autonomous, our acts would no longer be strictly moral; for every other motive except the *categorical imperative* of conscience and the respect which it inspires, be it friendship or even the love of God, renders the will *heteronomous*, and deprives its acts of their ethical character. Moreover, religion is true only when completely identical with morality. Religion within the bounds of reason consists in morality, nothing more nor less. The essence of Christianity is eternal morality; the goal of the church is the triumph of right in humanity. When the church aims at a different goal, it loses its *raison d'être*.\(^{43}\)

### III. Critique of Judgment\(^ {44}\)

While the *Critique of Practical Reason*, with its *categorical imperative*, its primacy of the conscience, and its absolute independence of morality, satisfies Kant’s moral feeling and his great love of liberty, which had been shaken by the conclusions of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, the philosophical instinct reasserts itself in his aesthetics and teleology, which form the subject-matter of his *Critique of Judgment*. We have seen how, in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, he universally combines synthesis with analysis, how he solders together the heterogeneous parts of the cognitive apparatus: between the functions of sensibility and those of reason he discovers the intermediate function of the idea of time, which is half intuition, half category; between *a priori* concepts which are diametrically opposed, he inserts intermediary categories. The same synthetic impulse leads him, in his *Critique of Judgment*, to bridge over the chasm which separates theoretical reason and the conscience.\(^ {45}\)

The aesthetical and teleological sense is an intermediate faculty, a connecting link between the understanding and the will. Truth is the object of the understanding, nature and natural necessity its subject-matter. The will strives for the good; it deals with freedom. The aesthetical and teleological sense (or judgment in the narrow sense of the term) is concerned with what lies between the true and the good, between nature and liberty: we mean the beautiful and the purposive. Kant calls it judgment because of the analogy between its manifestations and what is called judgment in logic; like the judgment, the sense of the beautiful and the teleological establishes a relation between two things which as such have nothing in common: between what ought to be and what is, between freedom and natural necessity.

1. **Aesthetics.** - The aesthetical sense differs both from the understanding and the will. It is neither theoretical nor practical in character; it is a phenomenon *sui generis*. But it has this in common with reason and will, that it rests on an essentially subjective basis. Just as reason constitutes the true, and will the good, so the aesthetical sense makes the beautiful. Beauty does not inhere in objects; it does not exist apart from the aesthetical sense; it is the *product* of this sense, as time and space are the products of the theoretical sense. That is beautiful which pleases (quality), which pleases all (quantity), which pleases without interest and without a concept (relation), and pleases necessarily (modality).\(^ {46}\)

What characterizes the beautiful and distinguishes it from the sublime, is the feeling of peace, tranquillity, or harmony which it arouses in us, in consequence of the perfect agreement between the understanding and the imagination. The sublime, on the other hand, disturbs us, agitates us, transports us. Beauty dwells in the form; the sublime, in the disproportion between the form and the content. The beautiful calms and pacifies us; the sublime brings disorder into our faculties; it produces discord between the reason, which conceives the infinite, and the imagination, which has its fixed limits. The emotion caused in us by the starry heavens, the storm, and the raging sea springs from the conflict aroused by these different phenomena between our reason, which can *measure* the forces of nature and the heavenly distances without being overwhelmed by the enormous figures, and our imagination, which cannot follow reason into the depths of infinity. Man has a feeling of grandeur, because he himself is grand through reason. The animal remains passive in the presence of the grand spectacles of nature, because its intelligence does not rise beyond the level of its imagination. Hence we aptly say, the sublime elevates the soul (*das Erhabene ist erhebend*). In the feeling of the sublime, man
reveals himself as a being infinite in reason, finite in imagination. Both infinite and finite: how is that possible? Kant cannot fathom this mystery without surpassing the limits which he has prescribed to knowledge.47

2. Teleology.48 -There are two kinds of purposiveness. The one arouses in us, immediately and without the aid of any concept, a feeling of pleasure, satisfaction, and inner harmony: this is subjective finality, which constitutes the beautiful. The other also arouses pleasure, but mediatly, in consequence of an experience or an intermediate process of reasoning: this is objective finality, which constitutes the suitable (das Zweckmässige). Thus, a flower may be both the object of an æsthetical judgment in the artist, and of a teleological judgment in the naturalist, who has tested its value as a remedy. Only, the judgment which stamps it as beautiful is immediate and spontaneous, while that of the naturalist depends on previous experience.

The Critique of Pure Reason regards every phenomenon as a necessary effect, and therefore excludes purposiveness from the phenomenal world. Physics merely enumerates an infinite series of causes and effects. Teleology introduces between the cause and the effect, considered as the end or goal, the means, the instrumental cause. Theoretically, teleology is valueless. However, we cannot avoid it so long as we apply our teleological sense to the study of nature. Unless we abandon one of our faculties, which is as real and inevitable as reason and will, we cannot help recognizing purposiveness in the structure of the eye, the ear, and the organism in general. Though mechanism fully explains the inorganic world, the teleological view forces itself upon us when we come to consider anatomy, physiology, and biology.

The antinomy of mechanism, affirmed by the theoretical reason, and teleology, claimed by the teleological sense, is no more inscrutable than that of necessity and freedom.49 Teleology is nothing but a theory concerning phenomena. It no more expresses the essence of things than mechanism. This essence is as unknowable for the Critique of Judgment as for the Critique of Pure Reason. Things-in-themselves are not in time; they have no succession, no duration. According to mechanism, the cause and its effect, considered to teleology, the free cause, the means, and the goal at which it aims, follow each other, i.e., they are separated in time. But time is merely an a priori form of intuition, a mode of conceiving things; as such and apart from my thought or my theory, the cause and the effect of the mechanist, the creative agent, the means, and the goal of the teleologist, are in each other, inseparable, simultaneous. Imagine an understanding which is not bound to the a priori forms of space and time like ours, a free and absolute intellectual intuition: such an understanding would perceive the cause, the means, and the end at one glance; it would identify the end and the principle; the end would not follow the efficient cause, but would be immanent in it and identical with it. Immanent teleology, which identifies the ends of nature with the acting causes, is the natural solution of the antinomy of mechanism and purposiveness.

We see that the subjectivity of time and space is the most original and, on the whole, the most fruitful of Kant’s teachings. There is no question so subtle, no problem so obscure, as not to be illuminated by it. Space and time are the eyes of the mind, the organs which reveal to it its inexhaustible content. These organs are at the same time the boundaries of its knowledge. But in spite of this insurmountable barrier, it feels free, immortal, and divine; and it declares its independence in the field of action. It is the mind which prescribes its laws to the phenomenal world; it is the mind from which the moral law proceeds; it is the mind and its judgment which make the beautiful beautiful. In short, the three Critiques culminate in absolute spiritualism. Kant compared his work to that of Copernicus: just as the author of the Celestial Revolutions puts the sun in the place of the earth in our planetary system, so the author of the Critique places the mind in the centre of the phenomenal world and makes the latter dependent upon it. Kant’s philosophy is, undoubtedly, the most remarkable and most fruitful product of modern thought. With a single exception, perhaps,50 the greatest systems which our century has produced are continuations of Kantianism. Even those — and their number has grown during the last thirty years — who have again taken up the Anglo-French philosophy of the eighteenth century, revere the illustrious name of Immanuel Kant.
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