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The Epigenesis of Pure Reason: Systematicity in Kant’s Critical Philosophy

Kant’s critical philosophy explicitly aspires to be systematic. Whether it achieves this aspiration is another question. Comparing pure reason to “an organized body,” Kant requires a critique of pure reason to be “entirely complete down to the least elements,” and regards this completeness or systematicity as a matter of “all or nothing” (Prol 4:263). He even speaks of critique as “a system of the epigenesis of pure reason” (KrV B167), i.e., an organic whole or system of possible ends that pure reason generates and also organizes entirely out of itself. Nonetheless, the epigenetic model of systematicity, which underlies critical philosophy, remains buried in Kant’s corpus. Neither Kant nor any interpreter of critical philosophy makes clear why and how pure reason generates and organizes itself as a self-standing operating system or whole of possible ends. They also do not explicate what this epigenetic conception of systematicity entails for the functioning of theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement.

This dissertation investigates the question of the systematicity of pure reason in Kant’s critical philosophy, presenting an epigenetic interpretation of Critique of Pure Reason through the lens of the transcendental doctrine of method. It argues that, in its primary sense, a critique of pure reason is the methodological epigenesis – i.e., self-
generation and self-organization – of pure reason as an organic system or embryonic whole of possible ends. The dissertation proceeds by discussing: 1) what motivates pure reason to generate itself as a system or whole of possible ends; 2) how pure reason generates itself as a whole of possible ends; 3) how pure reason structures this whole into organic parts; and 4) how pure reason’s self-generation and self-organization make the table of judgements transcendentally systematic.

In contrast to prevalent readings of Kant, this methodological interpretation articulates the most basic – i.e., disciplinary – sense of critique, and accounts for the epigenetic systematicity of critical philosophy. In a broader philosophical sense, the account demonstrates how critique – or transcendental negativity – is the generative ground of all positivity. It suggests new ways to conceive the relation between Kant’s critical philosophy and post-Kantian philosophies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. More specifically, this interpretation reveals that Kant’s critical philosophy is closer to German Idealism than usually thought, and yet very different when their common focus on systematicity is better understood.
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“Of course, the *triadic form* must not be regarded as scientific when it is reduced to a lifeless schema, a mere shadow, and when scientific organization is degraded into a table of terms. Kant rediscovered this triadic form by instinct, but in his work it was still lifeless and uncomprehended;”

Hegel

“... Kant has at least provided the first impulse which could carry philosophy beyond ordinary consciousness, and has at least shown the ground of the object that appears in consciousness; but he never even considered clearly, let alone explained, that this ground of explanation lying beyond consciousness is in the end no more than our own ideal activity...”

Schelling

“I am ... certain that Kant has entertained the *thought* of such a system, that all of the things he has actually presented are fragments and results of this system, and that his assertions make coherent sense only on this assumption. Perhaps he himself has not thought this system through with sufficient precision and clarity to be *able* to present it to others; or perhaps he has indeed done so, but simply did not *wish* to present it to others....”

Fichte

“The greatest and perhaps only utility of all philosophy of pure reason is ... only negative.”

“Transcendental philosophy is the act of consciousness whereby the subject becomes the originator of itself....”

Kant
Kant’s critical philosophy explicitly aspires to be systematic. Whether it achieves this aspiration is another question. Comparing pure reason to “an organized body,” Kant requires a critique of pure reason to be “entirely complete down to the least elements,” and regards this completeness or systematicity as a matter of “all or nothing” (Prol 4:263). He even speaks of critique as “a system of the epigenesis of pure reason” (KrV B167), i.e., an organic whole or system of possible ends that pure reason generates and also organizes entirely out of itself. Nonetheless, the epigenetic model of systematicity, which underlies critical philosophy, remains buried in Kant’s corpus. Neither Kant nor any interpreter of critical philosophy makes clear why and how pure reason generates and organizes itself as a self-standing operating system or whole of possible ends. They also do not explicate what this epigenetic conception of systematicity entails for the functioning of theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement.

This dissertation investigates the question of the epigenesis, or genetic-systematic self-determination, of pure reason. The following introduction articulates the necessity, task, and structure of such investigation in four sections. The first section presents an overview of major responses to the question of systematicity in critical philosophy, and shows the need to take up this question in terms of the epigenesis of pure reason. The second section poses the central argument of the dissertation: critique of pure reason is in essence the methodological epigenesis – i.e., self-generation and self-organization – of pure reason as an embryonic whole or organic system of possible ends. The third section demonstrates that the failure to appreciate the epigenetic nature of the critical system lies

---

1 Abbreviations used in quoting and referring to Kant’s works are included in the bibliography.
primarily in the widespread neglect of the first *Critique* as a treatise on the *method* of metaphysics. Emphasizing the need for a close reading of the transcendental doctrine of method as the culminating section of the first *Critique*, the last section of the introduction outlines the task and structure of the ensuing investigation.

1. The systematicity of pure reason

**Kant on the systematicity of pure reason**

Despite characterizing the critical system in terms of the epigenesis of pure reason, Kant does not provide a clear account of the formation and functioning of this system. In fact, Kant’s own statements on the systematicity of critical philosophy seem inconsistent and contradictory. In the first edition of the first *Critique*, Kant claims that his comprehensive approach to the perennial problems of metaphysics makes critique systematic: “there cannot be a single metaphysical problem that has not been solved here, or at least to the solution of which the key has not been provided” (KrV Axiii). In *Groundwork*, Kant proposes to unify natural determinism and moral freedom in thinking in general, and views such necessary unification as a “duty ... incumbent upon speculative philosophy” (GMS 4:456). This suggestion seems to have been tempered, if not abandoned, later in the second *Critique*: “the concept of freedom, insofar as its reality is proved by an apodictic law of practical reason, constitutes the *keystone* of the whole structure of a system of pure reason, even of speculative reason” (KpV 5:3). In 1790, the third *Critique* introduces the reflecting power of judgement within a threefold division of higher faculties. This faculty is supposed to unify theoretical reason and practical reason into a complete system (KU 5:168). Almost a decade later, in his 1799 Declaration concerning Fichte’s *Wissenschaftslehre*, Kant expresses his utter disbelief about Fichte’s proclaimed project to complete the system of
transcendental philosophy. Kant is adamant about “the completeness of pure philosophy within the *Critique of Pure Reason*,” and reasserts that the first *Critique* has already established “a fully secured foundation” for “the theoretical as well as the moral, practical purposes of reason” (Br 12:371).

Not only do these apparently diverging claims about the systematicity of pure reason fail to account for the epigenesis of pure reason, but they also add to complications and raise further questions. If the systematicity of pure reason requires a single apodictic ground, how can Kant insist on the irreducible nature of distinctions between subjective forms of perception (pure intuitions) and object-related forms of thought (the categories), happiness and virtue, theoretical reason and practical reason? Can critical philosophy accommodate two seemingly diverging conditions, the duality of sources of cognition and the absolute unity of the faculty of reason in general? Kant sounds unequivocal in the third *Critique* about the indispensable role of the power of judgement in unifying theoretical reason and practical reason, nature and morality (KU 5:175-6). Yet, it remains unclear how the faculty of the power of judgement can do so in light of its ostensible absence as an independent faculty in the first and second *Critiques*. Can the faculties of theoretical reason and practical reason be unified in an a posteriori and extrinsically, as so many commentators seem to imply? Or must their organic systematicity be conceived a priori and immanently, prior to the distinction between the theoretical and the practical? Can the power of judgement unify theoretical reason and practical reason without an a priori organic connection primordial to their distinct operation? Should the power of judgement – or at least its primary methodological principle – be taken as being already at work, perhaps obscurely and under different names, in the first and second *Critiques*? Where
should we look for an absolute and organic sense of pure reason immanent to and yet independent of the object-related faculties of theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement?

**Post-Kantians on the systematicity of pure reason**

Kant’s apparent inconsistencies and ambiguities aside, post-Kantians do not investigate the nature of the system of pure reason in epigenetic terms either. Instead, they seek to improve on Kant, to save Kant from himself, by glossing over, changing, or abandoning some basic tenets of critical philosophy.

Among the early interpreters of the first *Critique*, Jacobi, Maimon, and Beck do not appreciate the epigenetic nature of the transcendental systematicity of pure reason. For Jacobi, a philosophical system of reason lacks immediate grounding, and is therefore infinitely regressive and inevitably self-destructive. Critique can avoid the nihilistic fate of all rationalistic philosophy only through “the natural faith of reason.” Maimon shows that the categories of the understanding are applied a priori only to pure forms of intuition, and do not systematically ground the empirical content of intuition, i.e., sensation. Detecting a major problem in the first *Critique* – i.e., the blindness of the faculty of understanding proper with regard to the “particular rule by which an object arises,” Maimon proposes a two-step solution: first, the sensory content of objects is explained through its ideal-mathematical construction and the laws of psychological association in imagination;

---

2 Here I do not include patent misreadings of the first *Critique* in its first review in *Göttingische Gelehrten Anzeigen*, January 19, 1782, or utterly dismissive receptions of the first *Critique* such as Hamann’s. For Kant’s response to the first review, see his letter to Garve (Br 10:336-343) and his explanations in *Prolegomena* (Prol 4:371-379). Hamann’s brief account of a meta-critique against the first *Critique* can be found in Hamann [1759-1786] (2007), pp. 205-218.

second, human intellect is postulated as a finite aspect of God’s intellect, securing a justificatory ground for references to intrinsically imperfect appearances and images of things. This proposal, however, emphasizes mathematical construction at the expense of transcendental methodological functions of pure reason, and makes a Leibnizian postulate with regard to God which goes contrary to Kant’s ultimately methodological grounding of cognition of objects.4 A highly sympathetic reader of Kant, Beck attributes the difficulties in understanding the systematicity of critical philosophy mainly to the order of presentation in the first Critique. In developing his interpretation of critical philosophy, known at the time as “Doctrine of the Standpoint,” Beck argues that critical philosophy should be judged from the perspective of the “supreme principle of all philosophy,” the standpoint of “original representing,” i.e., “an operation of representation that antecedes any indication of what the object grasped is.” Beck, however, does not discuss how pure reason generates and organizes its original representation. Ignoring the methodological nature of critique, he locates the original representation in the “synthetic objective unity of consciousness” in the transcendental analytic, and even violates the distinction between the understanding and sensibility by collapsing the categories of quantity and quality into pure forms of intuition.5

Among prominent readers of Kant in the late eighteenth century are also Schiller as well as the early German romantics such as Novalis and Schlegel. Inspired by the third Critique, Schiller seeks the systematic ground of consciousness in the inner freedom of

---

4 Maimon [1790] (2010), p. 22. In the third Critique, Kant addresses this problem through the reflecting power of judgement: “If ... only the particular is given, for which the universal is to be found, then the power of judgement is merely reflecting” (KU 5:179). Kant sees this problem about two years before receiving Maimon’s manuscript of his Essay on Transcendental Philosophy in April 1789. In his June 25, 1787 letter to Schütz, Kant announces his intention to begin working on “the Foundation of the Critique of Taste” (Br 10:489-90). Six months later, in his December 28-31, 1787 letter to Reinhold, Kant speaks of three distinct a priori principles for “theoretical philosophy, teleology, and practical philosophy” (Br 10:513-6).

aesthetic determinability. He takes the “mind itself” to be “neither matter nor form, neither sense nor reason” “and yet ... both,” that is, the aesthetic realm that “alone is a whole in itself.” Schiller’s hypostatization of the mind with regard to its fundamental drives, however, steps outside Kant’s critical philosophy. Novalis and Schlegel aestheticize critical philosophy, and understand the systematicity as an incessant productive impulse in finite human being in search of the Absolute. For Novalis, “all searching for a single principle would be like the attempt to square the circle”; “the ground of philosophizing” is “a striving after the thought of a ground,” a “connection with the whole” rather than “a cause in the literal sense.” Schlegel finds it “equally fatal for the mind to have a system or not to have one at all”; hence the need to respect and to abandon both requirements at once. Despite their inconsistent interpretations of Kant’s critical method, Novalis and Schlegel appreciate the vital need for the self-production of a system of pure reason. Yet, they do not work out how this need is constantly satisfied in Kant’s critical philosophy.

Viewing themselves as heirs to Kant’s transcendental philosophy, German Idealists set for themselves the task of completing what they regard as his deficient conception of systematicity. Reinhold, whose Letters on the Kantian Philosophy made Kant a household name, distinguishes between Kant’s critical approach and a systematic one. According to Reinhold, Kant fails to account for the systematic or “internal grounds” of critique of pure

---

8 Schlegel [1798] (1997), p. 320. This fragment implies the simultaneously self-generative and self-destructive nature of all philosophical systems, even though Schlegel does not elaborate the movement of self-generation and self-destruction in Kant’s critical system. Schlegel seems to grasp the essence of critical philosophy, without formulating it in explicitly Kantian terms. The simultaneously self-generative and self-destructive nature of critique will be discussed in chapter two.
reason in terms of the single fundamental faculty of representation. The faculty of representation, Reinhold argues, is grounded in the fact or “principle of consciousness” – the first principle of the metaphysical deduction of the categories – which is taken to be valid and accessible through reflection. Reinhold’s successor at Jena, Fichte, embarks on his own version of transcendental philosophy assuming that, on the absolute grounding of the system, “Kant has not been understood in his true, but never clearly articulated principle.” Fichte finds Reinhold’s principle of consciousness to be psychological rather than transcendental. He distinguishes the empirical fact [Tatsache] of consciousness – the perception of the content of an object – from the act [Tathandlung] of consciousness – the awareness that accompanies all perceptions –, grounds all facts of consciousness in its pure self-positing activity, and is ultimately grounded in the pure will. Schelling and Hegel view Kant’s critical philosophy and Fichte’s transcendental philosophy as too subjectivist, and emphasize the need for developing a philosophy of nature in addition to the philosophy of mind [Geist]. Schelling and Hegel look for an absolute principle that systematically grounds the philosophy of nature and philosophy of mind [Geist]. Schelling finds “the keystone of its [philosophy's] entire arch” in “the philosophy of art” whereas Hegel attributes that foundational role initially to religion, in particular Protestantism, and later to “absolute knowing.”

---

is supposed to unify the objective logic of nature and the subjective logic of mind [Geist] in a dialectical-speculative logic that overcomes what Hegel regards as different forms of subjectivism. These include Kant’s transcendental logic (the categories of which Hegel thought were borrowed “from the subjective logic”), Fichte’s philosophy of pure will, Schelling’s philosophy of art, and even Hegel’s own earlier account of religion as the ground of the philosophical system. Unlike his predecessors, Hegel abandons the language of transcendental in his elaboration of the systematicity of reason in absolute knowing.16

Contrary to German Idealists, Fries, Reinhold’s student, departs from the very idea of grounding a system of pure reason through transcendental or metaphysical deduction. Fries takes “facts of consciousness” to be the underlying source of coherence in human cognition. These facts can be extracted through reflection on one’s own mental acts. According to Fries, the first Critique lacks a sufficiently clear method, and fails to illuminate that “the affective [object] has meaning for us only if cognition is looked upon subjectively as a state of the soul, as for example happens in anthropology, and not in view of its object.”17 Fries treats empirical psychology, which is based on the analysis of cognitive states through self-observation, as the foundation of this new version of critical philosophy. He views psychological philosophy – a science regarded as transcendental in its conclusions and genetic-psychological in its method – as the only way to avoid the circularity of inferential reasoning.18

18 Fries develops his psychological version of critical philosophy in Neue oder anthropologische Kritik der Vernunft [1807] (1828-31). For an outline of Fries’ philosophical position and its development, see Leary (1982).
In contrast to German Idealism and psychological philosophy, neo-Kantianism moves away from derivational, whether transcendental or metaphysical, models of systematicity as well as genetic-psychologist interpretations of Kant’s critical philosophy. Even though initially neo-Kantianism includes some forms of anti-psychologist psychology,\(^{19}\) it essentially consists of two versions of a logical-epistemological interpretation of critical philosophy: Marburg neo-Kantianism and Southwest (Baden) neo-Kantianism. The Marburg school approaches the first *Critique* through the lens of the analytic of principles, and argues for the primacy of the facts of natural sciences. The transcendental aesthetic (sensibility) and the transcendental method (apodictic modality) are collapsed into the transcendental logic proper – the logic of understanding in relation to existing objects.\(^{20}\) As Natorp writes, “time and space would have doubtlessly had to find their place in modality, in the category of actuality.”\(^{21}\) The Southwest school focuses on the value of historical-humanistic sciences, and understands Kant's argument for the primacy of practical reason in terms of the primacy of a theory of value in moral and theoretical realms. Windelband argues that “the problem of philosophy is the validity of the axioms,” in particular, “how the immediate evidence of axioms is to be proved.” Ruling out merely logical necessity or psychological necessity as a way to prove the validity of axioms, Windelband argues for a “teleological necessity” that derives from the fact that our ideas function according to an ideal type.\(^{22}\) Similarly, Rickert argues for the establishment of “a

---

\(^{19}\) E.g., see an account of anti-psychologist psychology of Helmholtz in Köhnke (1991).

\(^{20}\) For a contrast to this neo-Kantian interpretation of the first *Critique*, see Schopenhauer [1818] (2008), pp. 206-210. Schopenhauer identifies the noumenal thing in itself with the will, and argues for an interpretation of Kant that dissolves the transcendental logic into the transcendental aesthetic.

\(^{21}\) Natorp (1910), p. 276. The rejection of sensibility as an independent faculty is common to both schools of neo-Kantianism, although they collapse sensibility into understanding differently. For accounts of Marburg neo-Kantianism, including Cohen’s, see Köhnke (1991), Kühn (2009), and Stolzenberg (2009).

\(^{22}\) Windelband [1883] (1907), pp. 327-8.
general epistemological ‘standpoint’” that functions as “a theoretical basis for the primacy of practical reason.”\textsuperscript{23} In the name of anti-psychologism, both versions of neo-Kantianism evacuate the question of critical systematicity from its genetic significance. They reduce the critical method of pure reason to either the analytical-logical principles of understanding (Marburg school) or axiology (Southwest school), approaching the systematicity of pure reason in terms of the epistemology of mathematical-physical or historical-humanistic sciences.\textsuperscript{24}

Neither does the emergence of analytic philosophy and what has come to be called ‘continental’ philosophy in the early twentieth century yield an articulation of a system of epigenesis of pure reason.\textsuperscript{25}

Dominant trends in Anglo-American Kant scholarship approach the question of systematicity in an anti-metaphysical or merely epistemological spirit. They dismiss, overlook, or explain away Kant’s speculative references to the supersensible.\textsuperscript{26} Strawson brushes aside themes regarding the role of the supersensible in the first Critique because they purportedly “do not steadily answer to Kant’s intentions.”\textsuperscript{27} Guyer views “the

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item Rickert [1913] (1986), p. 3.
\item For two major criticisms of the psychological grounding of logic which give rise to logical positivism and phenomenology, and replace neo-Kantianism in the early twentieth century German philosophy, see Frege [1884] (1980) and Husserl [1900-1] (1970) respectively. Despite the decline of neo-Kantianism in the 1920s, the idea of a primarily epistemological interpretation of critical philosophy persists in one form or another. The privileging of epistemology in contemporary philosophical discourse and the domination of epistemological interpretations in Kant scholarship partly result from the lingering influence of neo-Kantianism. Many analytic interpretations of Kant rework and build on epistemological models of neo-Kantianism.\textsuperscript{25}
\item This is neither to play analytic philosophy and ‘continental’ philosophy against one another nor to bring them into conversation. I use this problematic distinction only occasionally and as shorthand to outline major contemporary tendencies in Kant interpretation as they are conventionally labeled in the English speaking world. Also, given the dominant role of Anglo-American philosophy in analytic philosophy, I use them interchangeably.
\item For two metaphysical interpretations of Kant in Anglo-American scholarship, see Ameriks (2003) and Franks (2005). The emergence of metaphysical interpretations of Kant in Germany goes back to Hartmann, Wundt, and Heimsoeth in the 1920s. See Heimsoeth [1924] (1967).\textsuperscript{26}
\item Strawson (1966), p. 38.
\end{thebibliography}
systematic unity of nature and freedom in Kant’s three *Critiques* “valid only ‘from a practical point of view.’” Longuenesse proposes to rid the critical philosophy of its metaphysical residues, i.e., “to use Kant against Kant and make it the goal of philosophy to come to terms with the ‘point of view of man’ rather than with ‘knowledge of God.’”

Allison reads the first *Critique* in terms of “epistemic conditions” for representing objects, and interprets systematicity primarily epistemologically. McDowell believes “we must discard the supersensible in order to achieve a consistent idealism.” Even among few metaphysical interpretations of Kant, some find his views on the systematicity of reason to be excessive, “overconfident,” and a source of endless irresolvable “divisions and problems.”

Scholarship on Kant’s moral philosophy pays little attention to the relation between the practical use of reason and the organic systematicity of critical philosophy as a whole. It mostly neglects to approach the practical use of reason as a form of reason’s self-enactment, which is subject to the purely speculative – negative-apodictic – method of pure reason. The moral *ought* can imply the natural *can* only if they both presuppose the purely speculative *must*, i.e., the organic self-formation of pure reason through its apodictic critical method. The strong tendency in contemporary Kant scholarship to deny or downplay the role of reason’s moral faith/belief as the systematic condition of the practical use of reason.

---


31 McDowell (1994), p. 44. For a similar interpretation of critical philosophy, see Wood (2000).

seeks to secularize Kant’s moral philosophy, and to turn it into a rule-following individualistic analytical conceptual machine. A common symptom of this approach has been a lopsided focus on multiple formulations and pragmatic applications of the categorical imperative. More recently, moral psychology is invoked to compensate for the absence of content in formalistic readings of Kant's practical philosophy. What is left out is an investigation of pure moral judgement in terms of a negative-modal-apodictic judgement of purely speculative reason, that is, an account of how the content of practical cognition is purely speculatively produced. To be sure, even in the second Critique, Kant does not offer such analysis, and fails to elaborate the archetypal role of modal-apodictic judgements of reason in the methodological grounding of “the typic of pure practical power of judgement” (KpV 5:67). The relation between the practical and purely speculative (negative-modal-apodictic) uses of reason, the categorical imperative and the discipline of pure reason, moral duty and self-preserving “duty to determine the bounds of pure reason in transcendental use” (KrV A726/B755) remains to be articulated.

The reduction of the whole of critical philosophy to the sum of its doctrinal parts or a hybrid of doctrinal philosophy and empiricist method can also be found in liberal renditions of Kant’s political philosophy. These accounts overlook the essential connection between a purely speculative sense of freedom and its juridical/political sense. Some take the Doctrine of Right as the last word in Kant’s political philosophy, and in effect identify

---

34 Throughout the text, I use purely speculative reason and pure speculation exclusively to denote the negatively-modally-apodictically formed spontaneity of reason. Kant himself occasionally uses “pure speculation” or “mere speculation” in this sense. E.g., see (KrV A851/B879). The purity of speculation consists in its complete abstraction from the theoretical, practical, and reflecting (aesthetic/teleological) uses of reason. As I discuss, negative-modal-apodictic thinking is the epigenesis of pure reason as a whole of possible ends, and does not rely on the categories in their strict sense. On the contrary, such self-enactment functions as the purely speculative origin of the categories. Kant’s focus on the a priori object-relatedness of transcendental logic, whether as truth or illusion, tends to overshadow this primary sense of critique.
his political philosophy with legal philosophy.\textsuperscript{35} Others dilute Kant’s doctrinal philosophy with empiricism in order to construe his political philosophy as an applied version of his ethics. Rawls collapses the distinction between the transcendental and the empirical in critical philosophy in order to reshape them “within the canons of reasonable empiricism.”\textsuperscript{36} Such interpretations ignore the negative and purely speculative role of \textit{sensus communis} in the original formation of public-ness and communicability. Can juridical laws procure any sense and significance without pure reason’s negative self-enactment of a purely speculative harmony that is neither private nor public (in a juridical sense) and yet underlies both? Does not Kant regard \textit{sensus communis} to be in essence a representational state preceding the representative state and its juridical laws in time and space?\textsuperscript{37}

Contemporary attempts in Anglo-American scholarship to interpret theoretical and practical parts of critical philosophy in a manner severed from its systematic whole deprive

\textsuperscript{35} E.g., see Ripstein (2009).

\textsuperscript{36} Rawls (1999), p. 304.

\textsuperscript{37} Kant distinguishes ‘\textit{sensus communis}’ as sound and healthy reason from ‘\textit{sensus vulgaris}’ and from “natural sciences” (Anth 7:139). The common element of \textit{sensus communis} is purely speculative, negative-modal-apodictic, individual-universal (quasi-monadic) rather than psychological. The essence of \textit{sensus communis} is the negative self-preserving character of the critical method of pure reason. In the third \textit{Critique}, Kant reaffirms this point as he defines \textit{sensus communis} to be “the idea of a communal sense, i.e., a faculty for judging [\textit{Beurteilungsvermögens}] that in its reflection takes account (a priori) of everyone else’s way of representing in thought, in order as it were to hold its judgement up to human reason as a whole and thereby avoid the illusion which, from subjective private conditions that could easily be held to be objective, would have a detrimental influence on the judgement. Now this happens by one holding his judgement up not so much to the actual as to the merely possible judgements of others, and putting himself into the position of everyone else, merely by abstracting from the limitations that contingently attach to our own judging; which is in turn accomplished by leaving out as far as is possible everything in one’s representational state that is matter, i.e., sensation, and attending solely to the formal peculiarities of his representation or his representational state” (KU 5:293-4). Even six years prior to the publication of the third \textit{Critique}, in his 1784 essay on enlightenment, Kant defines “public” primarily in a purely speculative rather than juridical and state-centered sense. He characterizes the work of state employees as “the private use of reason.” In its public use, reason is not subordinate to any social, political, or institutional end (WA 8:34-42). This purely speculative sense of public is the a priori condition of a juridical sense of public. The purely speculative sense of public is also the scene of the polemical use of reason. In a purely speculative sense, polemics underlies politics. It is in a purely speculative conception of public that we might be able to look for some form of political theology in Kant’s critical philosophy. For interpretations of Kant’s political philosophy which do not reduce the purely speculative sense of public to a juridical sense of public and take his notion of \textit{sensus communis} seriously, see Arendt (1982) and Lyotard [2006] (2009). For an account of Kant’s notion of publicity as the bridge between politics and morality, see Habermas [1962] (1989), pp. 102-117.
the understanding and practical reason of their purely speculative content, and tend to transform critical philosophy into a formalistic, mechanical, deterministic, and doctrinal philosophy. As already indicated, throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, parallel efforts appear in neo-Kantian and positivistic interpretations of critical philosophy. Kant himself opposes contemporary attempts to replace the critical interpretation of doctrinal parts of his philosophy with the doctrinal interpretations of the whole of critical philosophy. The purely speculative grounding of all acts of understanding and practical reason is precisely what Kant considers to be the most significant philosophical issue at stake in the pantheism controversy. Kant’s contribution to this debate – an essay on the primary sense of freedom in critical philosophy – foregrounds pure reason’s duty to self-preservation or purely speculative systematic grounding, and shows the constant need of human reason to orient itself “in that immeasurable space of the supersensible, which for us is filled with dark night” (WDO 8:137). Kant shows the purely speculative need of pure reason for self-preservation as immanent and prior to its needs in metaphysical cognitions proper. Hence, critical systematicity consists in constant satisfaction of the systematic needs of reason in purely speculative terms, the living organicity or incessant critical-methodological self-enactment of reason maintaining itself in the “immeasurable space of the supersensible.” As Kant suggests in his intervention in the pantheism controversy, without satisfying its purely speculative need in pure conviction or reason’s faith/belief [Vernunftglaube], i.e., the negative kernel or systematic ground of reason for orienting its

38 Contrary to English translations of Vernunftglaube as rational faith/belief, I translate it into reason’s faith/belief or reason’s faith/belief in itself. Rational faith/belief implies a faith/belief that conforms to reason whereas Vernunftglaube is in essence reason’s faith/belief in itself, reason’s self-certainty or self-confidence, which is generated by and originally belongs to the modal-apodictic or disciplinary sense of reason. Reason’s moral faith/belief in God presupposes reason’s faith/belief in itself, i.e., the discipline of pure reason.
object-related acts, reason cannot preserve its organic life, and ends up in dogmatic “unbelief” and nihilism (KrV B xxx). Even a few years before the publication of the first Critique, Kant considers “the usual scholastics and doctrinal methods of metaphysics” to be unacceptable since they “operate with a mechanical thoroughness,” “narrow the understanding, and make it incapable of accepting instruction” (Refl 18:84).

In contrast to the dominant trends in Anglo-American scholarship, the issue of living organicity or negative self-enactment of pure reason is taken more seriously among ‘continental’ philosophers. They, nevertheless, do not present an account of a system of epigenesis of pure reason in the foundational text of critical philosophy, the first Critique. In his 1924 lecture, “Kant and the idea of transcendental philosophy,” Husserl describes Kant’s critical turn as extraordinary and “still imperfect.” Kant’s use of “empty generalities” such as “reason” and “truth,” Husserl claims, undermines the systematic grounding and a coherent account of transcendental subjectivity. As the first attempt to make philosophy “a rigorous science,” Kant’s critical philosophy fails to question its own presuppositions, and “is far from accomplishing a truly radical grounding of philosophy, the totality of all

39 I use kernel in a transcendentally-methodologically negative or epigenetic sense. As the kernel of pure reason, critique forms pure reason through distinguishing what can be genetically acquired (generated) through pure reason from that which cannot, i.e., the sensible from the supersensible. Chapter two discusses the discipline of pure reason as its negative kernel, and shows that the negative (disciplinary) function of reason is one and the same as its boundary-determination or self-generation as a system or whole of possible ends.

40 Here Kant seems to employ “instruction [Unterweisung]” only in a negative (critical) sense. Critique is propaedeutic, i.e., providing introductory instruction, to metaphysics. Kant develops this negative sense of instruction in the opening pages of the transcendental doctrine of method in the first Critique. Positive instruction or teaching [Belehrung] is an extension of the understanding. Pure reason instructs and forms the understanding only negatively. The name of this negative instruction or formation in the first Critique is the discipline of pure reason. Unlike the merely logical negation in the principle of contradiction, which determines the mere form of the understanding, negative instructions concern the purely speculative form as well as the purely speculative content of pure reason. The negative self-formation of pure reason is the purely speculative formation of its content. In the self-discipline or self-enactment of pure reason, self-formation is a priori content-determination. The transcendental unity of form and content of pure reason is of an organic nature.

Missing Kant’s methodological insights, Husserl argues for deepening critical
philosophy in terms of a transcendental phenomenological teleology of meaning.\(^\text{42}\) Using
the first *Critique* to develop his fundamental ontology, Heidegger focuses on the
transcendental aesthetic and transcendental analytic, ignores Kant’s indispensable insights
in the transcendental dialectic and the doctrine of method, and takes “the transcendental
power of imagination as the root of sensibility and understanding.” Contrary to Heidegger’s
claim, neither original thinking nor its modal apodicticity is reducible to pure imagining.\(^\text{43}\)

---

(which he also calls genetic) questions from constitutive (static) ones. The primary problem with Kant’s
transcendental philosophy, according to Husserl, is its failure to ground the constitutive questions in a
transcendental teleology. Husserl’s *Nachlass* seems to contain a more fundamental level of grounding in
which genetic phenomenology – which only describes a primordial sense of origin [*Ursprung*] – is itself
grounded in generative phenomenology – which is involved with *Stamm*, i.e., a type of genesis within
historicity. For an account of the distinction between static (constitutive), genetic (teleological), and
distinction between constitutive/regulative, reflecting (aesthetic/teleological), and generative questions, I
suggest, is in play in Kant’s critical philosophy. From a methodological standpoint, Kant accounts for the self-
generation and self-organization of pure reason as the faculty of thinking in three steps: 1) the faculty of
theoretical reason (constitution) and the faculty of practical reason (regulation) in the first and second
*Critiques*; 2) the power of judgement in the third *Critique*; 3) the transcendental doctrine of method of the
first *Critique* as the ground of the faculty of thinking in general. The transcendental doctrine of method grounds
theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement. Throughout the text, I employ *generative*
and *genetic* interchangeably to describe the purely speculative or negative-modal-apodictic use of reason,
which is distinct from object-related uses of reason in theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power
of judgement.

\(^{43}\) Heidegger [1973] (1997a), p. 98. In its own way, *Being and Time* inherits and repeats the lateness and
obliqueness of the first *Critique* with regard to the question of method. It starts with the analytic of *Dasein*
before engaging with methodological questions. Despite a few general remarks on the phenomenological
method in his introduction, Heidegger defers his treatment of the question of method to the end. In the third
chapter of Division II, where the existential and the existentiell intersect in the concept of anticipatory
resoluteness [*die vorlaufende Entschlossenheit*], Heidegger notes: “[w]ith this step, the existential
interpretation at the same time makes known its ownmost methodical character. Apart from occasional,
necessary remarks, we have until now deferred explicit discussions of method.” This deferral is justified as
“[a]ny genuine method is grounded in the appropriate preview of the fundamental constitution of the ‘object’
or area of objects to be disclosed” Heidegger [1927] (1996), p. 280. Heidegger, however, does not address the
question of method in the last few chapters of *Being and Time* either. The question of method in Heidegger’s
ontological hermeneutics reveals itself particularly in the concept of “formal indication” [*formale Anzeige*]
which remains elusive throughout *Being and Time*. In his August 20, 1927 letter to Löwith, Heidegger explains
the absence of an explicit discussion of the concept of formal indication: “I first had to go all out after the
factic in order to make facticity into a problem at all. Formal indication, critique of the customary doctrine of
the a priori, formalization and the like, all of that is still for me there [in BT] even though I do not talk about
them now” Kisiel (1993), p. 19. Indeed, as early as 1919, in his lecture course *Phenomenology of Religious Life*,
Heidegger speaks of the formal indication as “a methodical moment” of “enactment” – a phenomenological
concept of a priori – which is concealed behind the relational content of theoretical cognitions. These early
More recently, the question of critical systematicity of pure reason is approached in terms of Kant’s aesthetics. The privilege given to the third Critique follows Kant’s own emphasis on the vital role of the power of judgement to “mediate the connection between the two faculties” of theoretical and practical reason (EEKU 20:202). In his discussion of Kant’s notion of disinterested aesthetic pleasure in Aesthetic Theory, Adorno remarks: “[t]here is no liking without a living person who would enjoy it. Though it is never made explicit, the Critique of Judgement is as a whole devoted to the analysis of constitua. Thus what was planned as a bridge between theoretical and practical pure reason is vis-à-vis both an άλλο γένος [other genus].”\footnote{Adorno [1970] (1997), p. 11. For an account of Adorno’s aesthetic theory, see Zuidervaart (1991).} Adorno views the negativity of the infinite movement of thought as a vanishing point that maintains a system of pure reason through keeping it in dissonant or antinomical relation to itself. Adorno pursues the negativity of thought primarily in terms of the faculty of the power of judgement rather than the negative essence of the critical method of reason.\footnote{Adorno [1966] (1973), p. 26. Although the transgressive nature of thinking is implied in the idea of block in Adorno’s 1959 lecture course on the first Critique (see Adorno [1995] (2001)), he does not interpret the transgressive character of thinking in terms of the epigenetic nature of the critical system. At different points in his intellectual life, Adorno seeks the vanishing point of the critical system – the simultaneous self-generation and self-destruction of pure reason – either in the transcendental dialectic of the first Critique or in the power of judgement in the third Critique. He does not engage with the first Critique in methodological terms. The discipline of pure reason, which determines the transcendental boundaries of pure reason, is mostly missing in Adorno’s interpretation of the first Critique.} Similarly, Deleuze discusses the systematicity of pure reason in terms of imagination which “frees itself” from any object-related legislation “so that all the faculties together enter into a free accord”; that is how “the last Critique uncovers a deeper free and indeterminate accord of the faculties as the condition of the

\[\text{impulses in Heidegger's phenomenology – particularly his distinction between the “how” of relation and the “how” of formal indication, which enacts “relational meaning” – seem to be more in tune with Kant’s critical philosophy than his imposition of an ontological-phenomenological frame on the first Critique. See Heidegger [1995] (2004), pp. 43-45. For discussions on the methodological role of “formal indication” and its theological sources in Heidegger’s fundamental ontology, see Kisiel (1993), Dahlstrom (1994), Streeter (1997), and Vries (1998).}\]
possibility of every determinate relationship." Focusing on the third Critique, Derrida describes the life of the system in terms of the “autoaffection” that “cathects itself with itself,” and “immediately goes outside its inside: it is a pure heteroaffection.” Derrida considers the “impossibility of arresting différance” as the destructive and yet motivating element for the life of the system of pure reason. The necessary self-enclosure of a living system cannot sustain itself unless it is aporetically ‘bound’ by a radical otherness – the threat of death or impossibility – that remains irreducible to transcendental possibilities. Lyotard locates the ground of critical philosophy in Kant’s notion of aesthetic pleasure and its systematic significance in interrupting cognition and thus allowing thought to “linger,” to “suspend its adherence to what it thinks it knows,” and to regenerate itself. Lyotard seems to suggest that one cannot look for something cognitively, unless it has been already found pre-cognitively, in one’s feeling. Nancy views Kant’s “pleasure system” as being “irresistibly both one and many, self-identical in its foreignness to itself”; “the heart of the system, what articulates it and puts it into play, what gives it the internal consistency and purposiveness that makes up genuine systematicity, is the feeling of pleasure and displeasure.” Arguing against formalistic readings of the third Critique, Gasché claims that

47 Derrida [1978] (1987), p. 47 & p. 80. Derrida’s writing on Kant is mainly about the third Critique. Although Derrida holds that the ‘logic’ of auto-affection is at work from Kant to Hegel (Derrida [1993] (1993), p. 14.), he does not engage with the first Critique. In my understanding, the following passage, which is not written on or about Kant, formalizes Derrida’s take on the critical system: “the very condition of a deconstruction may be at work … within the system … it may already be located there, already at work, not at the center but in an eccentric center, in a corner whose eccentricity assures the solid concentration of the system, participating in the construction of what it at the same time threatens to deconstruct… the disruptive force of deconstruction is always already contained within the architecture of the work, all one would finally have to do … is to do memory work” Derrida [1988] (1989), p. 73. In Kant, we can pursue this “memory work” primarily through the apodictic modality of pure reason in the discipline (transcendental remembering) of pure reason.
the form of the beautiful “is anything but a free-floating form. It is a concept that is intelligible from Kant’s elaborations on the transcendental concept of form in the First Critique.” Yet, Gasché does not show how the form of the beautiful and “the transcendental concept of form” in the first Critique are linked, what the transcendental concept of form consists of, how this concept is generated, and where it is located.50

In short, despite appreciating the living nature of reason’s systematicity and its generative constancy, most ‘continental’ accounts of systematicity either rest on the faculty of feeling/imagination or focus on a moment that putatively exceeds critical philosophy and makes its systematicity impossible. They do not take seriously the foundational methodological role that Kant conceives for the first Critique, fail to work out reason’s living organicity in terms of the disciplinary nature of the critical method, and mostly abandon the first and second Critiques to positivistic accounts that ignore the negative-generative grounding of theoretical and practical cognitions.

As it stands, hitherto attempts at articulating the critical systematicity of pure reason appear to conceive of the center or whole of the critical system in a manner that does not include all parts of the system. One way or another, explicitly or implicitly, these interpretations tend to reduce the critical system to a patchwork of incongruent parts. On the one hand, the pursuit of critical systematicity in terms of theoretical or practical reason passes over its negative (critical-methodological) nature, and fails to show the disciplinary generativity underlying metaphysical parts of the system. Critical systematicity is reduced to a set of doctrinal principles lacking generative function and at best fitting together merely analytically. On the other hand, locating the center or whole of the critical system in

---

50 Gasché (2003), pp. 7-8.
the faculty of feeling or pure imagination overlooks the inability of this faculty to unify theoretical and practical faculties by itself. Such unification requires a transcendental-methodological connection immanent to the operation of theoretical and practical faculties as organic parts of the system. In other words, the negativity of feeling or pure imagination is not the primary sense of negativity in critical philosophy. The break with positivistic interpretations of critical philosophy as such, the appreciation of the negative generativity of critique, requires a more radical understanding of the negative nature of critique. Such understanding demands tracing reason to its methodological conception in the discipline of pure reason, prior to the distinction between object-related faculties of theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement.

In a nutshell, almost all interpretations of critical philosophy approach the object-related character of critique in theoretical, practical, and reflecting uses of pure reason without grounding it in a system of epigenesis of pure reason. They fail to show how, prior to its relation to objects, pure reason generates and organizes itself as a system or whole of possible ends.

2. The question of systematicity: an epigenetic reorientation

The epigenetic nature of the system of pure reason

It would be naive and perhaps arrogant to think that Kant’s apparent inconsistencies or the post-Kantian failures to grasp the organic center or whole of the critical system is merely the result of neglect and theoretic blunders. The difficulties in articulating the critical system emerge partly from the self-disciplinary nature of critique as a transcendental negativity that arises from and is directed at pure reason. The disciplinary whole through which pure reason grasps its possible objects remains itself ungraspable and elusive. As the
genitive in the title *Critique of [der] Pure Reason* indicates, pure reason is the source and the object of critique. It is both the genetic form, or embryonic whole, and the relational matter, or part. In this sense, critique is pure reason striving to catch up with its own natural spontaneity, i.e., reason’s retrospective appropriation or purely speculative formation of its matter (natural spontaneity). We can make sense of the critical center or systematic whole of reason – the life of the faculty of thinking in general – primarily as this self-disciplinary drive or never-ending endeavour.

As I discuss in chapter two, pure reason can be formed only if it is simultaneously destroyed. Reason forms its systematic whole or boundary in separating itself from itself, or in separating its negative supersensible kernel from sensibility, which inevitably affects natural illusions. This incessant self-division of pure reason is the immanent negative logic – the corrective, critical, or disciplinary method – of reason’s purification. In essence, the systematicity of reason is its self-movement to redeem its negative supersensible kernel. *Critique is the transcendental-speculative redemption of pure reason.* In constant rebirth, reason forms itself as an organic system or embryonic whole. Whether conceived as “I think,” as moral autonomy, or as the reflecting unity of the power of judgement, *the essence (conatus) of critical reason is its in-finite self-formative self-division,* i.e., the discipline of pure reason or reason’s faith/belief in itself.\(^{51}\) This implies that the innermost ‘point’ of critique is its outermost. *The whole of reason is its self-dividing kernel, i.e., its self-formative negativity or self-preserving discipline.* Thus, we should not seek the organic center or whole of the critical system in terms of a positive presence or topology. Rather, such whole

\(^{51}\) The self-formative self-division of reason in reason’s faith/belief in itself is a finite version of *creation from nothing* in human reason. Kant calls this creation, self-formative freedom, or self-determination “the original right of human reason” which is “holy” (KrV A752/B780).
reveals itself as the disruptive (de-naturalizing) and yet formative (re-naturalizing) force of reason’s infinite self-division or pure negativity. This living force incessantly de-naturalizes and re-naturalizes reason’s natural spontaneity. It is in this spirit that we should reorient ourselves towards the intractable question of systematicity in critical philosophy.

Kant’s reference to a system of epigenesis of pure reason points to the critical-methodological ground, negative kernel, or most primordial function of pure reason. This function is the original conception, the genetic self-enactment, of the system or whole of pure reason, that is, the transcendental-speculative or “self-thought” origin of the categories. Neither merely logical nor empirical-psychological, this transcendental-methodological negativity, or the disciplinary use of reason, precedes the object-related use of theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement. Kant contrasts “a system of the epigenesis of pure reason” both with “a kind of preformation-system of pure reason” – i.e., simple enlarging of a preformed entity or an innate preestablished harmony – and “the assertion of an empirical origin” in “a sort of generatio aequivoca” – i.e., the mechanical origination of organic life out of inorganic matter, or generation out of something essentially different (KrV B167).\footnote{There are different notions of epigenesis in the eighteenth century. Without entering into a long historical discussion about different eighteenth century models of epigenesis and their relative popularity, I focus on the most basic sense of epigenesis at work in Kant’s critical system. Generally speaking, this sense of epigenesis is the notion that a living organism is the biological formation and continuous differentiation of an embryo (a simple whole) into organized parts in its environment. My concern is not the history of ideas in life sciences or the relation/tensions within/between different models of epigenesis and/or preformation. Neither do I focus on Kant’s teleology in the third Critique. I address Kant’s use of epigenesis as a metaphor that guides us in understanding the immanent life of pure reason. The goal is to demonstrate how, in analogy with a living organism, pure reason generates and organizes itself as a system or whole of possible ends in the first Critique as the foundational text of Kant’s critical philosophy. The epigenesis of pure reason, as I discuss, is the self-generation and self-organization of a system or whole (embryo) of pure reason. Preceded by such attempts as Buffon’s and Maupertuis’, eighteenth century epigenetic theory is developed primarily by biologists Wolff and Blumenbach. Wolff sees an “essential force [vis essentialis]” as the capability of matter to consolidate itself. Blumenbach replaces Wolff’s conception of essential force with “formative drive [Bildungstrieb].” For a discussion of theories of generation in early modern philosophy, see Smith (2006). An}
aequivoca as figurative counterparts of rationalist innatism and empiricist notions of generation. Kant’s case against preformation does not dismiss the idea of a priori harmony. He only opposes a preestablished harmony involving “subjective predispositions for thinking, implanted in us along with our existence by our author in such a way that their use would agree exactly with the laws of nature along which experience runs” (KrV B167).

Kant’s case against generatio aequivoca does not abandon the idea of generation. It only questions a psychological account of generation. Philosophical versions of preformation and generatio aequivoca respectively exclude the role of empirical possibility and a priori necessity in cognitions. The epigenesis of pure reason, as we see later, includes both, and functions as the absolute – negative-modal-apodictic – positing of possible existence.

Kant’s use of biological metaphors such as “epigenesis,” “generation,” “organism,” and “organized body” are directed at issues more primary than those he usually discusses through juridical and architectonic metaphors. Juridical metaphors such as “legislation”
and “deduction” are mostly concerned with the justification of the a priori application of categories to possible objects. Architectonic metaphors such as “edifice” and “building materials” often deal with the schematic ordering of relational content (matter or elements) of pure reason. Juridical and architectonic metaphors presuppose the whole or system of possible ends of pure reason. Kant’s biological metaphors mostly refer to the purely speculative origin or generation of the categories – reason’s epigenetic formation of its own natural spontaneity – as the a priori ground of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason. They suggest a negative, a priori corrective or preventive, system of purely speculative reason which is genetic to theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement.53

The term Erzeugung (generation) belongs to the same semantic network that encompasses words such as Zeug (material or matter), Zeugung (procreation), zeugen (to bear witness), Bezeugung (attestation), Zeugnis (testimony), and Überzeugung (conviction). Kant’s metaphorical use of epigenesis to describe the systematic formation or grounding of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason plays on the common thread among these terms.54

53 Kant does not always use these metaphors in a distinct manner. He sometimes conflates architectonic and biological metaphors. E.g., the way Kant uses “design [Entwurf]” does not differentiate epigenetic and teleological senses of pure reason. Kant also uses terms such as “acquire [erwerben]” and “acquisition [Erwerb]” in a manner that does not clearly emphasize the primacy of their epigenetic sense over their juridical or justificatory senses. Kant’s use of biological metaphors, as we see later, is tied to his invocation of the medical metaphor of “health” (medicina mentis) in the tradition of early modern logic. The epigenesis of pure reason as a whole of possible ends is a preventive function, an a priori correction, which is necessary for healthy reason. I interpret juridical and architectonic metaphors in terms of biological metaphors. Critique operates primarily in terms of an epigenetic rather than an architectonic or juridical model.

54 For more etymological details on German terms that are shaped around Zeug [material], see Das Herkunftswörterbuch, Duden Band 7, 4. Auflage (2006), Mannheim: Dudenverlag, pp. 946-7. A similar etymological affinity in Persian and Late Greek might shed more light on the philosophical connection among these German terms. In Persian, the term شهادت shahadat – which is also etymologically connected to shohood (intuition or presence) – means “testimony” and “martyrdom.” Martyrdom is regarded as a modality of bearing witness to existence from a remove. A martyr, often a masculine figure, offers himself as he is a witness, one who can see the world through the act of faith. There is a similar etymological affinity in the Late Greek martur (witness) from which English martyr and German Martyrer originate. In general, pure reason’s act to detach itself from matter [Zeug] really and to reattach itself to it negatively-modally-apodictically is the
This etymological affinity happens to indicate the philosophical essence of a system of epigenesis of pure reason or the self-formation of pure reason’s natural spontaneity: the non-psychological first-person generative apodicticity (discipline) of pure conviction or reason’s faith/belief in itself prior to any relation to objects in metaphysical cognitions. This self-formative apodicticity of pure reason, which is at once individual (I) and universal (we), forms the matter (natural spontaneity or relational content) of pure reason. There can be no a priori cognition without reason’s faith/belief in itself or pure conviction [Überzeugung], which disciplines pure reason and thus a priori generates [erzeugen] its material [Zeug] or objects in general. This transcendental discipline, as we shall see, is pure reason’s absolute positing of possible existence.

The two senses of the transcendental

Kant’s reference to the epigenesis of pure reason as the transcendental-systematic origin of the categories and thus of metaphysical cognitions indicates the direction to pursue fruitfully the question of critical systematicity of pure reason. It implies that the organic defining mark of the concept of reason’s faith/belief or pure conviction [Überzeugung] in critical philosophy. Kant views reason’s faith/belief in itself or pure conviction as the negative-modal-apodictic ground of the critical system. This is evident in the transcendental doctrine of method in the first Critique where the discipline of pure reason is detached from the possible existence of objects in the transcendental doctrine of elements and yet is purely speculatively reattached to it. Reason’s faith/belief or pure conviction is a necessary experiment, a transcendental testimony, a necessary fiction, to project and to protect pure reason in the supersensible. I use apodictic to denote the purely speculative, immediate, modal, and first-person necessity (discipline) of pure reason’s self-enactment. Critique is this necessary (ineluctable) self-preserving performative of reason not a preformed teleological design. Reason’s faith/belief in itself lives only in its self-enactment. Although Kant sometimes uses reason’s faith/belief to refer to reason’s moral faith/belief [moralische Vernunftglaube], I use the term reason’s faith/belief – which is reason’s self-certainty – only to denote the negative ground of – the first-person necessity or discipline underlying – moral faith/belief. Reason’s moral faith/belief is reason’s faith/belief (in itself) that is rendered positive (moral). There can be no moral faith/belief in God without reason’s faith/belief in itself in the discipline of pure reason.

55 I also use Ur-glaube and reason’s faith/belief [Vernunftglaube] interchangeably to stress the negative-transcendental-speculative nature of faith/belief underlying all cognitions. For Kant, reason’s faith/belief cannot be transformed or translated into knowledge. This refusal, pure negativity, or untranslatability is intrinsic to reason’s faith/belief, functioning as the quintessence of human reason. Strictly speaking, this negative sense of pure reason never takes an objective form and yet immanently shapes all objective forms of metaphysical cognitions. It is only as generative negativity that pure reason can be at once immanent to and separate from metaphysical cognitions proper.
systematicity of pure reason is in essence an original conception, a genetic form or systematic formation, of the categories and thus of metaphysical cognitions, prior to any relation to objects. The most original contribution of Kant’s critical philosophy lies in drawing attention to two quintessential characteristics of the categories in general: their a priori (transcendental-systematic) origin and their a priori object-relatedness. Generally speaking, these two characteristics correspond to the modal-apodictic (epigenetic) and relational-objective (ontological) senses of the term transcendental, the faculty of reason in general and the faculty of understanding proper, the transcendental doctrine of method and transcendental doctrine of elements. The a priori origin of the categories – the modal-apodictic sense of transcendental – is the foundation of the critical system, which negatively grounds the a priori object-relatedness of the categories.56

In his introduction to the first edition of the first Critique, Kant unequivocally speaks of the primacy of the modal-apodictic (critical-methodological) sense of transcendental: “I call all cognition transcendental that is occupied not so much with objects but with our

56 Kant defines modality in the metaphysical deduction of the categories: “the modality of judgements is a quite special function of them, which is distinctive in that it contributes nothing to the content of the judgement (for besides quantity, quality, and relation there is nothing more that constitutes the content of a judgement), but rather concerns only the value of the copula in relation [Beziehung] to thinking in general” (KrV A74/B99-100). In this sense, apodictic modality is the genetic form or measure of reason and is concerned with the value of the relational form of the understanding. Kant’s classification of modality as a special title in the table of categories is unprecedented in the history of logic. For Kant, the special nature of modality consists in its methodological character. The apodictic modality of pure reason is the primary sense of critique, the negative-epigenetic form of pure reason which functions as the purely speculative ground (form) of all content, including logical and actual content. In its apodictic modality, pure reason is (enacted in) its purely negative use. In short, the purity or apodicticity of reason is its generative negativity, i.e., pure reason in abstraction from existence or non-existence of objects. To present pure reason as being prior to its purely negative (disciplinary) use is to hypostatize it. In its essence, critical reason is apodictic prior to and as the a priori methodological condition of any possibility or actuality. As I discuss in chapter two, the apodictic modality of pure reason is its boundaries, critique par excellence, the transcendental remembering or mourning of the original loss of God in objective terms. The purely speculative constancy of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method is enacted through constant modal-apodictic negation – limitation or formation – of the objective constancy of the understanding in the transcendental doctrine of elements. Notably, Kant conceives of the biological concepts of “generation, corruption, alteration” to be derivative forms of modality (KrV A82/B108). Chapter four discusses how apodictic modality acquires such a foundational role in Kant’s critical philosophy.
method of cognition [Erkenntnisart] of objects, insofar as that should be possible a priori” (KrV A11).\textsuperscript{57} Kant also describes the first Critique in terms of the negative epigenetic methodological sense of transcendental: “This investigation, which we can properly call not doctrine but only transcendental critique, since it does not aim at the amplification of the cognitions themselves but only at their correction, and is to supply the touchstone of the worth or worthlessness of all cognitions a priori, is that with which we are now concerned” (KrV A12).\textsuperscript{58} Based on the genetic character of this methodological sense of transcendental, Kant distinguishes transcendental logic and general logic primarily in genetic terms. In its broad sense, transcendental logic “concerns the origin of our cognitions of objects insofar as that cannot be ascribed to the objects” (KrV A55-6/B80), and “would determine the

\textsuperscript{57} Similarly, in his introduction to the transcendental logic, Kant writes: “the difference between the transcendental and the empirical ... belongs only to the critique of cognitions and does not concern their relation to their object” (KrV A57/B81). Kant’s interchangeable use of the “method of cognition [Erkenntnisart] of objects” and “critique of cognitions” in these two passages indicates the methodological nature of the “transcendental.” Kant’s distinction between the amplification of synthetic judgements and the clarification of analytic judgements presupposes the modal-apodictic, or corrective/preventive sense of critique. The relational sense of critique refers to the a priori judgements of amplification whereas the modal-apodictic sense of critique serves “not for the amplification but only for the purification of our reason, and for keeping it free of errors” (KrV A12). Contrary to English editions of the first Critique, I translate Erkenntnisart as the “method of cognition” rather than the “manner” (Guyer and Wood), “way” (Pluhar), or “mode” (Kemp Smith) of cognition. The goal is to bring out the primarily genetic-methodological sense of Art (which also means kind, species, and nature/essence) in Kant’s use. Kant regards a rule of cognition which is based on “manner [Manier]” as “free,” i.e., arbitrary. If the rule rests on “method (compulsion),” it is apodictic (Log 9:139). The critical method of pure reason is the apodictic modality or transcendental-speculative measure of pure reason. As it will be discussed in chapter two, the critical method is the transcendentially compulsive [Zwanghaft] mood of pure reason. Following Meier’s logic textbook, Kant uses both Lehrart and methodus in his lectures. See Meier (1752). For a discussion of Meier’s influence on Kant’s critical terminology, see Hinske (1998), pp. 28-30. In Prolegomena, the second preface to the first Critique, and Religion, Kant uses Lehrart, although this term does not appear in the first edition of the first Critique. In the first edition, Kant uses Methode as well as such terms as Weg (way) Heeres-Weg, (highway) Königlichen Wege (royal road) and Heerestrasse (high road) to science. He also employs Art in compounds such as Erkenntnisart (way of cognition) and Denkart (way of thinking) to refer to method. Kant continues to use Methode and Art interchangeably throughout his critical writings.

\textsuperscript{58} Supplying “the touchstone of the worth or worthlessness of all cognitions a priori” unmistakably refers to Kant’s definition of modality as the determination of “the value of the copula in relation [Beziehung] to thinking in general” (KrV A74/B99-100). Apodictic modality is pure reason’s (transcendental-speculative) measure for (object-related) measure. The objective validity of the categories presupposes the apodictic limitation of pure reason. Critique generates the touchstone for such assessment or judging purely out of itself, through following its own necessity for self-preservation.
origin, the domain, and the objective validity of such cognitions” (KrV A57/B81). General logic, “on the contrary, has nothing to do with this origin of cognition” and “deals only with the form of the understanding, which can be given to the representations wherever they may have originated” (KrV A56/B80).

Kant’s treatment of the issue of the a priori methodological origin of the categories lays the ground of his critical project, and functions as the primary criterion to set critical philosophy apart from rationalism and empiricism. Rationalism understands the a priority of cognitions in terms of innate ideas, without any account of the origin or generation of cognitions in pure reason. Empiricism explains the origin or generation of cognitions in terms of empirical-psychological acts, at the expense of their a priority. In contrast to the innatist and psychologistic separations of the a priority and the origin of cognitions, critique is the epigenetic a priority of purely speculative reason—a system of a priori generation, the negative-modal-apodictic enactment, or absolute positing of metaphysical cognitions. Without distinguishing Kant’s transcendental criticism from rationalism and empiricism primarily in epigenetic-methodological terms, one is destined to assimilate critical philosophy into some version of pre-Kantian rationalism or naturalism. To a large extent, this has been the unfortunate fate of critical philosophy in the last two centuries.

**Genetic-transcendental versus genetic-psychological & ideal-teleological**

The absence of explicit discussion of the system of epigenesis of pure reason in Kant’s critical corpus has motivated a variety of interpretations with regard to his references to

---

59 Kant's interchangeable use of “transcendental philosophy” and “critique,” or “transcendental” and “critical” tends to obscure the distinction between objective-relational and modal-methodological senses of critique of pure reason. The term “transcendental philosophy” sometimes denotes the logic of object-relatedness or ontology, what Kant strictly calls transcendental logic. The term “critique” is also used in a way that includes ontology and the critical method. To avoid potential confusion, I indicate the particular meaning of each term as it becomes necessary.
the question of the a priori origin of the categories, or the systematic ground of metaphysical cognitions. These readings either locate the origin of the categories in empirical or transcendental psychology, or exclude genetic questions from critical philosophy and displace them onto ideal-teleological/epistemological functions of the system.

The first type of interpretation begins with Fries’ interpretation of critical philosophy in terms of psychological facts of consciousness. Despite his refutation of Fries’ psychological-anthropological philosophy, Hegel’s dismissive characterization of Kant’s transcendental logic as “the subjective logic in which they [the categories] were adopted empirically” is another example of a psychologistic reading of the first Critique. Kitcher presents a contemporary version of the first type of interpretation in the form of a defence of transcendental psychology as “the psychology of the thinking, or better, knowing, self.” Such interpretations, prevalent in the first few decades of the nineteenth century, have since then mostly given way to the second type of reading.

One of the most straightforward formulations of the second type of reading appears in Windelband’s “Critical or Genetic Method?” In his account, Windelband contrasts the ideal-teleological necessity of the critical method with a genetic, and presumably psychological, necessity. A contemporary version of this interpretation – which also tries to accommodate the “mentalist” or “psychological” aspects of the first Critique – is

---

62 Kitcher (1990), p. 22.
63 Windelband [1883] (1907), pp. 327-8.
Longuenesse’s argument for guiding “the psychological hypotheses ... by a logical analysis of the conditions of truth or falsity of our judgements.” This merely epistemological approach does not deal with the methodological function of reason, and focuses on the teleological function of logical forms of judgement as acts of the understanding proper.\(^{64}\)

What remains left out in the dichotomy between genetic-psychological and ideal-teleological/epistemological readings of critical philosophy is a genetic and transcendental account of how the whole or system of pure reason is generated prior to its object-related parts. Despite their significant differences, both types of interpretations reduce reason to its object-related parts, and conceive pure reason primarily in terms of its relation to actual or ideal objects. They suppress the question of the transcendental-methodological formation of the whole of pure reason, i.e., the question of the purely speculative origin of relation to objects. Such suppression, which converts critique into some form of positivism, is common to most interpretations of critical philosophy.\(^{65}\)

To be sure, Kant does not provide a clear account of the transcendental systematic origin of necessary (theoretical and practical) and contingent (reflecting) relation to objects. Yet, be it obscurely, he outlines basic elements of such an account. For instance, sections 76 and 77 of the third Critique point to the transcendental systematic origin, or a priori whole, of contingent relation to objects. Kant acknowledges the paradoxical condition of living human reason with regard to the whole of nature, i.e., the systematic

---


\(^{65}\) Reading critical philosophy primarily in terms of relation [Verhältnis] between the subject and the object, Meillassoux views critical philosophy as the beginning of what he calls "correlationism" of contemporary philosophy. Critical philosophy, Meillassoux argues, fails to account for the “ancestorality” or the existence of things and facts prior to the existence of subjects. Meillassoux [2006] (2008), p. 5 & p. 85. Meillassoux’s unapologetically pre-Kantian claims against Kant exemplify an extreme case of what is common among many Kantians who read critical philosophy in pre-Kantian terms: the neglect of the self-relational (modal), negative, and epigenetic nature of the critical method. Without appreciating the transcendental-methodological origin (whole) of relation to objects, one cannot take account of the primary sense of critique.
origin of contingent relation to objects. On the one hand, human reason cannot create the whole of nature in its real-objective sense. Such whole belongs to the intuitive archetypal intellect (intellectus archetypus) as it is taken to be in divine cognition. On the other hand, human reason needs to refer to the whole of nature in order to make sense of the functioning of its relational parts. Before articulating his own response, Kant outlines two kinds of approach to this paradox in the history of philosophy: the first displaces the question of the origin of the whole, provides a putatively complete account of nature through itself, and does away with any analogical grounding of nature; the second addresses the question of the origin of the whole of nature analogically, by an unlimited extension of the teleology of parts into the whole. The first approach, Kant maintains, leads to “the causality or ... the fatality of the determination of nature in the purposive form of its products,” e.g., the physical determinism of Epicurus or the hyperphysical fatalism of Spinoza, to identify nature with God. The second approach projects life onto the physical and hyperphysical. This is the living matter of hylozoism and the living God of theism.

In contrast, Kant puts forward an account of the transcendental-systematic origin of contingent relation to objects, i.e., an account of the generation of the whole of nature which is separate from its relational parts and yet grounds them speculatively-organically: pure reason cannot produce a real-objective whole of nature but it can generate its finite analogue purely speculatively, “the representation of a whole containing the ground of the possibility of its [nature's] form and of the connection of parts that belong to that” (KU 5:408). Such representation is formed in analogy with the intellectus archetypus of divine cognition. Unlike the physical (psychological-physiological) determinism of Epicurus and the hyperphysical fatalism of Spinoza, the generation of the whole of nature in the power of
judgement is purely speculative and analogical. Kant’s use of analogy in the power of judgement is neither hypothetical nor arbitrary, as in hylozoism and theism. The analogical generation of the whole of nature in the power of judgement rests on the negative methodological apodicticity – discipline – of pure reason, which delimits and preserves pure reason by ridding it of transcendental dialectical errors.

The obscurity of the epigenesis of pure reason in the first *Critique*

Despite its crucial significance, the question of the epigenesis of pure reason – i.e., the question of the a priori origin (whole) of categories or the transcendental systematic origin (whole) of relation to objects – is not treated clearly and adequately in the first *Critique*.66

---

66 Kant’s cumbersome technical vocabulary and what Heine calls his “starchy and ponderous style” add to this obscurity. Heine [1835] (2007), p. 81. Kant acknowledges that he “completed the book hastily,” and his text does not “care about the style and ease of comprehension” (Br 10:345). Kant’s acknowledgement of and concern for his lack of literary talent and the absence of elegance and proper style in his writings goes back to his precritical works (PND 1:387) & (BDG 2:66). With regard to his critical works, Kant adds “infirmities of old age” and the lack of sufficient time for a man of his age as reasons that prevent him from developing what he considers to be a proper exposition of the system (KrV B xlii-xliv). The problems plaguing the presentation of the critical system, however, are neither merely personal nor merely rhetorical, nor extrinsic to the substance of critical philosophy. The issue of how to write philosophy in a style distinct from popular discourse and mathematical signs is of particular significance in critical philosophy. An insuperable tension seems to disturb the presentation of the critical system. The pure substance of the critical system demands that it be presented only in terms of its plan or schema, in a style-less style. For Kant, dead languages, scholastic terminologies, and example-free discourses seem to serve an ideally bare style of presentation best (MS 6:206). And yet no dead language or scholastic discourse can entirely free itself from natural languages and be without style, if it is supposed to be minimally intelligible. Kant acknowledges that there is only one reason and therefore one system of philosophy and yet there has been more than one way of presenting it (MS 6:207). A style-less style and idiom seem to be at once necessary for and obstructive to communicating the purity of a system of pure reason. This paradox is evident in regard to the epigenetic kernel of critique, and has motivated patchwork readings of critical philosophy which one-sidedly focus on its parts rather than engage with its epigenetic kernel (negative whole). Kant seems to be aware that his wish to present the system in a style-less style can never be completely fulfilled. The ideal of philosophy cannot be represented in a completely precise manner. Not being a doctrine, the critical system is un-presentable in the same way that thinking is un-teachable. At best, one can try a less inadequate presentation of the system in order to facilitate the reader’s own self-enactment – which is also self-presentation – of the system. As Kant states, “no one who learned it would be able to say that he was a philosopher, for subjectively his cognition of it would always be only historical” (Log 9:25). Later, Hegel develops Kant’s point on the insurmountable gap between the philosophical purity of a system of reason and its historical presentation: “From what has been said about the Concept of this science and where its justification is to be found, it follows that the general division of it here can only be provisional, can be given, as it were, only in so far as the author is already familiar with the science and consequently is historically in a position to state here in advance the main distinctions which will emerge in the development of the Concept” Hegel [1812-16] (1969), p. 59. For an account of Kant’s presentation as a discourse of syncope, a discourse in constant need of resuscitation and breath, see Nancy [1976] (2008).
The main source of obscurity in Kant’s account of systematicity is rooted in the way he privileges the presentation of the a priori object-relatedness of the categories over the presentation of their purely speculative origin in pure reason.\textsuperscript{67} The order of presentation in the first \textit{Critique} runs contrary to the order of transcendental-methodological grounding: the transcendental doctrine of elements, i.e., the relational matter of pure reason, is presented prior to the transcendental doctrine of method, i.e., the methodological form of pure reason. Although philosophically necessary, this order of presentation, in the way Kant implements it, obscures the epigenetic-methodological nature of critique, that is, the a priori origin of the categories or the systematic origin of relation to objects. This obscurity is evident in the four sections of the first \textit{Critique}: the transcendental aesthetic, transcendental analytic, transcendental dialectic, and transcendental doctrine of method.

The transcendental aesthetic does not demonstrate that the specification of matter as individual objects requires more than the capacity to receive manifolds of intuition in pure forms of intuition. The formation of sensation as individual objects is distinct from its immediate reception. Pure sensibility cannot determine sensation in terms of individual ends that reason might pursue in regard to objects. The ground of individuation of objects must be established prior to their givenness in sensibility, i.e., \textit{ultimately} through the epigenetic function of pure reason to form itself as a whole of possible ends, regardless of the existence or non-existence of objects and their specific ends.\textsuperscript{68} Through this absolutely

\textsuperscript{67} In 1796, Beck claims that we can overcome the obscurity of the first \textit{Critique} if we read it from the standpoint of “synthetic objective unity of consciousness” in the transcendental analytic. Beck [1796] (2000), p. 220. By contrast, I suggest reading the first \textit{Critique} from the standpoint of the transcendental doctrine of method.

\textsuperscript{68} Many interpreters of Kant read the transcendental aesthetic in a manner that denies the methodological role of purely speculative reason in forming object domains and in transcendental individuation of objects prior to their givenness in intuition. E.g., Friedman writes: “intuition \textit{alone}... provides the field of possible objects for the application of our concepts” Friedman (1992), p. 96. Italics added. In a very different manner,
necessary function, pure reason projects itself as an end in general. This projection is the necessary methodological self-enactment or self-givenness of pure reason prior to the givenness of objects in sense, and generates the transcendental ground for individuation of objects, the ground for the unfolding of empirical contingency. Kant later calls this ground a “systematic unity among merely empirical laws, just as if it were a happy accident which happened to favour our aim” (KU 5:184).69

The transcendental analytic does not work out the transcendental-methodological grounding – the purely speculative origin – of the table of judgements and the table of categories. As a result, the connection between the epigenetic formation of pure reason as a systematic whole and the object-relatedness of understanding remains unclear. Kant does not demonstrate that and how a relational-objective sense of critique presupposes a modal-apodictic, or methodological, sense of critique to form itself as a whole or system of possible ends and thus purely speculatively necessitates, or absolutely posits, the

---

69 Rereading the transcendental aesthetic from the standpoint of the transcendental analytic, as some interpreters suggest, is necessary for the objective grounding of intuition in general but cannot address the problem of individuation of objects. The systematic grounding of intuitions, as I later suggest, demands rereading the transcendental aesthetic and transcendental analytic from the standpoint of the transcendental doctrine of method. Transcendental specification of objects – the determination of objects in terms of possible individual ends of pure reason – requires a disinterested ground regarding the existence of objects in general as well as their specific ends. Transcendental logic proper presupposes the possible existence of objects in general, and cannot be disinterested towards their existence. Moreover, the schematic disinterestedness of transcendental logic toward specific ends of objects is rather mechanical, and does not generate the a priori ground for specifying possible ends of objects, the a priori ground of particular intuitions. Although Kant tries to address the issue of individuation of natural objects outside the transcendental logic, through “the law of specification” in the appendix to the transcendental dialectic (KrV A656/B684), he does not seem satisfied with the result. This dissatisfaction is a major motivation behind the third Critique's new distinction between “sensation [Empfindung]” “as a receptivity belonging to the faculty of cognition” and “feeling [Gefühl],” which “is related solely to the subject and does not serve for any cognition at all” (KU 5:206). Kant suggests that the systematic condition of specification of the object – the a priori principle of the faculty of the power of judgement – is prior to the givenness of the object. Chapter three, below, discusses that the determination of the systematic condition of individuation of objects or individual ends of reason takes place in the history of pure reason. The reflecting use of reason in the power of judgement presupposes the determination of the whole of individual ends of reason in the history of pure reason.
transcendental possibility of existence of objects in general. Contrary to many interpretations that focus on the principle of causality in the Second Analogy, the possibility of objects in general requires more than the categories and principles of understanding as they are defined in the transcendental analytic. This possibility presupposes the a priori harmony or orderliness of nature, which can be supplied only through apodictic methodological reason. But Kant does not address the apodictic methodological grounding of the object-relatedness of understanding as he privileges the presentation of the objective deduction of categories – i.e., the explanation of “how subjective conditions of thinking should have objective validity” (KrV A89/B122) – over discussing the subjective deduction of categories – i.e., the explanation of “the transcendental constitution of the subjective sources that comprise the a priori foundations for the possibility of experience” (KrV A97). Given his focus on the object-relatedness of

---

70 The popularity of a narrow focus on the Second Analogy has been partly due to the way it can be used for non-metaphysical interpretations of the first Critique. In many readings of Kant, his notion of causality is discussed mainly, if not merely, as a response to the “Hume problem.” See, e.g., Longuenesse (2005) and Waxman (2008). To be sure, Kant acknowledges that he was awoken from his “dogmatic slumber” by Hume’s skepticism about a priori causality, and that the generalization of this skepticism pointed toward the central question of the first Critique, the possibility of synthetic a priori judgements. It is, however, only in the question of transcendental-speculative genesis of the categories, a question that is developed in response to Hume’s psychologistic and Leibnizian-Wolffian innatist accounts of cognition of objects, which we can find the primary sense of critique.

71 Kant’s idea that “the understanding is itself the source of the laws of nature, and thus of the formal unity of nature” (KrV A127) does not address the issue of the transcendental systematicity of nature. The term “formal” here refers to pure understanding in its strict sense. Kant acknowledges the inadequacy of the transcendental analytic and transcendental aesthetic for the systematicity of pure reason in regard to empirical laws: “To be sure, empirical laws, as such, can by no means derive their origin from the pure understanding, just as the immeasurable manifoldness of the appearances cannot be adequately conceived through the pure form of sensible intuition” (KrV A127). Moreover, Kant is not sufficiently careful in his use of the term “nature.” The use of “nature” in two distinct senses, as an aggregate of objects and as an a priori harmonious order that organically contains all empirical laws, compounds his account further.

72 The interpretation of the distinction between subjective and objective deduction of the categories is a controversial issue. See Carl (1989) & Longuenesse [1993] (1998), pp. 56-8. I take subjective deduction to be in essence the self-justifying epigenesis of pure reason in its purely speculative immediate self-enactment and apodictic-philosophical certainty. The transcendental analytic does not clearly work out the connection between the epigenetic methodological formation of the faculty of thinking in general and the transcendental deduction of categories, partly due to the way Kant discusses imagination in the first edition or its apparent exclusion in the second edition of the first Critique. The apodictic-methodological grounding presupposed in
understanding, Kant does not trace the subjective deduction of categories to the methodological condition or systematic generation of “the faculty of thinking itself” (KrV A xvii).73 Similarly, the transcendental schematism in the analytic of principles does not make it explicit that the transcendental schema, which guides the a priori application of understanding to sensibility in pure imagination, must be generated in the architectonic of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method.74

In its attempt to expose the unjustifiable and illusory nature of theoretical-speculative claims about supersensible objects, the transcendental dialectic eclipses the underlying role of purely speculative reason in generating its whole of possible ends, and thus in the modal-apodictic grounding of the transcendental dialectic itself. Transcendental dialectic lacks a canon – a principle of correct use – but remains a natural and indispensable part of critique, and negatively presupposes the ultimate ends of pure reason in the canon of pure reason. This is possible due to the systematic grounding of transcendental dialectic in the discipline of pure reason, i.e., Kant’s critical methodological remedy to satisfy the speculative interest of reason. The negative lessons of the pure imagination as well as the connection between the understanding proper and methodological reason, which negatively instructs the understanding, remain obscure in both editions of the first Critique. In reading the first Critique, I do not privilege either edition, whether in terms of presentation or substantive argument. Kant views the changes in the second edition to be only a matter of style of presentation (KrV B xxxviii). I take Kant’s explanation to be mostly an accurate reflection of his changes in the second edition.

73 Kant is not sufficiently clear about his use of “subjective.” Sometimes he employs “subjective” to refer to sense and imagination. His methodological use of “subjective,” however, complicates the picture. In my understanding, the primary sense of “subjective” is purely speculative, or negative-modal-apodictic, prior to the object-related contrast between the transcendental aesthetic and the transcendental logic. In this methodological sense, “subjective” conveys the most basic sense of transcendental philosophy, i.e., the apodictic modality of pure reason as a system: “the method can always be systematic. For our reason itself (subjectively) is a system” (KrV A737-8/B765-6). Systematically speaking, the methodological sense of “subjective” is presupposed in two other senses of “subjective” which refer to sense and imagination.

74 In the architectonic of pure reason, Kant defines schema as “an essential manifoldness and order of parts determined a priori from the principle of end” (KrV A833/B861). This principle is not from the understanding. It belongs to a methodological sense of reason as the idea of a systematic unity of the understanding.
transcendental dialectic only warn pure reason against transcendental-dialectical errors, but such warnings cannot necessarily prevent, or a priori correct, them. Knowing about dialectical errors is distinct from their prevention. Transcendental prevention or a priori correction can only be a self-enactment of pure reason. In the transcendental dialectic, Kant sometimes prematurely presents these lessons as teaching [Belehrung] rather than as indications of an epigenetic discipline, a transcendental correction or cultivation [Zucht], which belongs to the critical method and its apodictic function to satisfy pure reason's transcendental-speculative needs.

Finally, the transcendental doctrine of method, particularly the discipline of pure reason, is the only part of the first Critique in complete abstraction from, i.e., negation of, sensibility in general. And yet, Kant does not adequately elaborate the epigenetic significance of this abstraction or separation in forming the primary sense of critique. The first Critique also does not address the significance of its most important structural division, between the transcendental doctrine of elements and the transcendental doctrine of method. At many points, the doctrine of method can come across as a patchwork of redundant notes. It seems to have been written hurriedly, with significantly less care than other parts of the text. This manner of presentation does not illuminate the crucial role of the transcendental doctrine of method as Kant’s genetic-methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics. It obscures the negative-epigenetic function of the critical method to prevent transcendental dialectical errors, satisfy pure reason’s purely speculative interest, and generate the systematic ground – the whole of possible ends – of metaphysical cognitions.
The epigenesis of pure reason in Kant scholarship

The epigenetic underpinning of the first *Critique* and indeed of critical philosophy as such remains mostly hidden in Kant’s presentation. More than two centuries of scholarship on Kant has not substantially changed this picture. Contemporary scholarship has produced an enormous body of literature to analyze different parts of Kant’s critical project and yet it has not engaged with his corpus in a manner that brings to light the whole of critical philosophy, i.e., the epigenesis of pure reason as an organic system of possible ends. No interpretation of critical philosophy accounts for the transcendental systematicity of pure reason epigenetically. Most existing literature does not even acknowledge the crucial significance of Kant’s reference to a system of the epigenesis of pure reason for critical philosophy as a whole. Even those few who engage with the question of epigenesis do not mostly appreciate, let alone demonstrate, its connection to the transcendental doctrine of method and its centrality for the entire critical project.

In a short article, Wubnig interprets the epigenesis of pure reason as a function of the mind through which the understanding supplies the organizing principles to form “materials (sensible intuitions) into objective experience.” Critical of Wubnig’s rather empiricist take on the epigenesis of pure reason, Genova approaches epigenesis in terms of the generation of knowledge: “Analogous to the development of a biological organism, our mental faculties develop under the influence of the epistemological ‘environment’.” Genova does not say anything about Kant’s doctrine of faculties and where it is located in the first *Critique*. Despite their differences, Wubnig and Genova reduce the epigenesis of pure reason to an epistemological function of the understanding proper. Waxman’s short

---

analysis of the epigenesis of pure reason undermines the a priori systematic role of epigenesis in the generation of metaphysical cognitions. He claims that “apprehension is the bottommost level of consciousness, presupposed by all others, and, at the same time, the germ of the process Kant characterized as epigenesis.” The characterization of epigenesis of pure reason in terms of apprehension – “the synopsis of the manifold a priori in sense” which “is aimed directly at the intuition” (KrV A99) – rules out an account of a system of epigenesis of pure reason prior to any relation to objects of sense. Zöller claims that despite the “move to a generative account of a priority in representations and principles,” “the ground for such formation and production is still considered innate by Kant.” Generation is accordingly grounded in “Kant’s higher innatism—an innatism of specific ways of representing, not of specific representations” which “is no better off than the original innatist account.” Zöller identifies Kant’s acknowledgement of our inability to explain why there are two forms of intuition and twelve categories with innatism. In a later essay, Zöller speaks of the priority of the whole over parts in the critical system, but does not pay heed to the connection between a system of epigenesis of pure reason, the table of judgements, and the transcendental doctrine of method. An abstract reference to the priority of the whole over parts determines nothing about the methodological nature of this whole and how it is generated. In an article, Ingensiep finds Kant’s analogy between epigenesis and a transcendental system of philosophy to be an “intuitive clarification” that gestures at “structural similarities” between biology and transcendental philosophy. Yet, Ingensiep leaves the question of the epigenetic grounding of the critical system completely
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unaddressed. In a later study, Müller-Sievers devotes a chapter of his book *Self-Generation* to the influence of the eighteenth century German epigenetic theory on Kant. Müller-Sievers discusses Kant’s use of the metaphor of epigenesis in a number of works. There is, however, no account of the systematic significance of the epigenesis in critical philosophy. Epigenesis is presented primarily as an argumentative device used by Kant against rationalism and empiricism. As his chapter titles indicate, Müller-Sievers describes transcendental philosophies of Kant and Fichte as “self-generation in philosophy” and “self-generation of philosophy” respectively. The identification of self-generation of philosophy with Fichte precludes a reading of Kant’s transcendental philosophy as a methodological epigenesis of pure reason and self-generation of philosophy. Limiting their discussion of epigenesis to political communities or natural organisms, Shell and Zuckert do not address Kant’s invocation of a system of epigenesis of pure reason in the first *Critique*. Reading Kant’s references to “seeds and predispositions [Keimen und Anlagen]” (KrV A66) in the first edition of the first *Critique* as indications of a diluted form of innatism, Sloan claims that Kant grounds “the categorical a priori on a contemporary version of biological preformation, stronger in the A edition of the *KrV* than in B, but still present in both editions of the first Critique.” In an essay on Kant’s precritical use of epigenesis, Zammito suggests “that Kant was never comfortable with epigenesis, that it was a strain for his critical philosophy even when he explicitly invoked it.” In an earlier book, Zammito discusses the concept of generation only with regard to Kant’s discussion of natural
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organisms in the third *Critique*. In a later essay, Zammito expresses concern about the lack of clarity regarding “the tension between the concepts of epigenesis and preformation as they featured in Kant’s thinking.” Zammito contrasts what he views as Kant’s “performationist” reference to “seeds and predispositions” in the first edition of the first *Critique* (KrV A66) and his invocation of “a system of epigenesis of pure reason” in the second edition (KrV B167), suggesting the persistence of an unresolved tension between epigenesis and preformation in Kant.

The only book in Anglo-American scholarship that aims to explore the relation between epigenesis and Kant’s critical philosophy is Mensch’s newly published *Kant’s Organicism*. This book provides an informative history of the development of epigenetic
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87 Zammito (2003). Some commentators, including Sloan, point to Kant’s use of the language of “germs and predispositions [Keimen und Anlagen]” (KrV A66) in the first edition of the first *Critique*. They claim that this language implies preformationism. As the term *Keime* also means “seeds,” which expresses no particular commitment to any theory of generation, including preformation, these commentators thus ignore that Kant’s reference to “germs and predispositions” in the first edition of the first *Critique* does not necessarily indicate a commitment to preformationism. Also, in his *Review of Herder’s Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Humanity*, written in 1785, Kant explains that his use of “germs” or “seeds” and “predispositions” should not be understood in a preformationist sense. Kant interprets Herder’s concept of “genetic force” as the dismissal “on the one side the system of evolution and yet also on the other side the mere mechanical influences of external causes as providing unworkable grounds of elucidation.” Kant states that Herder assumes “a principle of life” as the cause of this genetic force. This principle of life “appropriately modifies itself internally in accordance with differences of the external circumstances; with this the reviewer fully concurs, only with this reservation, that if the cause organizing itself from within were limited by its nature only perhaps to a certain number and degree of differences in the formation of a creature (so that after the institution of which it were not further free to form yet another type under altered circumstances), then one could call this natural vocation of the forming nature also ‘germs’ or ‘original predispositions,’ without thereby regarding the former as primordially implanted machines and buds that unfold themselves only when occasioned (as in the system of evolution), but merely as limitations, not further explicable, of a self-forming faculty, which latter we can just as little explain or make comprehensible” (RezHerder 8:62-3). Contrary to Sloan, “germs” are neither preformed categories nor categories “biological properties” (Sloan, 2002, p. 245). Kant himself rules out such reading in his polemic against Eberhard: “The *Critique* admits absolutely no implanted or innate representations. One and all, whether they belong to intuition or to concepts of the understanding, it considers them as acquired. But there is also an original acquisition (as the teachers of natural right call it), and thus of that which previously did not yet exist at all, and so did not belong to anything prior to this act” (UÉ 8:221). As Kant states in his review of Herder, these “germs” or “original predispositions” should be understood as limitations. This dissertation discusses these limitations primarily as embryonic wholes that are enacted in the transcendental doctrine of method. In particular, it shows that the original acquisition of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason takes place in the discipline of pure reason.
theory in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and traces its influence on Kant’s thought. It also acknowledges, at least in general terms, the pivotal role of the doctrine of method for the systematicity of critical philosophy. The book, however, is written mostly in the genre of the history of ideas, and does not present an immanent interpretation of the critical system in epigenetic terms. To be sure, natural history and life sciences had significant influence on the development of Kant’s thought. But appreciating the epigenetic nature of the critical system requires examining it primarily in terms of the immanent life of pure reason. An account of the effects of eighteenth-century epigenetic theory on the development of critical philosophy cannot demonstrate the immanent organicity of the critical system. Mensch engages with the immanent organicity of reason only tangentially, in the last chapter of the book. Despite her characterization of the doctrine of method as “the Bauplan of the system,” Mensch focuses on a few passages discussing the organic and self-developmental nature of pure reason in the architectonic of pure reason, and does not engage with the doctrine of method comprehensively. Thus she overlooks that the architectonic of pure reason presupposes the systematic self-enclosure of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason, as well as the systematic determination of the final ends of pure reason in the canon of pure reason. Her neglect of the discipline of pure reason tends to reduce the negative-modal-apodictic nature of reason’s generativity to some form of positivity. Given that the organicity of reason cannot be limited to the theoretical domain and the empirical field, Mensch also does not address how epigenesis is relevant for the
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88 Mensch’s book was published as I was putting the final touches on this dissertation. Here I do not engage with the book’s primary focus, a fascinating historical account of the influence of eighteenth century life sciences on the development of Kant’s thought and critical philosophy. I limit myself to outlining the general direction of my take on the book’s philosophical treatment of a system of epigenesis of pure reason in critical philosophy.
practical use of reason. A comprehensive account of the system of epigenesis of pure reason requires demonstrating how pure reason functions immanently as a living organism, in itself and in necessary (theoretical and practical) and contingent (empirical) relation to objects. To do this, it is essential to determine what the embryonic whole or systematic drive of reason is, how it is formed, and how it is structured into organic parts.\(^8^9\)

In short, contemporary Kant scholarship mostly ignores the question of the epigenesis of pure reason and its crucial role for the systematicity of pure reason. If they are noticed at all, Kant’s use of biological metaphors, particularly his references to a system of epigenesis of pure reason in the first *Critique*, are treated as instrumental applications of his contemporary biological theory of epigenesis, a marginal topic of curiosity, a sophisticated form of preformation and innatism, or, at best, an account of how the rise of epigenetic theory in life sciences influenced the development of Kant’s critical philosophy. That pure reason or the faculty of thinking as such must immanently form its natural spontaneity or relational matter and operate in epigenetic terms is left mostly unrecognized and unexplored.\(^9^0\)

3. The question of the critical method of pure reason

The significance of the critical method in critical philosophy

The single most important obstacle to appreciating the epigenetic nature of critical reason as a system or whole of possible ends is the failure to read the first *Critique* as “a treatise on

\(^8^9\) Mensch (2013), see especially pp. 12-13 and pp. 125-145.

\(^9^0\) Even a comprehensive teleological account of the critical system of pure reason, which includes each and every one of its organic-structural parts, is yet to be worked out. Of course, such an account, at best, would only presuppose the embryonic whole of reason. It would not be able to show how pure reason *generates* itself as such. In other words, holism or organicism – at least in the sense it is usually used in contemporary philosophical discourse – does not engage with the question of the transcendental-speculative generation of the whole of pure reason. Most contemporary versions of holism or organicism seem to be compatible with an innatist teleology of reason. The epigenesis of pure reason is irreducible to mere teleology.
the method” (KrV B xxii), i.e., the negative (critical) apodictic method of metaphysics. The transcendental doctrine of method is where most readers of the first Critique seem to skim through the book, if not completely stop reading. Disregard toward the primordial role of the critical method for the transcendental systematicity of pure reason is common to German Idealist, psychologicist, neo-Kantian, phenomenological, epistemological, antimetaphysical, and merely metaphysical interpretations of the first Critique. These readings ignore that the epigenesis of pure reason by reason’s faith/belief in itself is the transcendental systematic ground (origin or end) of metaphysics. Without the incessant striving of purely speculative reason in the supersensible, or the constant self-generation of pure reason as a system or whole of possible ends, metaphysics of nature and metaphysics of morals degenerate into an aggregate of lifeless concepts. In his critical project, Kant neither abandons nor forbids the pursuit of the end of traditional metaphysics, the supersensible. He does not regard such pursuit to be an arbitrary choice, an accidental extension, or even necessarily a conscious decision. Pure reason does not seek the supersensible primarily for theoretical inquisitiveness or even for the practical need to postulate the ideal of the highest good. The pursuit of the supersensible is first and foremost necessary for the self-preservation of pure reason as a system or whole of
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91 By merely metaphysical I mean metaphysical readings of the first Critique which pay little attention to the negative methodological grounding of metaphysics. These interpretations argue for some positive ground for critical philosophy, present critique as a weak or strong version of metaphysical positivism, and undermine the methodological-epigenetic role of reason’s faith/belief in the critical system. See e.g., Heimsoeth [1924] (1971) and Ameriks (2000).

92 Kant’s characterization of the first Critique as a treatise on the method implies that this treatise is on metaphysics and logic. In the tradition of the early modern logic, method is taken to be a part of logic. Kant’s unique contribution to logic lies in envisioning its methodological ‘part’ to be its transcendental origin or systematic whole. The discipline of pure reason is the genus of all logical forms, the ‘part’ that is the whole. Despite Hegel’s criticism of the place of method in critical philosophy, Hegel’s speculative logic and Kant's critical philosophy rely on an immanent epigenetic method (an internally generated measure), although such method is formulated and understood in each case differently. E.g., for Kant, a modally-apodictically disciplined analogy can function immanently whereas Hegel views analogy and immanence as irreconcilable.
possible ends. Pure reason can never do away with its “natural predisposition” to metaphysics:

metaphysics, in the dialectical endeavors of pure reason (which are not initiated arbitrarily or wantonly, but toward which the nature of reason itself drives), does lead us to the boundaries; and the transcendental ideas, just because they cannot be avoided and yet will never be realized, serve not only actually to show us the boundaries of reason’s pure use, but also to show us the way to determine such boundaries; and that too is the end and use of this natural predisposition of our reason, which gave birth [ausgeboren] to metaphysics as its favorite child, whose generation [Erzeugung] (as with any other in the world) is to be ascribed not to chance accident but to an original seed that is wisely organized toward great ends. (Prol 4:353)

At numerous points, Kant emphasizes that the source of metaphysics – whether illusory metaphysics or systematic metaphysics – is the nature of pure reason. Metaphysics is organic to pure reason. The organic nature of metaphysics, however, becomes intelligible only in retrospect, i.e., from a critical-methodological standpoint, with the rebirth of metaphysics as a system. The issue then is not whether but how to pursue the supersensible “in us, above us, and after us” (FM 20:295) in order to develop a systematic metaphysics. Should we pursue the supersensible according to the dogmatist, skeptic, indifferentist methods – a groping among mere concepts, sensations, and hypothetical claims – or through the negative apodictic method of pure reason, i.e., through the determination of the “boundaries” and “entire internal structure” of pure reason (KrV B xxiii) prior to any relation to objects? This is the most fundamental question of critical philosophy.

Given his focus on the object-relatedness of categories, Kant does not elaborate the issue of the critical method – the a priori systematic origin of the categories – sufficiently and clearly. Even for the most sympathetic and attentive reader of the first Critique, many questions on the place and significance of the transcendental doctrine of method remain
unanswered. What work does the transcendental doctrine of method perform within the first *Critique*? Does Kant’s remedy to problems of metaphysics lie essentially in the transcendental doctrine of method? Should we interpret the negative lessons and conclusions of the transcendental dialectic primarily retrospectively, in light of the transcendental doctrine of method? Why does Kant order the first *Critique* in a manner that defers his critical method to the end? Given such deferral, in what sense does the first *Critique* give primacy to the critical method of pure reason? What principle governs the structure and internal organization of the transcendental doctrine of method? What systematic motivation is behind the four chapters of the transcendental doctrine of method? Why does Kant include the history of pure reason as the last chapter of the doctrine of method and yet defers addressing it to the future? What special function does each chapter perform in the architecture of the first *Critique*? How is the doctrine of method connected to the doctrine of elements within the organic structure of the first *Critique*? How is the transcendental negativity of the critical method at work as the epigenetic systematic ground of the transcendental aesthetic, transcendental analytic, and transcendental dialectic?

**The failure to engage with the transcendental doctrine of method**

Most interpretations of the first *Critique* have avoided these basic questions. No interpretation of the first *Critique* in English engages with the epigenetic function of the transcendental doctrine of method. In fact, the question of the critical method, perhaps
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93 Neither does such an interpretation seem available in German either. Nineteenth century German scholarship is dominated by psychologistic and neo-Kantian interpretations of critical philosophy. In the twentieth century, the analytic, patchwork, and epistemological renditions of Kant prevail. Responding to Heidegger’s claim on the centrality of schematism and pure imagination in the first *Critique*, one of the last figures of the Marburg school of neo-Kantianism, Cassirer seeks the systematicity of critique in all places except the transcendental doctrine of method: “Schematism and the doctrine of the transcendental
the most philosophical of all philosophical questions in modern philosophy, remains one of the most neglected. If not totally overlooked or taken as superfluous, the doctrine of method is approached largely selectively, just to serve interpretations that ignore or dismiss the foundational role of the critical method of pure reason in generating the systematic ground or a priori whole of metaphysical cognitions (judgements). This neglect has resulted in numerous interpretations that fail to give an account of the first Critique as a whole and in terms of its structural parts.

Kemp Smith devotes a short appendix to the transcendental doctrine of method only to claim that the division between the doctrine of elements and the doctrine of method is “highly artificial,” and “the entire teaching of the Methodology has already been more or less exhaustively expounded in the earlier divisions of the Critique.”94 Wolff dismisses the architectonic of pure reason as Kant’s idiosyncratic compulsion for teleology, and criticizes Kant for permitting “his arguments to be twisted half out of shape to fit its demands.”95 Paton, Strawson, and Guyer rarely, if at all, address the systematic grounding of pure
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imagination stand in the middle of Kant’s analysis but not in the focal point of Kant’s system. This system is completed only in the transcendental dialectic and, further, in the Critique of Practical Reason and in the Critique of Judgment Cassirer [1930] (1967), p. 149. Reich’s 1932 study of the table of judgements argues for an objective-relational grounding of this table in the objective unity of apperception, and does not even acknowledge the possibility of a methodological grounding of the table of judgements and unity of apperception. More recently, in his criticism of Reich, Brandt [1991] (1995) draws some parallels between the transcendental doctrine of method and the title of modality in the table of judgements. He, nevertheless, does not discuss modality primarily in terms of transcendental-methodological use of reason. Modality is considered as a function for locating judgements in an epistemic process. Criticizing Brandt, Wolff (1995) characterizes modality as the function to value the positive or negative quality of the propositional content of a judgement. Wolff interprets this evaluative character of modality in positive epistemological rather than negative methodological terms. One way or another, all of the above interpretations reduce Kant’s negative (critical) methodology to some form of positive epistemological condition. The negative-modal-apodictic ground of the table of judgements, the primary function of the doctrine of method in a priori generation or transcendental speculative grounding of metaphysics, is left completely unaddressed. For two general commentaries in German on the transcendental doctrine of method, see Heimsoeth (1971) and Moher & Willaschek (1998), pp. 547-645.  
reason in the transcendental doctrine of method in their readings of the first *Critique*. In *Kant’s Theory of Form*, Pippin leaves out the primary conception of transcendental form, the epigenetic-systematic form or the discipline of pure reason. In the revised edition of *Transcendental Idealism*, Allison adds a new chapter to discuss the appendix to the transcendental dialectic, but continues to exclude the transcendental doctrine of method. Gardner discusses the completeness or systematicity of critical philosophy through the canon of pure reason. He does not explain why the transcendental doctrine of method starts with the discipline of pure reason, and how the critical system can be complete without grounding the canon of pure reason and the transcendental dialectic in the discipline of pure reason.

Sporadic engagements with the transcendental doctrine of method fail to approach it in terms of the epigenetic function of pure reason, or pass over its purely speculative and apodictic nature. Vaihinger presents Kant’s method as an example of a “theory of Fictions.” For Vaihinger, Kant’s method is a heuristic means for the ideal ordering of thoughts. He
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97 Pippin (1982).
100 Among more recent works in English that are not focused on the first *Critique*, Makkreel (1990), Zammito (1992), and Zuckert (2007) have contributed to a better appreciation of the role and significance of the third *Critique* within Kant’s critical corpus. These interpretations, however, remain more or less disconnected from the primary sense of critique, the self-generative function of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method. They do not address how the critical method of pure reason is in play in the third *Critique*. Makkreel and Zuckert pursue the question of systematicity respectively in terms of the hermeneutical significance of transcendental schematism in pure imagination and reflecting judgements, focusing on the connection between the third *Critique* and a few sections of the transcendental analytic and the appendix to the transcendental dialectic. They do not discuss how, prior to the organic determination of nature, pure reason must determine itself organically in the first *Critique*. Zammito locates the genesis and “ultimate concerns of the Third Critique” in Kant’s attempt to confront Spinozism. See Zammito (1992), p. 6. He does not examine how the third *Critique* comes out of the internal sources of the first *Critique*, particularly the transcendental doctrine of method, which is written before the pantheism controversy. The trajectory of the critical project after 1781, including the genesis of the third *Critique*, should be explained primarily in immanent philosophical terms.
assumes such ideality to be hypothetical rather than apodictic. Abela dismisses the methodological principle of systematicity for a realist interpretation of a system of nature. Despite acknowledging the significance of the doctrine of method for the question of faith, Wilson does not discuss the indispensable role of method for the systematicity of pure reason, and construes the doctrine of method as “nothing other than a literary device” for “experiments in philosophical communication.” O’Neill reads the doctrine of method in order to show “why the Categorical Imperative is the supreme principle of all reasoning.” She does not engage the discipline and architectonic of pure reason, and explains the systematicity of reason in terms of practical reason. Manchester’s essays on the architectonic of pure reason are restricted to one part of the doctrine of method, and do not even indicate the systematic connection between the architectonic and other parts of the doctrine of method or the structure of the first Critique as a whole.

Perhaps the richest study of some major themes of the doctrine of method can be found in Tonelli’s posthumous manuscripts. Characterizing the first Critique as “a treatise on logic as much as on metaphysics,” Tonelli questions dominant orthodoxies in Kant scholarship. Yet, Tonelli’s unfinished research is mainly concerned with historical terminological issues, overemphasizing the continuity between critical philosophy and the tradition of early modern logic, and failing to adequately recognize Kant’s break from innatist and psychologistic accounts of logic. Tonelli does not interpret the critical method epigenetically, and fails to work out issues such as the divisions and order of chapters
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within the transcendental doctrine of method as well as the genetic-structural relation
between the doctrine of method and the doctrine of elements.\textsuperscript{106}

An adequate understanding of the critical systematicity of pure reason requires
redressing the widespread neglect of the transcendental doctrine of method. Although the
transcendental doctrine of method comes after and is disproportionately shorter than the
transcendental doctrine of elements, it is the organic center, origin, or epigenetic whole of
the critical system of pure reason. The transcendental doctrine of method presents Kant's
systematic remedy for dialectical errors and the problem of metaphysics. Motivated by the
failure of the transcendental dialectic to ground metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects
in supersensible objects, the transcendental doctrine of method is pure reason's 'return' to
the home it never had, the home that pure reason can establish only through losing it, that
is, retrospectively.\textsuperscript{107} Through the transcendental method, pure reason negatively forms,
i.e., denaturalizes, its natural spontaneity. It functions as the systematic origin/end of
transcendental elements of pure reason, and epigenetically unifies sensibility and
understanding, intuition and concept, nature and morality, prior to their formation as

claims that "the Critique is, in a certain way, included in metaphysics, as a preparation to it: Kant is explicit on
this point in the Architectonic." On the other hand, Tonelli holds that "Kant may subsume the methodology of
metaphysics to metaphysics" Tonelli (1994), p. 4 & p. 9. Tonelli overlooks that the inclusion of critique in
metaphysics proper is primarily of a disciplinary nature, as the inclusion must take place in a manner that
does not violate the irreducibility of critique to metaphysics. It is also unclear how, in Tonelli's account, the
critical method can be at once a ground and \textit{subsumed} to metaphysics proper.

\textsuperscript{107} In this sense, critical methodology prefigures the most sophisticated versions of early German
romanticism such as Hölderlin's and Schlegel's. This retrospective structure of critique shows that historicity
is immanent to critical reason. This structure comes out more explicitly in historical terms in the final chapter
of the first Critique: the history of pure reason. Even though Hegel fails to appreciate Kant's critical
philosophy, particularly the negative-modal-apodictic nature of critique, the inclusion of the history of pure
reason as part of the transcendental doctrine of method, i.e., the immanence of historicity to critical reason,
reveals the affinity between Hegel and Kant. It is the apodictic modality of pure reason that generates the
historicity of pure reason, the transcendental-speculative ground (form) of individuation of objects. The
historicity of pure reason systematically grounds pure form of intuition and its empirical content. The
dissertation discusses the structure of the historicity of pure reason in the last part of chapter three.
distinct faculties, species of representations, or object domains. In this sense, it is only the
transcendental doctrine of method which is truly propaedeutic to metaphysics. That is to
say, in its strictly critical sense, reason does not appear in the first Critique prior to the
transcendental doctrine of method. The primary locus of critical reason in the first Critique
is the transcendental doctrine of method. Without an account of the foundational role of
the critical method, one cannot address “the general problem [Aufgabe] of pure reason”
(KrV B19): the transcendental conditions of possibility of synthetic a priori judgements of
metaphysics. The understanding can predicate transcendentally-objectively in synthetic a
priori judgements only if pure reason is apodictic transcendentally-methodologically.108
That which is objectively determined in theoretical reason must be transcendentally-
methodologically necessitated in pure reason. This is Kant’s critical version of his precritical
thesis that existence is in essence an absolute positing not a real predicate.109 This absolute
positing or methodological necessitation – the necessity of the transcendental possibility of
synthetic a priori judgements – is reason’s self-enactment as pure conviction or reason’s
faith/belief in itself, a purely speculative harmony or absolutely necessary unity of possible
ends prior to any relation to objects.110 Given the lack of intellectual intuition – the infinite
spontaneity of intuition – in human cognition, the critical method generates pure

108 The Latin dic originates from the Greek deik that means “to show” or “to see.” As it is understood in the
philosophical tradition, there cannot be any knowing without seeing. There are two kinds of ‘seeing’ or
‘visibility’ in Kant’s critical philosophy, each representing a distinct sense of a priority: 1) the absolute seeing
or positing: pure reason’s seeing of itself in a self-relation (the modal-apodictic seeing as epigenetic a priority
of purely speculative reason); 2) the relative seeing or positing: the understanding’s seeing of the object in a
relation (the relational-objective seeing as relational a priority of the understanding). The second kind of
seeing presupposes the first kind. There can be no understanding without presupposing pure reason’s self-
givenness in the epigenesis of pure reason; no predication without an apodictic ground.

109 The non-predicative nature of existence is at the core of Kant’s move in the first Critique to separate
modality from the objective content of judgements. Chapter four discusses Kant’s precritical thesis on the
non-predicative nature of existence and how it drives Kant’s thought towards critical philosophy.

110 To put it in Hegel’s language: “the method is nothing but the structure set forth in its pure essentiality”
conviction or reason’s faith/belief, that is, the self-formation of reason’s natural spontaneity as the finite human analogue of a complete spontaneity in purely speculative terms. It forms reason as a negative transcendental-speculative enclosure or whole of possible ends from which all metaphysics derives. As Kant states, “true metaphysics is drawn from the essence of the faculty of thinking itself” (MAN 4:472), that is, from the methodological self-enactment of pure reason prior to the distinction between the faculties of theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement. One cannot appreciate critical philosophy, as a whole or in its object-related parts, without comprehending how, prior to theoretical, practical, and reflecting grounding of objects, pure reason must critically-methodologically ground, or negatively generate, itself as an embryonic whole or system of possible ends.

4. The task and structure of the present investigation

The task of the present investigation

To appreciate the epigenetic nature of the critical system, i.e., the organic unity of pure reason in its metaphysical cognitions, the first Critique should be read through the lens of the transcendental doctrine of method. This means a methodological interpretation of the first Critique as distinct from its German Idealist, psychologicist, neo-Kantian, epistemological, phenomenological, anti-metaphysical, and merely metaphysical readings. Contrary to these accounts, the primary aim of the present investigation is to depict the transcendental-methodological epigenesis of reason as a whole of possible ends, a single negative-modal-apodictic ground, in terms of which transcendental elements of pure reason are transcendentally-speculatively enclosed. The investigation presents critique as an incessantly negative (self-dividing) transcendental-speculative self-enactment of pure
reason’s complete enclosure. That is how reason determines its boundaries and sustains itself as a living organism. Critique is the negative-modal-apodictic self-enactment of reason as a system or whole of possible ends whose self-enclosure is constantly naturally-dialectically violated and thus remains in constant need to be re-enacted.

This methodological reading of the first Critique can proceed only contrary to its order of presentation, that is, from the standpoint of the transcendental doctrine of method. And yet such reading can succeed only in appreciating the philosophical motivation and logic behind the first Critique’s order of presentation. Although nowhere in the first Critique Kant adequately explains why a critique of pure reason starts with its elements rather than its systematic whole, this order of presentation seems to be necessary for laying out the unfolding of a priori conditions of metaphysical cognitions. Kant mentions that the order of presentation in the first Critique mirrors the natural life of human reason (KrV A5). Two years after the publication of the first Critique, Kant explains that it “had to be composed according to the synthetic method, so that the science [critique] might present all of its articulations, as the structural organization of a quite peculiar faculty of cognition, in their natural connection” (Prol 4:263). Hence, the first Critique starts with the “elements” and proceeds to the “law of its pure use” (the method) (Prol 4:274).111
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111 Kant seems to borrow the medieval distinction between analytic and synthetic methods of presentation, which is also used in early modern philosophy. Descartes contrasts these methods: analysis is a method of discovery and exposition, and synthesis is a method of strict proof. Descartes [1628-43] (1988), pp. 150-151. Drawing on Descartes, Arnauld and Nicole define analysis and synthesis respectively as “the method of resolution” (“discovery”) and “method of composition” (“instruction”). The analytic method discovers the truth when we do not know it. Synthetic method proves the truth that we already know. Arnauld & Nicole [1683] (1996), p. 233. Kant interprets synthetic method, the method of instruction, negatively: “I wish that this word [instruction] would never be allowed to be used in anything but the negative sense” (KrV A712/B740). Compositions or synthetic products of understanding and reason in the transcendental doctrine of elements (in imagination) are grounded negatively in the transcendental doctrine of method, in particular in the discipline – negative instruction – of pure reason. In this sense, Kant’s method of presentation enacts his argument for grounding metaphysics in negative instruction or critique.
This order, according to Kant, accepts nothing as given except pure reason itself. It lays out its essential needs, and “develop[s] cognition out of its original seeds without relying on any fact whatever” (Prol 4:274). Even in his putative shift from synthetic procedure to the “analytic procedure” (KrV B418) of presentation in parts of the second edition of the first Critique or in Prolegomena, Kant does not change the order in which he presents major sections of the first Critique. The changes in the second edition are mostly limited to the transcendental aesthetic, transcendental deduction, and paralogism. Prolegomena follows the same order of presentation as the first Critique: the aesthetic, analytic, dialectic, and method. The analytic method of presentation seems to operate only within some of these sections. The first Critique derives the scientific status of mathematics and natural sciences from transcendental elements (intuitions and concepts) whereas Prolegomena presupposes their scientific status to present their transcendental conditions in a more accessible manner. Kant’s brief explanation of the respective applicability of synthetic and analytic methods to parts of the first Critique and Prolegomena remain insufficient and unconvincing. As I discuss in chapter two, Kant’s characterization of the structural organization of pure reason and the order of presentation in the first Critique as natural and customary can be understood more adequately only if we appreciate the structurally necessary lateness of the critical method as the epigenetic center of a system of pure reason. This order presupposes a transcendental structural gap in pure reason, a generative negativity, which surfaces necessarily late.112

112 This transcendental structural gap at the core of pure reason, i.e., the structural lateness of the propaedeutic (transcendental methodology) with regard to metaphysics or ontology (transcendental logic proper), indicates the esoteric nature of critical philosophy and complicates its presentation. On several occasions, Kant states that critique cannot be popularized. E.g., in the preface to The Metaphysics of Morals, we read: “the systematic critique of the faculty of reason itself, along with all that can be established only by means of it ... has to do with the distinction of the sensible in our cognition from that which is supersensible
Thus, contrary to the general order of presentation in the first *Critique*, the present investigation does not begin with the matter (relational content) of pure reason—intuitions and concepts (including ideas or ideals of reason) in the transcendental doctrine of elements. Rather, it starts with the transcendental doctrine of method, the organic center...
of pure reason, which generates a system of pure reason. This approach is in tune with the
epigenetically produced order – negatively-modally-apodictically formed spontaneity – of
pure speculative reason in the transcendental doctrine of method, and aims to foreground
the role of the transcendental doctrine of method as the a priori origin (whole) and
structural plan for the transcendental doctrine of elements, and indeed all parts of critical
philosophy. Although my reading of the first Critique goes against its order of presentation,
it takes its cue from the transcendental doctrine of method itself. The transcendental
document of method does not start from the parts or elements of pure reason. It rather
opens with the discipline of pure reason, the apodictic-methodological self-enactment
through which pure reason forms or generates itself as a system or whole of possible ends,
and only then determines its organic ends (internal structure or parts) in subsequent
chapters. Contrary to the natural or customary order of the first Critique as a whole, the
transcendental doctrine of method is organized in a certain denaturalized order. A ‘part’
reorders and recasts the whole. In this sense, a ‘part’ is the whole. The nature of critique
lies precisely in pure reason’s constant self-division or denaturalization – the modal-
apodictic self-negation, or retrospective regeneration – of its own natural spontaneity. Self-
division or denaturalization is the only way reason can purify itself and let its ‘second’ but
more original (disciplinary) nature remedy its natural dialectical errors.113 The primary

113 In his 1766 book on Swedenborg, Kant speaks of a second “advantage” of metaphysics that comes late but
is more original since it supplies the fundamental ground of metaphysics (TG 2:368). In one of the earliest
and obscure manifestations of the idea of critique, Kant shows its most essential genetic-structural
characteristic: critique is a transcendental supplementation that grounds pure reason retrospectively. In this
sense, a transcendental ground is a second nature that necessarily surfaces late. That is to say, transcendental
preparation or philosophical propaedeutic is ineluctably retrospective. Chapter two discusses this
quintessential characteristic of critique. We can find a formulation of Kant’s point on the necessity of
retrospection of metaphysics in his 1763 treatise The Only Possible Argument in Support of a Demonstration of
the Existence of God. In preface to this treatise, Kant writes: “Metaphysics is a dark and shoreless ocean,
marked by no beacons. One must proceed as the mariner proceeds on an un navigated sea: as soon as he
The task of critique is to separate the sensible and the supersensible really-objectively in order to connect them modally-apodictically. Strictly speaking, the primary sense of critique is nothing but this separation. The structural lateness of the transcendental doctrine of method reflects pure reason’s transcendental maturity, and enables pure reason to function as the a priori negative-modal-apodictic origin (whole) of its own transcendental elements and retrospectively form them as a complete organic system.\footnote{Before becoming mature to acquire or to form its natural spontaneity, reason is in “self-incurred minority” (WA 8:35), incapable of thinking for itself. Kant speaks of the self-incurred minority and maturity of reason primarily in philosophical terms. The maturity of reason arises from pure reason’s recognition of its natural propensity to fall behind, to remain in the dark with regard to, its own natural spontaneity. Historically, this maturity corresponds to the emergence of critical enlightenment.}

The contrast between the order of presentation in the first \textit{Critique} as a whole and the order of presentation in the transcendental doctrine of method, as Kant suggests in \textit{Jäsche Logic}, reflects two distinct standpoints with regard to the sources of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason: 1) “according to their \textit{objective} origin, i.e., according to the sources from which alone a cognition is possible. In this respect all cognitions are either \textit{rational} or \textit{empirical}”; 2) “according to their \textit{subjective} origin i.e., according to the method \textit{[Art]} in which a cognition can be acquired by men. Considered from this latter viewpoint, cognitions are either \textit{rational} or \textit{historical}” (Log 9:22).\footnote{Here again, I use “method” rather than “manner” as an equivalent for \textit{Art}. The methodological epigenesis of pure reason is the purely speculative self-acquisition of pure reason prior to, as the ground of, metaphysical cognitions.} These two orders of presentation correspond to the two closely connected but distinct senses of the transcendental as the object-relatedness and a priori origin of the categories, the relational-objective character of the understanding and the modal-methodological character of purely speculative reason.

The objective and subjective origins – the relational content (matter) and modal-apodictic makes a landing, he subjects his voyage to scrutiny, with a view of determining whether undetected currents, for example, may not have carried him off course, in spite of all the care, prescribed by the art of navigation, which he has taken” (BDG 2:66). The essence of critique lies in the retrospective movement of reason to retrace and recast itself.
genesis (form) – of metaphysical cognitions are in necessary agreement because the subjective origin – the epigenetic (negative) function or form of pure reason – retrospectively generates the methodological ground for the object-relatedness of the understanding, be it truth or illusion. The epigenetic function of pure reason purely speculatively forms the matter of pure reason. The transcendental doctrine of elements is the unfolding of what is retrospectively acquired and enfolded in the transcendental doctrine of method. All that can be learned from rational doctrines is immanent to the discipline of pure reason. The transcendental doctrine of method generates and organizes the possible ends of the transcendental doctrine of elements.

A critique of pure reason contains the modal-apodictic archetypal thinking of purely speculative reason in the transcendental doctrine of method and relational-objective ectypal thinking (image-dependent understanding) in the transcendental doctrine of elements. This concept suggests a twofold sense of reason: first, reason in its primary sense, i.e., reason as the epigenetic form of critique, the a priori origin of metaphysical cognitions, which is modally-apodictically self-enacted and is through the structural division of the first *Critique* insulated from sensibility in general; second, pure reason as the matter, the relational content or elements of pure reason, the object of critique, which operates within pure imagination and remains under the influence of sensibility in general and thus inevitably susceptible to dialectical errors. The modal-apodictic sense of reason retrospectively appropriates and grounds its relational-objective sense in order to generate pure reason as a complete whole of possible ends. Ignoring the priority of the methodological sense of reason over its object-related sense in theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement objectifies reason and obscures the disciplinary nature
of critique as the necessarily un-objectifiable origin of theoretical, practical, and reflecting object-relatedness. Without the methodological a priority of the discipline of pure reason, critique loses its generative negativity and starts to degenerate into positivism.

In its primary sense, critique regenerates its object retrospectively. This redemptive sense of critique is our incalculable debt to Kant. As the uncritical spread of the language of critique in modern scholarship and public discourse indicates, thinking after Kant is inescapably assessed in critical terms. Such popularity has taken place mostly at the expense of the negative-generative essence of critique, through hollowing out critique and reifying it as a philosophical doctrine, strategic tool, or transferable skill. We need to regenerate the philosophical spirit that is bequeathed and promised to us by Kant’s critical philosophy. Neither an antiquarian nor a utilitarian quest, this concerns the future of Kant’s critical philosophy and indeed critical thinking as such. We should neither approach critique as a fascinating antique in the history of ideas’ museum nor ask what use critique has for our time. Critique is reason’s promise of redemption, which needs to be constantly renewed. The first step to appreciate the spirit of critique is to refuse to elevate ourselves above Kant, arrogantly assuming that by virtue of living two centuries later we are in a privileged position to definitively sort out what is valuable in his philosophy. Instead of assigning Kant his place in the history of ideas or determining how Kant fits contemporary philosophical problems, we need to ask what our time means in light of his critical philosophy. We should let critical philosophy speak to us. This dissertation is a first step, the rudiments of a speculative essay, in this direction, aiming to regenerate Kant’s critical philosophy by demonstrating the fecundity of critique as pure reason’s creation from nothing.
The structure of the present investigation

In what follows, I read the transcendental doctrine of method to demonstrate how reason generates and organizes itself as a system or whole of possible ends. This methodological grounding underlies theoretical, practical, and reflecting uses of reason in the three Critiques. Four major questions orient my reading of the transcendental doctrine of method: 1) What motivates pure reason to generate itself as a system or whole of possible ends? 2) How does pure reason generate itself as a system or whole of possible ends? 3) How does pure reason structure its whole of possible ends – the faculty of thinking in general – into organic parts, i.e., faculties of practical reason, theoretical reason, and the power of judgement? 4) How does pure reason’s self-generation and self-organization make the table of judgements transcendently systematic? Addressing these questions offers a basic sense of critique in its epigenetic formation and organic structure.\[116\]

Chapter one explores how the failure of Kant’s precritical attempts to address the problem of metaphysics motivates the critical method of pure reason. An outline of Kant’s precritical response to the crisis of metaphysics and its relation to physics in eighteenth century German philosophy leads to an account of his major precritical methodological steps to recast and remedy the problem of metaphysics in genetic terms. The chapter expounds how the failure of these attempts clears the way for the emergence of Kant’s critical-methodological remedy: the epigenesis of pure reason as a transcendental-speculative whole or system of possible ends. Finally, the chapter discusses the inadequacy

\[116\] The four chapters of this dissertation do not exactly coincide with these four questions. In particular, chapter one deals with the first question by discussing Kant’s historically specific philosophical path from precritical to critical philosophy. In its first section, chapter two takes up the first question again, this time in terms of the development of the genetic structure of pure reason in the first Critique, demonstrating that critique is a transcendental-speculative autobiography or self-writing of pure reason, i.e., pure reason’s self-formation in transcendental remembering. Chapter two also discusses the second question. Chapters three and four correspond to the third and fourth questions.
of the first *Critique* in presenting Kant’s transcendental-methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics.

Chapter two interprets the discipline of pure reason to demonstrate that pure reason’s structural lateness – the necessarily late awareness of the original absence of supersensible objects in the transcendental dialectic – motivates its critical methodological function to generate itself as a system or whole of possible ends. The negative or self-dividing methodological self-enactment of pure reason in pure conviction or reason’s faith/belief in itself – which is enacted in negative-modal-apodictic judgements – acquires the matter of pure reason transcendentally-speculatively, and in so doing at once a priori corrects or prevents dialectical errors and grounds metaphysical cognitions systematically.

Chapter three explores how pure reason renders its negative-modal-apodictic whole positive through organizing it as parts, i.e., as systematic conditions of the use of object-related faculties. The canon of pure reason determines the negative whole of possible ends in terms of the systematic condition (final ends) of the practical use of reason. The architectonic of pure reason determines the whole of possible ends of reason as the systematic condition (essential ends) of the theoretical use of reason in the world. The history of pure reason, which remains undeveloped in the first *Critique* and is worked out later in the third *Critique*, determines the systematic condition (individual ends) of the reflecting use of reason. These three conditions make metaphysical cognitions relationally, qualitatively, and quantitatively systematic.

Chapter four focuses on the table of judgements in the metaphysical deduction of the categories. This table contains each and every act of reason, i.e., all ends that reason can possibly pursue in its metaphysical cognitions. Kant’s project to make metaphysics a
science cannot succeed without the systematicity or completeness of the table of judgements. Although the table is located at the start of the transcendental analytic, its transcendental-speculative genesis or absolute unity lies in the transcendental doctrine of method, ultimately in the discipline of pure reason. The chapter examines how the negative-modal-apodictic judgement, or the special act of pure reason to form itself as a whole, underlies disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements, and how this special act also transcendentally grounds the logic of predication in the traditional pairings of judgements. Thus, Kant connects all acts of reason to their modal-apodictic origin – the apodictic judgement of discipline or what we can call reason’s last judgement, and renders the traditional table of judgements transcendentally systematic.

After the transcendental-speculative account of the systematicity of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method and the table of judgements, the conclusion briefly outlines the implications of the negative epigenetic nature of the critical method for the operation of the object-related – that is, theoretical, practical, and reflecting – parts of the critical system. These implications call for reinterpreting the theoretical, practical, and reflecting parts of critical philosophy in the three *Critiques* from the standpoint of the organic center of critical philosophy, i.e., the transcendental doctrine of method.
Chapter 1. Metaphysics and the Problem of Method

Critical philosophy arises from the failure of Kant’s precritical attempts to reform traditional metaphysics. In making these attempts, Kant comes to realize that metaphysics cannot be salvaged by incremental reform. A systematic or scientific metaphysics requires a radical reorientation in philosophical methodology, i.e., a “revolution brought about all at once ... in the way of thinking [Denkart]” (KrV B xvi). The present chapter outlines how the failure of Kant’s precritical attempts to reform metaphysics motivates his critical methodological revolution in philosophy. It proceeds in three sections. The first section introduces the most important elements of Kant’s precritical response to the crisis of metaphysics in eighteenth century German philosophy, and highlights major precritical steps to recast and remedy the problem of metaphysics – i.e., the problem of grounding the sensible in the supersensible or the world in God – in genetic terms. Kant aims to rethink traditional metaphysics in a manner that grounds modern physics without undermining its achievements and self-explanatory character. The second section examines how the failure of a merely analogical method to ground metaphysical cognitions of objects in God motivates the search for the distinct method of metaphysics. The use of analogical reasoning must be limited if it is to avoid making unverifiable and potentially illusory knowledge claims. The necessity to limit analogical reasoning in metaphysics leads Kant to the distinct method of metaphysics: the critical method of transcendental philosophy. The third section discusses the emergence of Kant’s critical-methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics, and the oblique manner in which it is presented in the first Critique. This section demonstrates the need to work out the transcendental doctrine of
method in the first *Critique* in order to appreciate the critical-methodological nature or living organicity of the transcendental system of pure reason.

### 1.1 Kant’s precritical response to the crisis of metaphysics

#### 1.1.1 The young Kant and German metaphysics

Kant’s early precritical views emerge in response to the crisis of German metaphysics in the first half of the eighteenth century. The extraordinary accomplishments of the Cartesian geometrical method and the Newtonian inductive-mathematical method in modern physics put enormous pressure on Aristotelian metaphysics, the dominant version of metaphysics in German philosophy. Abandonment of the Aristotelian model of nature, which is based on the occult metaphysical qualities of substances, in favour of a mathematically-based self-explanatory physics threatens more than traditional answers to the problem of metaphysics. The loss of major parts of the territory of ancient Greek ontology to modern physics raises questions and casts serious doubt on the *raison d’être* of metaphysics as

---

117 Without committing to the standard periodization of Kant’s intellectual life into precritical and critical periods, I use the term *precritical* only as shorthand to refer to Kant’s writings prior to publication of the first *Critique*. These texts, which are written over thirty-four years, do not represent a coherent whole or a commitment to a final goal. There are major elements of Kant’s precritical thought which remain essential for critical philosophy while some other aspects of his precritical thought are abandoned after publication of the first *Critique*. In the present chapter, I focus on the formation of a particular path in Kant’s precritical thinking that can be identified in retrospect: the concern for the question of origin or genetic grounding of metaphysics.

118 During the late seventeenth century and the first few decades of the eighteenth century, Aristotelian metaphysics enjoys a privileged status in Prussian universities. Orthodox Protestantism relies heavily on Aristotelian doctrine to facilitate its own teaching. The decline of Aristotelian metaphysics in Prussian universities starts as a result of an alliance between Pietists and Wolffians, who take over key positions in major universities with the support of King Fredrick I. In the absence of much philosophical or religious affinity, this alliance disintegrates soon after its victory over Aristotelians. The decline of Aristotelianism in Königsberg – a remote provincial town in East Prussia – occurred about a decade later than most other Prussian Protestant universities. Until 1725, students in Königsberg’s Albertina University were still required to study Aristotle for three to six years. Kant’s use of Aristotelian terminology in the first *Critique* such as “analytic,” “dialectic,” “amphiboly,” etc. indicates the lingering influence of Prussian Aristotelianism in Albertina University in the 1740s. For an examination of the influence of Aristotelian terminology on Kant, see Tonelli (1964). For a discussion of the intellectual milieu in Albertina University, including the relation between the higher faculty of theology and the lower faculty of philosophy in the 1730s and 1740s, see Tonelli (1975) & Kühn (2001), pp. 62-68.
such. With the decline of Aristotelian metaphysics in German philosophy during the first few decades of the eighteenth century, a major philosophical rivalry emerges. On the one hand, the Leibnizian-Wolffian School emulates the method of mathematics to enhance the precision and demonstrative power of metaphysics.\(^{119}\) The goal is to clearly define concepts, rigorously deduce theorems from them, and make metaphysics more systematic. On the other hand, Pietist theology argues against extension of mathematical reasoning to the metaphysical realm. Having no qualms about miracles and supernatural interventions, it advocates complete subjection of physical sciences to the authority of biblical tenets, and regards Wolff's claims on the power of reason and mechanical-mathematical explanations of nature in modern physics as determinism, atheism, and fatalism.\(^{120}\)

The young Kant responds to the crisis of metaphysics with an open mind and significant degree of eclecticism. He approaches the problem of metaphysics in the light of new achievements in mathematics and modern physics.\(^{121}\) If metaphysics is to avoid relegation to an utterly irrelevant and moribund scholasticism, it must revitalize and redefine itself, and demonstrate anew its value and necessity. Metaphysics should be

\(^{119}\) Wolff identifies mathematical and metaphysical methods of rational cognition: “both philosophy and mathematics derive their methods from true logic” Wolff [1736] (1963), p. 77. He does not recognize distinct ways in which mathematics and metaphysics abstract from experience, and assumes the same conception of purity for mathematical and metaphysical cognitions. Rational cognitions are considered pure only if they “can connect the truths to each other without assuming a single proposition from experience” Wolff [1719] (2009), p. 31.

\(^{120}\) The confrontation between Pietists and Wolff, who represented German rationalist Enlightenment, had an explicitly political dimension. Pietists presented Wolff’s defence of the doctrine of preestablished harmony to King Frederick I in such a manner that he found this doctrine a threat to his rule in Prussia. In 1723, the King gave Wolff 24 hours to leave Halle or face execution. Wolff fled to Marburg. Other Wolffians in Prussian universities were dismissed as well. In 1729, Wolff's famous book known as German Metaphysics was officially banned from the curriculum. During his years in Marburg, Wolff attracted considerable European audience and fame. In 1740, he returned to Halle upon King Frederick II repeated invitations. For a discussion of the relation between Wolffians and Pietists, see Beck (1969), pp. 247-256, Polonoff (1973), pp. 68-72, Schönfeld (2000), pp. 56-62 & 96-104, and Kühn (2001), pp. 66-86.

\(^{121}\) Discussing Kant's precritical texts chronologically by no means suggests that critical philosophy was destined to emerge out of Kant's precritical thinking. My goal is to sketch a philosophical history from the perspective of genetic concerns and preoccupations in Kant's precritical writings. As any other historical narrative, mine is inevitably retrospective.
neither reduced to nor detached from physical sciences; neither subordinated to some form of theology nor completely detached from divine existence. Despite his Pietist upbringing, Kant does not view metaphysics in opposition to modern physics or as its theological overdetermination. He rather starts to reorient metaphysics toward its core function as a fundamental science of first principles that physical sciences necessarily presuppose. Kant concurs with Leibniz that “everything happens mechanically in nature, but ... the principles of mechanism are metaphysical.” In articulating these metaphysical principles, however, Kant departs from Leibnizian-Wolffian imitation of the method of mathematics, and refuses to reduce metaphysics to the merely logical principle of contradiction. Kant follows Crusius who systematized a number of the Pietist criticisms of Wolff in the 1740s. Crusius states that the explanatory power and usefulness of mathematics to investigate nature ought not to eclipse the key distinction between the natural character of physical objects and the artificial character of mathematical objects. Modern physics, Crusius holds, cannot be fully explained mathematically, hence the need for metaphysics as the science of the supersensible.

Even though one cannot speak of anything called Kant's precritical project, there are indications that point to Kant's general orientation towards the crisis of metaphysics. At least, we can outline what metaphysics should not look like from his perspective. Kant's approach to metaphysics is distinct from the dogmatic-enthusiastic theology of Pietists, a merely logical or mathematically-modelled metaphysics of Leibnizian-Wolffians, and a

123 In opposition to Wolff, Crusius distinguishes metaphysics and mathematics: “metaphysics, is the science of those necessary truths of reason that are something different from the determination of extended magnitudes.” He suggests that, as the fundamental science, metaphysics “contains in itself the grounds for mathematical and practical sciences, although the determinate constitution of the necessary truths that they contain in themselves cannot be justly incorporated into metaphysics” Crusius [1745] (2009), pp. 138-137. For discussions of Crusius's criticism of Wolff, see Polonoff (1973), pp. 68-72 & Schönfeld (2000), pp. 62-66.
physico-theological metaphysics.\textsuperscript{124} He does not seek to establish metaphysics as an improved explanation of nature in either mechanical-mathematical or theological terms. Even the most comprehensive explanation of nature cannot show how it is originally generated. Metaphysics may be in harmony with mathematical or theological principles, but it remains irreducible to either. To work out metaphysics as a reliable science distinct from mathematics, theology, or their arbitrary combination, Kant seems to put together elements of a reorientation to recast the central problem of metaphysics – to ground the sensible in the supersensible, the world in God – in genetic terms. These attempts are not always coherent and successful but they indicate Kant's general concern for the question of origin and genetic grounding of metaphysics. Despite its vagueness, eclectic nature, and sporadic presentation, this methodological reorientation toward metaphysics aims to determine the genetic principles that derive from the divine and bring nature into being in its completeness, without violating the self-standing character of explanations of nature in modern physics.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{124} Physico-theology explains natural phenomena in terms of their putative theological purpose. Similar to Wolff, physico-theologists saw divine revelation as the ultimate end of nature but criticized his anthropocentrism. The beauty, order, and harmony of nature reveal God's greatness rather than conditions of utility for humans. Eighteenth century physico-theologians wrote extensively on the physico-theology of water, fire, birds, grass, thunder, snow, etc. in order to demonstrate how natural objects and phenomena are divinely designed. Among foundational texts of physico-theology are \textit{Physico-theology} (1714) by English clergyman and natural philosopher Derham and \textit{The True Use of World-Concepts} (1715) by Dutch philosopher and theologian Nieuwentyt. These texts influenced Paley's famous teleological argument in \textit{Natural Theology} (1802).

\textsuperscript{125} The issue of genetic recasting of the problem of metaphysics is not thematized in either Kant's texts or interpretations of his precritical philosophy. The loss of topical significance of some precritical themes after Kant's critical turn, his public repudiation of precritical works, and the prevalence of non-metaphysical readings of critical philosophy tend to obscure the enduring import of genetic reformulation of the problem of metaphysics beyond his precritical years. Even among those who take precritical works seriously, the central significance of this issue remains unaddressed. Polonoff characterizes precritical philosophy in terms of a loose connection between Kant's early studies on the nature of force and metaphysical cosmology and his later preoccupations with the method of metaphysics, Polonoff (1973), p. 201. Ameriks divides precritical thought into four phases: empiricist (1747-56); rationalist (1756-66); skepticist (1766-68); and quasi-critical (1768-1780), Ameriks (2000), pp.12-16. In another periodization, Beiser characterizes precritical thought in terms of four periods: infatuation with metaphysics (1747-1759); disillusionment with metaphysics (1760-
1.1.2 Precritical elements of a genetic approach to metaphysics

The earliest indication of some major elements of Kant's precritical attempt to recast the problem of metaphysics in genetic terms appears in his first book, * Thoughts on the True Estimation of Living Forces*, where he sets for himself the ambitious and unrealistic goal to settle the *vis viva* controversy.\(^{126}\) Even though this book primarily engages with issues regarding accounts of living forces in nature, the problem of metaphysics lurks in background. The young Kant argues against Descartes' and Leibniz's conceptions of force, and looks for the irreducible metaphysical origin of living force. On the one hand, Kant takes issue with Descartes' quantitative reduction of motion. In contrast to Descartes, Kant speaks of a "great difference" between mathematical objects and physical substances (GSK 66); partial reconciliation with metaphysics (1766-1772); divorcing metaphysics (1772-1780), Beiser (1992), p. 26. Despite their differences, Ameriks and Beiser deny the persistence of the problem of metaphysics in precritical Kant. Friedman and Laywine respectively emphasize Kant's Newtonianism and his commitment to the theory of physical influx as the major unifying thread running throughout precritical thought, see Friedman (1992) and Laywine (1993). Schönfeld describes precritical philosophy as a failed attempt to reconcile "a modern mechanical model of physical nature with the metaphysical assumptions of a uniform structure of nature, of a purpose to the world, and of the possibility of freedom." Schönfeld's account of precritical philosophy is more detailed than others and yet does not articulate the loose genetic framework at work in Kant's attempts to reconcile mechanical nature with the purposiveness of the world and human freedom. In particular, Schönfeld does not adequately appreciate the role Kant considers for God as the ultimate origin or necessary genetic ground for interaction among substances in * Nova Dilucidatio* (1755). Schönfeld claims that only in "the early 1760s" Kant "established a bridge from nature to God." Even in his analysis of Kant's 1763 treatise on God, Schönfeld does not highlight the genetic character of Kant's argument. Similar to Beiser, Schönfeld reads *Dreams of a Spirit-Seer* (1766) as an indication of Kant's divorce from metaphysics, and gives little weight to Kant's explicit suggestion in the same work to pursue metaphysics through self-limitation of human reason (TG 2:368), see Schönfeld (2000), p. 9 & p. 10.

\(^{126}\) Leibniz coins the Latin term *vis viva* (living force) in contrast to *vis mortua* (dead force) in his unpublished "essay on dynamics." The first public mention of *vis viva* occurs in *Specimen Dynamicum*. See Leibniz [1675-1716] (1989), p. 121. The *vis viva* controversy starts with Leibniz's 1686 criticism of Descartes' reduction of force to a merely mechanical concept. Leibniz considers force primarily in terms of the metaphysical quality of matter rather than a mere quantity of motion. The first stage of controversy is between Leibniz and some Cartesians, and later with the Newtonian Clarke. Leibniz favours *vis viva*, and Cartesians (and to a lesser extent Newtonians) repudiate any metaphysical component to force. The second stage of controversy takes place after Leibniz's death in 1716 between Leibnizians like Wolff and Cartesians/Newtonians. The controversy dies down after the publication of d'Alembert's *The Treatise on Dynamic* in 1743. Due to the inadequacies of Königsberg's book trade, Kant does not know about d'Alembert's treatise until after the publication of his own book. For an account of the philosophy of d'Alembert, see Tonelli (1976b). For a detailed history of the *vis viva* controversy and its influence on Kant, see Polonoff (1973), pp. 5-39 and Schönfeld (2000), pp. 17-38.

68
Mathematical objects lack an inner force or “power [Kraft]” to allow for external causation, and therefore the exact measurement of their force as quantity of motion is possible. Physical substances have “an entirely different nature [Beschaffenheit],” “a potential in itself [Vermögen in sich], the power [Kraft]” that is triggered but not increased by external causes (GSK 1:140). Thus, Descartes’ mathematical formula for the measurement of physical substances (F = MV) is plausible only to a limited extent since it cannot capture their potential living force. On the other hand, despite his agreement with Leibniz on the qualitative nature of living force, Kant refuses to go along with his grounding of the inner potential [Vermögen] or “intension [Intension]” of physical substances in a preestablished harmony (GSK 1:141-2). The Leibnizian-Wolffian innatist models of a completely preestablished harmony of physical substances ultimately relegate their inner potential to the principle of contradiction, and deprive them of a truly metaphysical quality. Arguing for “the triumph of physical influx over preestablished harmony” (GSK 1:20), Kant proposes a theory of “vivification [Lebendigwerdung]” through which the inner potential or intension of physical substances is awakened and triggered in physical influx (influxus physicus) (GSK 1:146-8). Kant also links, albeit obscurely, the vivification of inner

127 The eighteenth century debate on the relation between mathematics and metaphysics generates a set of problems with which Kant grapples throughout his precritical philosophical life. This debate contains at least three major topics: 1) the nature of force; 2) the existence of physical monads; 3) the nature of space. The first topic is the subject of the debate between Cartesians and Leibnizians. Kant engages with this topic in his first book Thoughts on the True Estimation of Living Forces (1747). The second and third topics are sources of controversy between Leibnizians and Newtonians. Kant articulates his position on these topics in Physical Monadology (1756) and Concerning the Ultimate Foundation of the Distinction of Directions in Space (1768). The debate on the relevance of the mathematical method for metaphysics continues well into the second half of the eighteenth century. In 1761, the Academy of Sciences in Berlin assigns this topic for its prize competition. Kant writes Inquiry Concerning the Distinctness of the Principles of Natural Theology and Morality (1763) for this competition. In this essay, Kant offers his most comprehensive precritical account of the distinction between methods of metaphysics and mathematics. The critical version of this distinction is formulated in the first Critique (KrV A712-738/B740-766).

128 Physical influx is the causal theory that affirms intersubstantial causation. Little is certain about the origin of this theory. It seems that Suarez was the first who referred to “physical influence” in his metaphysical
potential or intension of physical substances to “the intentions of God’s wisdom” (GSK 1:107). Despite making such links, in his first book, the young Kant develops neither his promised synthesis of mathematical rules and metaphysical principles nor the connection between the vivification of substances, the physical influx theory, and intentions of God’s wisdom.\(^{129}\) Kant’s projected position, nonetheless, reveals a general commitment to a genetic conception of metaphysics, which is grounded in God and is more primary than the merely logical principle of contradiction. Despite its obvious deficiencies, incoherence, and eclecticism, Kant’s first book deploys some key elements of a genetic approach to...

---

\(^{129}\) Some interpreters claim that Kant’s book contains a number of contradictory positions. They suggest Kant contradicts his earlier view on the mathematical immeasurability of metaphysical quality of physical substances, and falls back on Leibniz’s formula for accurate measurement of vis viva \((F = MV^3)\), Schönfeld (2000), pp. 51-55. Schönfeld also takes Kant’s account of vivification to be inconsistent with his endorsement of physical influx theory, Schönfeld (2000), pp. 53-54. Kant seems to be aware of some of these problems at the time, especially since the publication of the book was delayed for two years. In his letter to Swiss mathematician and physicist Euler, on August 23, 1749, Kant mentions that “a short appendix to this book ... will soon be ready as well, ... in which I develop the necessary explanations and certain ideas that belong to the theory but which I could not include in the work itself without rendering the system too disjointed.” This letter is not included in the Akademie Ausgabe (AA). See Correspondence in The Cambridge Edition of Works of Immanuel Kant, pp. 45-46.
metaphysics, which are taken up and developed in a more coherent philosophical framework in the following two decades.

While dropping the vocabulary of *vis viva* in later works, Kant pursues his search for the metaphysical origin of living force as well as his unfulfilled promise to synthesize quantitative and qualitative, mathematical and metaphysical aspects of physical substances. He becomes increasingly cognizant that genetic recasting of metaphysics requires re-conceiving both physical laws and metaphysical principles.\textsuperscript{130} To this end, Kant uses Newtonian physics to provide an analogical account of the origin and structure of the cosmos in the *Universal Natural History*, and develops a genetic interpretation of the principle of sufficient reason, as well as his own version of physical influx theory in *Nova Dilucidatio*.\textsuperscript{131} Written after Kant’s return to Königsberg in 1755, these works redefine physical laws and metaphysical principles respectively, in a manner that facilitates their cooperation to address a genetic version of the problem of metaphysics. Kant tries to reconcile key elements of Newtonian physics and Leibnizian metaphysics without adopting either a Newtonian position on metaphysics or a Leibnizian position on physics.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{130} Kant’s increasing awareness of the need for metaphysics to take into account the principles of natural philosophy seems in part due to the influence of Euler, who calls on metaphysicians to consider principles of physics as they develop their system of metaphysics. Euler accepts major aspects of Newtonian physics, although he develops different theories to account for impenetrability, inertia, and extension of matter. For Euler’s critique of Leibnizian-Wolffian disregard for achievements of modern, particularly Newtonian, physics, see Euler [1760-2] (2009), pp. 209-230. For a discussion of Euler’s influence on precritical Kant, see Laywine (1993), pp. 27-31.

\textsuperscript{131} The young Kant’s take on Newton’s physics is a matter of dispute. Friedman (1992) and Laywine (1993) see Kant as Newtonian from the very beginning. Schönfeld finds no evidence to support Kant’s Newtonian leanings in *Thoughts on the True Estimation of Living Forces*. Schönfeld traces first indications of Kant’s conversion to Newtonian physics to two short essays on rotation and aging of the Earth written in the summer of 1754. See Schönfeld (2000), pp.73-95 & p. 262.

\textsuperscript{132} The attempt to reinterpret Leibnizian metaphysics and Newtonian physics in a manner to reconcile them is also manifest in the title Kant publishes a year later in 1756: *The Employment in Natural Philosophy of Metaphysics Combined with Geometry, of which Sample I Contains the PHYSICAL MONADOLOGY*. In this text, Kant attempts to bring together two apparently inconsistent ideas of Newton and Leibniz: the infinite divisibility of space and the indivisibility of physical monads in space.
The *Universal Natural History* is permeated with concern for the natural history and origin of the universe. Kant analogically extends principles of Newton's physics to account for the origin and structure of the universe in a complete system of nature. Kant, nevertheless, acknowledges that the difficulty of the question of the origin of the universe pales in comparison to the question of origin of a living being. We could say “without being presumptuous: *Give me matter and I will build a world out of it,*” but “are we in position to say: *Give me matter and I will show you how a caterpillar can be created?”* (NTH 1:230).

Methodologically, the *Universal Natural History* maintains Kant’s earlier position on the ill-suited nature of a mathematical approach for genetic investigations (GSK 1:70). A metaphysical method is needed to enquire into questions of the origin of the universe. Kant uses analogical reasoning as the method of metaphysics in order to bring out the qualitative aspect of nature. Although the analogical method lacks mathematical precision (NTH 1:236), Kant views it as the only way humans can investigate the origin and structure of the cosmos. The “leading thread of analogy and reasonable credibility” supplies us with the best possible method to ground celestial mechanics metaphysically (NTH 1:235). Analogy secures the “infinite extension of the Divine Presence” (NTH 1:306), allowing one to understand nature in terms of its schema derived from divine understanding. Confident in the analogical method, Kant goes as far as considering whether “suppositions in which analogy and observation are in full agreement and support each other are exactly of the same value as formal proofs” (NTH 1:255).133

In his attempt to provide a genetic foundation for mechanical principles of nature through analogical extension of Newtonian principles, Kant assumes that perfection is the

---

133 The use of analogical reasoning, as we shall see, continues in the critical philosophy with the key difference that in critical philosophy the discipline of pure reason limits the analogical use of reason.
telos of nature in all its activities, including the mechanical ones. All planetary structure and order is coordinated and grounded “in a single intention [Zweck]” (NTH 1:333) of the highest wisdom that designs and creates the cosmos. The question, therefore, is not whether but how to conceive of a divinely designed perfection, how to work out the teleological origins of mechanical nature. In Section 8, Part 2, of the Universal Natural History, Kant contrasts two responses to this question, two models of nature. According to the first response, God originally implants “the plan for the structure of the universe” in “the eternal laws of motion.” Within this plan, harmony develops “freely” and “in a manner appropriate to the most perfect order.” According to the second response, parts of the

134 Kant’s notion of perfection at this point is under the influence of Pope. In a passage in his Nachlass, written around 1753-4 for the Prussian Academy of Science 1755 prize essay competition on Pope’s dictum “Everything is good,” Kant speaks of the “superiority” of Pope’s notion of perfection over Leibniz’s, i.e., a pre-established determination of the best of possible worlds. Pope’s notion is not merely based on the logical principle of contradiction. He does not understand “everything is good” or his line “One truth is clear, ‘Whatever is, is right’” in a Leibnizian sense. In Pope’s long poem, Essay on Man, we read: “Yes, nature’s road must ever be preferr’d; Reason is here no guide, but still a guard; ’Tis hers to rectify, not overthrow, And treat this passion more as friend than foe.” Pope [1734] (1999), p. 12 & pp. 16-17. Kant appreciates Pope’s poetic system of nature, reads his poem as a serious contribution to philosophy, and uses lines from Essay on Man as epigraphs for different parts of the Universal Natural History. Kant agrees with Pope in subjecting all possibility of existence to the power of God as a self-sufficient original being. Kant’s passage also contains core elements of some ideas on themes such as elective affinities, the harmony and free play of faculties in the faculty of feeling pleasure or displeasure, and the source of radical evil, which are developed three and four decades later in the third Critique and Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason. Comparing Pope’s and Leibniz’s conceptions of perfection in his Nachlass, Kant writes: “Pope subjects the creation to detailed scrutiny, particularly where it most seems to lack harmony; and yet he shows that each thing, which we might wish to see removed from the scheme of greatest perfection, is also, when considered in itself, good. He also shows that we should not beforehand entertain an advantageous prejudice in favour of the wisdom of the Organising Being, in order to win applause for Him. The essential and necessary determinations of things, the universal laws which are not placed in relation to each other by any forced union into a harmonious scheme, will adapt themselves as if spontaneously to the attainment of purposes which are perfect. Self-love, which has as its only purpose one’s own pleasure, and which seems to be the manifest cause of the moral disorder which we observe, is the origin of that beautiful harmony which we admire. Everything which is of use to itself also finds itself constrained to be of use to other things, as well. The universal bond, which links the whole together in a fashion which has not been examined, ensures that individual advantages always relate to the advantages of other things, and do so in a perfectly natural sequence. Thus a universal law of nature firmly establishes the love which maintains the whole, and it does so by means of the motive causes which also naturally produce that evil, the sources of which we would happily see destroyed” (Refl 17:233-234). Kant’s later characterization of critique of pure reason as corrective and purifying as well as his description of the discipline of pure reason as a “guard” (KrV A795/B823) indicates his appropriation of some key elements of Pope’s dynamic understanding of the perfection of reason. The interpretation of logic as a guard is also an integral part of the tradition of early modern logic which Kant inherits.
world are incapable of harmony and need “a foreign hand” to generate the “restriction and coordination which allows us to see the perfection and beauty in it.” In this scenario, “the universal natural laws in and of themselves produce nothing but disorder.” This model of nature, according to Kant, “transform[s] all nature into miracles”; instead of nature, “there will be only a God in the machine who produces the world’s changes.” Kant clearly sides with the first model of nature, which is a sophisticated form of innatism and seeks “the primordial developments in the forces of nature, as if these forces were a principle independent of the Godhead and were an eternally blind fate” (NTH 1:333 & 334). In a sense, the ends of nature are genetic to its elemental forces and underlie their apparently mechanical operation. The “universal efficient material laws” are a result and evidence of the completeness and greatness of God’s creation (NTH 1:222). In “a self-forming nature” (NTH 1:266), the “simplest, most universal characteristic, seemingly designed without purpose, the material, which appears merely passive and in need of forms and structures, has in its simplest condition a tendency to build itself up by a natural development to more perfect arrangements” (NTH 1:263). Nature is grounded in God through a genetic harmony that accommodates infinite diversity, change, and freedom. The common origination of all beings “in one particular Original Essence” (NTH 1:333) or their “common dependency on a single cause [Ursache],” “the Divine Understanding,” is distinct from specific determination of all beings in a preestablished harmony (NTH 1:295). It only means that

---

135 Here Kant seems to have Malebranche’s occasionalism in view. See Malebranche [1674-5] (1992), pp. 92-127.

136 Later, Kant uses a version of this genetic account within a critical framework: the whole of possible ends of pure reason is genetic to transcendental elements of pure reason. The crucial difference of the critical version of this genetic account is its break from Kant’s precritical innatism. Rather than originating in God, the whole of possible ends in critical philosophy is generated in the discipline of pure reason.

137 As seen here, in the Universal Natural History, Kant often uses “cause [Ursache]” and “origin [Ursprung]” interchangeably. This terminological ambiguity sometimes obscures Kant’s position that mathematics can
beings cannot produce consequences “except those which bring with them an image of the perfection of exactly the same Divine Idea” (NTH 1:295). The specific image thereby produced is not preestablished and remains a matter of physical influx and determination.

Kant summarizes his conclusion on order and harmony in this passage:

All things connected together in a reciprocal harmony must be unified among themselves in a single being on which they collectively depend. Hence, there is a being of all beings, an infinite intelligence and self-standing wisdom, from which nature, even in its possibility, draws the origin of complete determination of its purposes. (NTH 1:334)

As it stands, the Universal Natural History reveals how, in its diversity and beauty, nature “flows from a single universal rule with an eternal and proper order” (NTH 1:306). In essence, perfection is genetically built into nature, even though its expression is a matter of natural interaction and contingency. As a self-explanatory science, physics enacts and expresses divine intention rather than replacing it. Kant’s teleological view of nature is distinct from the anti-scientific teleology of pietists, which relies on divine intervention through miracles, the teleology of Wolff, which occasionally invokes miracles for natural scientific explanations, physico-theological accounts of natural objects or phenomena, which conflate purpose and use, and that of Newton, which reverts to God in the face of

explain only the how of nature, i.e., efficient causality, whereas the why of nature, i.e., the origin/end of nature, requires metaphysics and its qualitative method.

138 A version of this idea appears in critical philosophy: nature produces only consequences that are always already transcendentally determined. Consequences presuppose a transcendental system of possible uses or whole of possible ends of pure reason.

139 This passage implies Kant’s own version of physical influx theory in which physical influx is grounded in God. Kant develops this argument in Nova Dilucidatio, which will be briefly outlined below.

140 Also contrary to Wolff, throughout the precritical years, Kant denies that the whole cosmos has been structured for human interests. See (NTH 1:352-354) & (BDG 2:131).

141 Kant’s distinction between purpose and use as well as his attempt at a theological grounding of physics which respects natural contingency can be traced back to Pope’s insights on the combination of lawfulness and chance. Tonelli (1975) also argues that the Universal Natural History is written under the influence of the French mathematician and philosopher Maupertuis who was invited and assigned by Fredrick the Great as the president of Berlin Academy of Science (1746-1759) to promote French Enlightenment thought in Prussia. Maupertuis redefines physico-theology by shifting its focus from specific physical phenomena to
mechanically inexplicable physical phenomena. Kant explains harmony and order in terms of their genetic ground in the divine. Nonetheless, he insists on the immanent self-organization of mechanical laws of nature, without falling back on constant divine intervention (Malebranche) or merely logical grounding (Leibniz and Wolff).

While the *Universal Natural History* is devoted to redefining physical laws in genetic-cosmological terms (as possible built-in expressions of intentions of divine wisdom), *Nova Dilucidatio*, Kant’s first purely philosophical work, reinterprets metaphysical principles in genetic-ontological terms. It substantially revises two major methodological principles of Leibnizian-Wolffian metaphysics – principles of contradiction and sufficient reason –, appropriates Crusius’s principle of identity, and presents Kant’s own version of physical influx theory. These revisions play an indispensable role in advancing Kant’s precritical attempt to recast and remedy the problem of metaphysics in genetic terms.

In revising the principle of contradiction, Kant challenges its ultimate authority even for explanation of truth. This principle – “*everything which is not not, is*” – while primary in the Wolffian School’s interpretation of Leibniz, contains only one side of the more primary principle of identity – “*everything which is, is*” (PND 1:390). The significance of Kant’s argument lies in showing that “it is neither necessary that every truth be guaranteed by the impossibility of its opposite, nor ... is it in itself sufficient either” (PND 1:391). In this way,

universal laws of reason. His goal is to open room for an ultimately theological account of natural necessity without violating scientific explanations of contingency in nature. On Maupertuis’s influence on precritical Kant, also see Zammito (2006).

142 For Newton, God recurrently infuses nature with new motion. A Newtonian position criticizes the limitation of God’s will or his visible hand in nature in Leibniz’s monadology. E.g., Clarke notes: “the wisdom of God consists in framing originally the perfect and complete idea of a work, which began and continues according to that original perfect idea by the continual uninterrupted exercise of his power and government” Leibniz & Clarke [1717] (2000), p. 12. For the precritical Kant, this recourse to God’s ongoing use of his will implies a lack in his original creation.

143 Kant pursues the genetic grounding of nature in God in ontological terms. A major step in Kant’s move toward critical philosophy is to abandon pursuing his genetic approach in ontological terms.
Kant targets the exclusion of the direct method of argumentation in the principle of contradiction as well as the primacy given to explanation through the indirect method of argumentation. Kant’s case for including a direct method of argumentation indicates his emphasis on the need for the immediacy of the foundational proof of metaphysics. Indirect proofs cannot constitute an identical or genetic ground for metaphysics.\textsuperscript{144}

In the next step, \textit{Nova Dilucidatio} directly challenges the Leibnizian-Wolffian take on the principle of sufficient reason – what Kant, following Crusius, renames ”the principle of determining ground” (PND 1:393) –, and argues for its genetic interpretation. Kant and Leibniz both seek to ground principles of physics metaphysically, albeit in different ways. Leibniz’s solution is based on a key distinction between two kinds of properties in a physical substance: monadic properties – predicates contained a priori in a single subject – and relational properties – predicates emerged from relations among many subjects.\textsuperscript{145}

Monadic and relational properties are grounded in divine intellect and divine will.

\textsuperscript{144} In \textit{Nova Dilucidatio}, Kant speaks of such immediacy in terms of ”an intuition of the ground” (PND 1:394). In critical philosophy, as I discuss in chapter two, immediate certainty occurs through the transcendental generation of pure reason. The negative proofs of the discipline of pure reason are ostensive (direct) not apagogic (indirect).

\textsuperscript{145} Leibniz’s distinction between monadic and relational properties seem to respond to Aristotle’s dilemma of substantiality and relationality in Book XIII of \textit{Metaphysics}: ”If we do not suppose substances to be separate, and in the way in which particular things are said to be separate, we shall destroy that sort of substance which we wish to maintain; but if we conceive substances to be separable, how are we to conceive of their elements and their principles?” Aristotle [1912-1954] (1984), p. 1717. In \textit{Phenomenology of Spirit}, Hegel addresses how the modern reformulation of the Aristotelian dilemma motivates the emergence of the notion of force in modern physics and philosophy. According to Hegel, the dialectic of ‘One’ and ‘Also’ in the phenomenology of perception can be addressed only by superseding the standpoint of perception for that of understanding, whose object is “force” rather than “thing.” This position reflects Spinoza’s metaphysics of substance. Leibniz’s position takes a step further to invert Spinoza’s metaphysics of substance and introduce the monadic subject into it. In his precritical philosophy, Kant tries to use Leibniz’s argument for monadic properties without his doctrine of pre-established harmony. In his critical philosophy, Kant recasts the monadic realm in modal-apodictic terms. It becomes a realm that enacts its own a priori harmony in a disciplinary manner, i.e., in terms of the methodological epigenesis of pure reason. The negative-modal-apodictic reason functions as the absolute positing of possible existence, prior to the relational or relative givenness of objects in intuition. Later Hegel uses Leibniz’s argument for the windowlessness of monads to invert what he calls the ”Inverted World” and to reconfigure the dialectical balance between the substance and the subject. For Hegel, the transcendental philosophies of Kant, Fichte, and Schelling negotiate this balance, one way or another, in favour of the subject. See Hegel [1807] (1977), pp.67-79.
respectively. Leibniz grounds contingent properties through a preestablished harmony created by the divine will. Kant perceives a major flaw in this solution. Leibniz’s doctrine of preestablished harmony obliterates the original distinction between monadic and relational properties as it considers the creation of a prefect a priori coordination among monadic properties to be the ground for relational properties. For Leibniz, the distinction between monadic properties and relational properties, absolute necessity and hypothetical necessity, is tenable only for finite understanding that cannot know substances in their complete concept. In contrast to the infinite divine understanding, relational properties and their hypothetical necessity are presented as confused and defective forms of human understanding of monadic properties.

Kant develops his distinctive version of metaphysics with the belief that Leibnizian-Wolffian solution lacks an account of “a genetic or at least an identical ground” for metaphysical cognitions, i.e., a metaphysical necessity that “bring[s] the truth into being” rather than “only explain it” (PND 1:394). While the “knowledge of the truth is always based upon an intuition of the ground” (PND 1:394), the Leibnizian-Wolffian school cuts off the necessary connection between the knowledge of the truth (explanation) and its

---

146 The monadic-relational distinction also corresponds to the distinction between absolute necessity and hypothetical necessity. Leibniz introduces this distinction in order to explain how everything that must happen to an individual substance is already contained virtually in its nature or notion. A passage in Discourse on Metaphysics encapsulates Leibniz’s set of distinctions: “I assert that connection or following [consécution] is of two kinds. The one whose contrary implies a contradiction is absolutely necessary; this deduction occurs in the eternal truths, for example, the truths of geometry. The other is necessary only ex hypothesi and, so to speak, accidently, but it is contingent in itself, since its contrary does not imply a contradiction. And this connection is based not purely on ideas and God’s simple understanding, but on his free decrees and on the sequence of the universe” Leibniz [1675-1716] (1989), p. 45.

147 In his 1696 letter to Basnage de Beauval, Leibniz presents his theory of preestablished harmony in contrast to physical influx and occasionalism. The preestablished harmony is “a prior divine artifice, which has formed each of these substances from the beginning in such a way that by following only its own laws, laws which it received with its being, it nevertheless agrees with the other, as if there were a mutual influence, or as if God always meddled with it, over and above his general concourse” Leibniz [1675-1716] (1989), p. 148.
ontological ground. Without grounding the consequent epistemological certainty of cognition in the antecedent ontological foundation of being, metaphysics cannot sustain itself. Similarly, within being (essence) or the ontological ground of cognition, we need to develop the ground of becoming (existence) to account for how contingent things come into and go out of existence. Although it is beyond our understanding to know the inner working of divine cognition, we cannot ignore the necessity of such generation for providing a complete account of the existence of contingent things.\footnote{This kind of generation does not disappear in critical philosophy. The first Critique pursues the question of the origin of existence in purely speculative or transcendental-methodological terms, as the artifice (method) of human reason rather than that of the divine mind. Kant also discusses this issue in the Dialectic of teleological judgements in the third Critique.} His reduction of relational properties of substances to preestablished harmony among monadic properties constrains Leibniz’s dynamics to be based on “derivative force.”\footnote{In \textit{A Specimen of Dynamics}, Leibniz defines “primitive force” as “nothing but the first entelechy” which “corresponds to the soul or substantial form. But, for that reason, it pertains only to general causes, which are insufficient to explain the phenomena”; in contrast, “derivative force” results “from a limitation of primitive force through the collision of bodies with one another, for example, is found in different degrees” Leibniz [1675-1716] (1989), p. 119. In \textit{Against Barbaric Physics}, Leibniz defends his conception of dynamics based on "derivative force" against Newton: "It is permissible to recognize magnetic, elastic, and other sorts of forces, but only insofar as we understand that they are not primitive or incapable of being explained, but arise from motions and shapes. However, the new patrons of such things don’t want this... It pleased them to make the immediate inference that all matter essentially has a God-given and inherent attractive power and, as it were, mutual love, as if matter had senses, or as if a certain intelligence were given to each part of matter of remote thing" Leibniz [1675-1716] (1989), p. 313. Leibniz’s argument against the illusory “mutual love” among physical substances and Kant’s endorsement of Pope’s argument for “the love which maintains the whole” reveal how differently Leibniz and Kant account for the origin of relational properties.} For Kant, who embraces Newtonian physics and tries to ground it metaphysically, the reduction of dynamics of nature to a preestablished harmony among isolated substances is tantamount to its negation, and indicates a failure to account for the genetic necessity that produces and preserves nature as a self-standing dynamic community \textit{[commercium] of interactive substances. Relational properties of substances can be grounded only “by means of those determinations which attach to the origin of their existence” (PND 1:415). A genetic
interpretation of the principle of sufficient reason is needed in order to ground relational properties of substances. Kant’s appropriation of this Leibnizian principle in genetic terms deepens his differences with the rationalist tradition dominant in German metaphysics.

Kant argues against Leibnizian-Wolffian reduction of the principle of sufficient reason to the principle of contradiction. This reduction takes place primarily through eliminating the essential difference between the natures of necessity in each principle. The Leibnizian-Wolffian school is “convinced that that which is posited by the chain of grounds which hypothetically determine each other still falls a little short of complete necessity, because it lacks absolute necessity” (PND 1:400). By contrast, Kant holds that the difference between the hypothetical necessity and absolute necessity is a difference in kind rather than degree or the “effective power of necessity” (PND 1:400). The absoluteness grounding the principle of sufficient reason is the absolute ground of existence (becoming) rather than a merely logical one. That is to say, in Kant’s account, the principle of sufficient reason concerns the source or genetic ground rather than the force or efficient ground of metaphysical necessity. The absolute necessity in the principle of sufficient reason is a distinct metaphysical necessity that “hinges not upon to what extent but upon whence the necessary futurition of contingent things derives” (PND 1:400). Although Nova dilucidatio does not directly engage with Leibniz, Kant seems to have a passage from Theodicy in mind when he suggests that the distinction between absolute necessity and hypothetical necessity “does little to diminish the force of the necessity or certainty of the determination.... nothing can be conceived which is more determined than determined” (PND 1:400). From Kant’s standpoint, Leibniz’s passage in Theodicy reduces the distinction between the principle of contradiction and principle of sufficient reason to a merely
quantitative distinction, and thus overlooks the genetic character of the principle of sufficient reason and the nature of its absolute necessity.⁰¹⁵ In the reduction of the “antecedently determining” ground – “the reason why, or the ground of being or becoming” – to the “consequentially determining” ground – “the ground that, or the ground of knowing,” “one would indeed discover a great deal which was possible, but nothing at all which was true” since the ultimate source of reality – the genetic necessity of truth – is neglected (PND 1:392).

Kant locates the genetic necessity of metaphysical cognitions ultimately in God as “the source of all reality” or “the absolutely necessary principle of all possibility” (PND 1:396). This theological claim is distinct from the ontological proof of the existence of God in Anselm or Descartes, or Wolff’s extension of the principle of sufficient reason – and thus “a chain of grounds” – to God (PND 1:395). Kant remarks that “it is only the existence of contingent things which requires the support of a determining ground, ... the unique and

⁰¹⁵ In *Theodicy*, Leibniz writes: “I would not take ‘free’ and ‘indifferent’ for one and the same thing, and would not place ‘free’ and ‘determined’ in antithesis. One is never altogether indifferent with an indifference of equipoise; one is always more inclined and consequently more determined on one side than on other: but one is never necessitated to the choice that one makes. I mean here a necessity absolute and metaphysical” (1875-90) (1951), p. 206. Bold is added. Except *Theodicy* and a few other texts, many of Leibniz’s major writings – including *Discourse on Metaphysics* – were either unpublished or unavailable to Kant in the 1750s and 1760s.

⁰¹⁶ In the second section of Nova Dilucidatio, Kant also defends his genetic interpretation of the principle sufficient reason against Crusius’s categorical rejection of this principle. In Kant’s understanding, Crusius thinks that “certain existent things are determined by their actuality in such a way that it would be futile to demand anything else in addition...and, hence, that there is no need for a determining ground” (PND 1:397). Kant questions Crusius’s identification of the existence of a thing with its “thorough determination.” Since contingent things must necessarily include an element that accounts for their passing from non-existence to existence, “without an antecedently determining ground, there can be no kind of determination of a being, which is conceived of as having come into being; and hence, there can be no existence” (PND 1:397). The existence of a contingent thing involves certain relational properties which cannot be grounded merely in terms of the monadic properties contained in the thing itself in isolation from other things; hence the need to account for the genetic necessity that brings a contingent thing into existence. In response to Crusius’s claim that any version of the principle of sufficient reason does nothing but “impairing all freedom and morality” (PND 1: 399), Kant uses Pope’s notion of “self-love,” “the spring of motion” (Pope [1734] (1999), p. 14), to argue that “at any given juncture, the series of interconnected grounds furnishes motives for the performance of the action which are equally attractive in both directions: you readily adopted one of them because acting thus rather than otherwise was more pleasurable to you” (PND 1:402).
absolutely necessary Being is exempt from this law” (PND 1:396). The primary function of Kant’s appeal to God is the latter’s presentation as the source from which the necessity of contingent things, the accidents of fate, originates. As the absolutely necessary origin of all reality, God supplies the absolute harmonious non-relational ground for relational (contingent) properties of physical substances, or things, which cannot be accounted for in terms of monadic properties and preestablished harmony. The invocation of God as the complete real givenness, “the Creator ... the well or bubbling spring from which all things flow with infallible necessity down an inclined channel” (PND 1:403), is “based on essence” or “the possibility itself of things” (PND 1:395). For things to be thinkable as limited realities – in regard to their relational properties –, they must originate from the most real being.¹⁵² Divine reality is the absolute necessity that genetically grounds all possibility.¹⁵³ Without such genetic grounding, possibilities lack an internal necessity. Although Kant finds “no room for a genetic proof” of the existence of God in Nova Dilucidatio, he thinks that he has shown the direction of such proof for the existence of God as the origin of existence of things which “is based upon a most fundamental consideration, namely, the possibility itself of things” (PND 1:395). Kant’s invocation of a proof for the existence of

¹⁵² Kant develops this argument more comprehensively as a support for a genetic proof in The Only Possible Argument (1763). The proof is reiterated in Inaugural Dissertation (MSI 2:407-8). The first Critique regards the proof as dialectical as it is not originally mediated through the methodological apodicticity of pure reason (KrV A578-582/B606-611). Without an apodictic methodological ground, the proof falls into dialectical errors as it extends the logic of the sensible to the supersensible. A critical version of the proof is elaborated in Kant’s later essay on the pantheism controversy (WDO 8:138). This proof presupposes the discipline of pure reason as the absolute positing underlying reason’s claim with regard to possible existence of objects. This proof is based on the need of reason to make presuppositions with regard to the supersensible and is justified in critical-methodological terms.

¹⁵³ The idea of absolute necessitation or positing of the possibility of existence remains foundational to critical philosophy. The critical version of this idea replaces the real necessity of God with the methodological apodicticity of purely speculative reason – the necessity of reason’s faith/belief or pure conviction – in the human being.
God is only meant to affirm the necessity of his being as the ground of knowledge. It does not lay any claims on how God brings things into existence.154

In his last revisionary methodological step in *Nova Dilucidatio*, Kant uses his genetic interpretation of the principle of sufficient reason and its deduction from God to develop his own version of physical influx theory. He works out two new, although not fundamental, metaphysical principles: succession and coexistence. These principles, particularly the latter, further distinguish Kant's account of relational properties from Leibnizian-Wolffian preestablished harmony, Malebranche's occasionalism, and what Kant calls "the popular system of physical influence" (PND 1:416). Preestablished and occasional causations deny substances' "reciprocal dependency on each other," and favour an a priori or occasional "agreement" among them (PND 1:415). The popular system of physical influence conceals the genetic metaphysical ground of reciprocal dependency, and explains influence merely in terms of physical relation. On the contrary, the principle of coexistence

---

154 One point here is of particular importance for Kant's approach to the question of the existence of God in the first *Critique* as well as the development of his critical methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics. Kant does not speak of the absolute necessity of God's existence as the immediate determining ground of things: "For although essences (which consist in inner possibility) are ordinarily called absolutely necessary, nonetheless, it would be more correct to say that they belong to things absolutely necessarily" (PND 1:395). The adverbial distinction between what absolutely necessarily belongs to a thing and the absolute necessity of God separates things from God. This is one of the first indications of what emerges in the first *Critique* as the immanent modal-methodological apodicticity of pure reason in all things. Kant modalizes existence in order to ground it a priori. Also in his *Attempt to Introduce the Concept of Negative Magnitude in Philosophy*, published seven years after *Nova Dilucidatio*, Kant shows the need for incorporating becoming into our understanding of existence. Kant's concept of the negative implies a certain separation from the extant and implies Kant's precritical conception of modality in its most developed form in *The Only Possible Argument*. Kant writes: "every passing-away is a negative coming-to-be. In other words, for something positive which exists to be cancelled, it is just as necessary that there should be a true real ground as it is necessary that a true real ground should exist in order to bring it into existence when it does not already exist" (NG 2:190). Kant discusses a flame as an example: "the continued existence of a flame is not the continuation of a motion, which already exists, but rather the constant generation of new motions of other combustible particles of vapour. The flame's ceasing to exist is, accordingly, not the cancellation of an actual motion, but the lack of new motions and the absence of several separations, for their cause is missing, namely the continued feeding of the fire" (NG 2:192-3). In chapter four, I discuss how Kant's treatment of the question of the existence of God functions as a medium through which he develops his critical conception of modality in the first *Critique*. 
“reveals the origin itself of the reciprocal connection of things; and this origin is sought outside the principle of substances, considered as existing in isolation” (PND 1:416). No substance can determine relational properties of other substances internally. The principle of coexistence suggests that there must be a harmonious ground for intersubstantial causation in general which ultimately originates from and is genetically maintained through the divine understanding.155 The coordinating or harmonizing role of “the divine schema of understanding” as the absolute necessary genetic ground for reciprocal interaction of substances distinguishes Kant’s theory of physical influx from its earlier versions in eighteenth century German philosophy, particularly in Gottsched, Knutzen, and Crusius:156

The schema of the divine understanding, the origin of existences, is an enduring act (it is called preservation); and in this act, if any substances are conceived by God as existing in isolation and without any relational determinations, no connection between them and no reciprocal relation would come into being. If, however, they are conceived as related [Latin respective or German Beziehung] in God’s intelligence, their determinations would subsequently, in conformity with this idea, always relate to each other for as long as they continued to exist. That is to say, they would act and react; and the individual substances would have a certain external state. But if you abandoned this principle, no such state could exist in virtue of their existence alone. (PND 1:414)157

Kant completes his precritical attempt to recast and remedy the problem of metaphysics in genetic terms with elaboration of his thoughts on the absolute genetic

---

155 In Metaphysik Herder, his earliest remaining lecture notes from 1862-3, Kant follows Baumgarten’s definition of the world to develop his notion of community of interactive substances into the notion of world as a real whole: “The world is a real whole <totum reale>: all things in it stand in real connection <in nexus realis>” (V-Met/Herder 28:39). The world is grounded in God: “no substance can contain the ground of the accident of the other .... God is the ground. If two substances are in interaction <in commercio>, the two depend on a third, so their powers are harmonious with substance which is the ground of both, and has willed a connection <nexus>” (V-Met/Herder 28:52). For a more detailed discussion of Baumgarten’s definition of the world, see Baumgarten [1739] (2009), pp. 104-109.


157 Kant keeps some key aspects of this model of genetic grounding in critical philosophy. In its primary sense, critique is the enduring act of self-preservation – the self-formative discipline – of pure reason. In a necessary analogy with God, pure reason conceives schemata of existence in the transcendental doctrine of method.
necessity of God in *The Only Possible Argument* (1763). The argument for the existence of God, which is presented briefly in *Nova Dilucidatio*, is further developed in this work, even though in strict terms Kant does not demonstrate the existence of God. He only presents a modest argument [*Beweisgrund*] in support of such demonstration. This presentation focuses on “the method of using natural science to attain cognition of God” (BDG 2:68). Kant claims that his argument is “derived from the internal characteristic mark of absolute necessity” and “is thus acquired in a genuinely genetic fashion” (BDG 2:91). A genetic account of possibility of things leads us to God as the most real being [*ens realissimum*] or absolutely necessary origin.\(^{158}\) Kant discusses physico-theological, cosmological, and ontological arguments for the existence of God after presenting his own argument, or proof-ground [*Beweisgrund*]. He describes the physico-theological and ontological arguments not as “proofs which simply lack proper rigour” but as claims that “prove nothing at all.”\(^{159}\) The cosmological argument, Kant holds, is “at once powerful and very beautiful” but “it is incapable of the rigour required of a demonstration” (BDG 2:162). According to Kant, what is completely missing in all of these arguments for the existence of God is the appreciation of the absolute necessity of God as the necessary ground of existence, which must be presupposed as the internal possibility of existence in general. In Kant’s account, existence is not a real predicate; rather it is “the absolute positing of a thing”

\(^{158}\) In *The Only Possible Argument*, Kant’s engagement with the question of origin is not limited to metaphysics. He also extensively addresses the question of origin of organic products in nature in the context of his account of physico-theology. Kant’s text shows his engagement with major theories of generation, such as Buffon’s and Maupertuis’, on the origin of products of nature. Genetic questions are of particular significance at multiple levels in most precritical texts. These questions become thematic and acquire such significance in Kant’s philosophy primarily in light of a metaphysics of creation which Kant inherits from medieval scholasticism.

\(^{159}\) For a discussion of Maupertuis’s influence on Kant’s revision of the physico-theological argument, see Zammito (2006), pp. 337-346. A detailed account of Kant’s reconstruction of the ontological argument can be found in Schönfeld (2000), pp. 197-208.
that depends on God as an absolutely necessary existing ground (BDG 2:73). God functions as the most real being that genetically grounds all determinations of things in the world. God is the absolutely necessary ground in terms of which possibility and reality become intelligible, although Kant does not claim any human insight into God’s creation. In critical philosophy, Kant attributes this absolute grounding to the discipline of pure reason, which refers to God in terms of the original loss of human reason.160

1.2 Toward a critical-methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics

1.2.1 The need to limit the analogical use of reason

Despite Kant’s attempt to ground physical things in the absolute genetic necessity of God, the problem of metaphysics as a self-standing system of pure reason remains unaddressed. Lacking its own method, metaphysics cannot properly mediate the connection between the sensible and the supersensible. Metaphysics still operates in analogy with the physical realm, and analogical reasoning can introduce physical influences into the metaphysical realm, engendering arbitrary metaphysical postulates and leading to fantastical conclusions with regard to the supersensible. Even in his 1763 prize essay, the most elaborate precritical text on the distinction between mathematical and metaphysical methods of cognitions of pure reason, Kant fails to address the risks and pitfalls of analogical reasoning, or to articulate the distinct nature of the special method of metaphysics. How can physical things be reliably grounded in the absolute necessity of God, if one cannot be assured of the necessity of analogical reasoning itself – the necessity

160 Here I refer only to the genetic character of Kant’s argument for the existence of God. Chapter four discusses the significance of the modal character of this argument. The idea of existence as the absolute positing of things, which is formulated in 1763, is central to critical philosophy. In critical philosophy, Kant approaches this thesis in a critical framework. As it turns out, only through introducing the distinction between things in themselves and appearance can Kant speak of simultaneously modal and genetic grounding of objects. In its critical sense, the absolute positing of things is the negative-apodictic-modality of pure reason, the transcendental-speculative boundary-determination of pure reason.
of connection between the sensible and the supersensible? Physical objects need to be grounded apodictically rather than through arbitrary (hypothetical or problematic) analogy. An apodictic grounding of objects in God, however, cannot be direct. A direct grounding is inevitably self-undermining since it leads to an infinite regress in physical series. An apodictic grounding requires the methodological formation or delimitation of a field that mediates – i.e., separates really and connects modally-apodictically – the sensible and the supersensible. The distance between metaphysics and God has to be articulated in a manner to form a self-standing and purely speculative home for human reason. The formation of this field – where the disciplinary logic of pure reason or the criterion for the reliable use of reason (what Kant later calls a critique of pure reason) is to be established – prevents reason from the naturalistic projection of physical existence onto God or direct invocation of God for explanation of physical phenomenon.\footnote{Here Kant’s search for a disciplinary logic or criterion starts to differentiate from his precritical use of the term “transcendental.” In his precritical text, Kant’s use of “transcendental” is more or less indistinguishable from his use of “transcendent.” For a discussion of the place of concept of “transcendental” in Kant’s early works, see Hinske (1970), pp. 40-77. As chapter two demonstrates, this conception of critique – as the immanent methodological (purely speculative) criterion of metaphysical judgements of pure reason – should not be understood in terms of rule-following procedures. The necessary (transcendental-speculative) criterion of pure reason is a self-enactment. In its primary sense as self-enactment, critique is its application. As Kant later argues, critique is primarily the apodictic method of purely speculative reason which is directed at pure reason itself rather than what may objectively correspond to it. It is pure reason itself that supplies the criterion for reliable use of reason. Arguing against dogmatic-assertive methods (Epicurean, Spinozistic, hylozoistic, and theistic) of grounding the purposiveness of nature, Kant later writes: “in most speculative matters of pure reason the philosophical schools have usually tried all of the solutions that are possible for a certain question concerning dogmatic assertions. Thus for the sake of the purposiveness of nature either lifeless matter or a lifeless God as well as living matter or a living God have been tried. Nothing is left for us except, if need be, to give up all these objective assertions and to weigh our judgement critically, merely in relation [Beziehung] to our cognitive faculty, in order to provide its principle with the non-dogmatic but adequate validity of a maxim for the reliable use of reason” (KU 5:392). Kant criticizes these positions even earlier, in his 1783-84 Lectures on the Philosophical Doctrine of Religion, see (V-Phil-Th/Pölitz 28:993-1004). As I discuss in chapter two, in the first Critique, pure reason internalizes the original loss or absence of God in objective terms in the transcendental dialectic as the apodictic modalty of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method. This apodictic modality is the transcendental criterion or purely speculative boundaries of pure reason.}
In his 1766 treatise on the works of the religious enthusiast Swedenborg, *Dreams of a Spirit-seer*, Kant acknowledges the failure of previous attempts, including his own, to address the problem of metaphysics through analogy. The analogical method of reasoning by itself lacks absolute necessity, and can make up empty metaphysical semblances similar to the dreams of a mentally sick person.\(^{162}\) Kant implies an appreciation of the indispensable need to purify the mind\(^{163}\) and set apart arbitrary (illegitimate) and necessary (legitimate) uses of analogical reasoning in metaphysics.\(^{164}\) Methodological

---

\(^{162}\) Kant’s appreciation of the need for a unique method of metaphysics is evident in a title – *The Proper Method of Metaphysics* – that the publisher advertised in the 1765 official catalog of the Leibzig book fair even though Kant had only expressed some general intention to write a book with this title. Kant expressed his dissatisfaction with the publisher’s hasty advertisement of his intention as a real book.

\(^{163}\) Kant’s discussion of the need for purification of the mind through a criterion or method that tells apart arbitrary and necessary uses of reason is under the influence of *Medicina mentis*. Also called *spiritual physicke or cultura animi*, *Medicina mentis* is a theme widely used by physicians, theologians, and philosophers at the turn of the sixteenth century to refer to the cultivation, discipline, and healing of the embodied mind. Francis Bacon is a major figure in introducing *Medicina mentis* as a methodical program to increase wealth and to improve health in human beings through an understanding of natural processes, including those in the human mind. Many philosophers use *Medicina mentis* to develop their logic in response to what they regard as the pathological or therapeutic affects of passion on the mind. Two years prior to publication of his book on Swedenborg, Kant anonymously publishes “Essay on the Maladies [Krankheiten] of the Head” in a local journal. The essay provides a taxonomy of mental illnesses, and argues for a “purification” that “thoroughly and quietly purge[s] of the ill without disturbing the common essence [Gemeinwesen]” of the mind (VKK 2:271). In his treatment of the question of mental illness, Kant engages with the question of limits of the mind. The themes of the limits of mind and madness become more explicit in *Dreams of a Spirit-Seer* where Kant locates the problem of madness in the absence of limit to the function of the understanding in imagination. In a passage anticipating his critical turn, Kant acknowledges that the limit to the understanding is itself a fiction. It takes another fifteen years for Kant to work out how this fiction is a *single necessary* one (a transcendental testimony, pure conviction, or reason’s faith/belief) belonging to pure reason rather than imagination. In the meantime, Kant argues for a negative pneumatology: “But even the possibility of such negations is based on neither experience, nor on inferences, but on a fiction, in which reason, stripped of all assistance whatever, seeks its refuge. On this basis, the pneumatology of man can be called a theory of necessary ignorance in respect of a type of being which is supposed to exist; as such it is quite adequate to its task” (TG 2:352). After his critical turn, Kant recurrently speaks of the health of pure reason, and defines critique as purification of the common concept of human reason from dialectical errors. Critique is a transcendental version of *Medicina mentis*, a necessary methodological provision or pre-scription for healthy reason. The modal-apodictic pre-scription of pure reason is the transcendental-speculative ground for its relational-objective inscription. In chapter two, I discuss how a critical version of *Medicina mentis* is in play in the genetic structure of pure reason in the first *Critique*. For a reading of Kant’s *Essay on the Maladies of the Head* from aesthetic and moral perspectives, see David-Ménard (2000) & Ross (2000). These papers, however, do not discuss Kant’s essay in relation to *Medicina mentis* in the tradition of early modern logic.

\(^{164}\) As Kant notes in *Jäsche Logic*, analogy is a mode of inference of the power of judgement, which does not yield necessity. It is a judgement that infers “from many determinations and properties, in which things of one kind agree, to the remaining one insofar as they belong to the same principle” (Log 9:132); “analogy extends the given properties of one thing to several [other properties] of the very same thing” (Log 9:133).
grounding – the systematic grounding of all uses of reason in the absolutely apodictic (universal) use of reason – requires a criterion for such distinction. Without such a criterion or measure to distinguish the necessary and arbitrary uses of reason, even the argument for the absolute genetic necessity of God as the most real being remains unreliable.

To address the issue of analogical reasoning, Kant identifies two “advantages” of metaphysics: the natural spontaneity of “reason to spy after the more hidden properties of things” (TG 2:367); and the “limit[ation] of human reason” with regard to such spontaneity (TG 2:368). By itself, the natural spontaneity of pure reason lacks a clear criterion to distinguish between arbitrary and necessary postulates with regard to the supersensible ground of things. It can unjustifiably postulate spiritual beings in nature. That is why in the natural pursuit of knowledge by pure reason, “satisfaction has escaped our eager grasp” and metaphysics has recurrently fallen into illusion (TG 2:367). The antidote to illegitimate excesses of natural spontaneity of pure reason comes from “the second advantage” “the least known” but “the most important” and “more consonant with the nature of the human understanding” (TG 2:367). The second advantage holds the scientific or systematic character of metaphysics: “[M]etaphysics is a science of the limits of human reason” (TG 2:368). The limitation of human reason determines the criterion according to which the natural spontaneity of reason can avoid arbitrary analogical reasoning and operate

---

165 In the first Critique, Kant explains the historical-philosophical acquisition of such self-consciousness of pure reason (the second advantage) in terms of a methodological shift from rationalist dogmatism to empiricist skepticism and ultimately to critical philosophy. In this sense, Kant provides a philosophical history of pure reason in terms of its awareness of the apodictic boundaries – the ground or form of spontaneity – of pure reason. I consider Kant’s passage in this 1766 text as the earliest indication of the beginning of critical philosophy, in which Kant explicitly speaks of his new critical project. In this sense, Dreams of a Spirit-seer exemplifies the simultaneity of Kant’s disillusionment with traditional metaphysics and the emergence of critique. This simultaneity is not merely at the personal level for Kant. As I discuss in chapter two, it plays itself out in systematic terms in the structure of the first Critique.
apodictically. If reason can be limited in terms of its most essential characteristic (the absolutely necessary limitations for satisfying the natural spontaneity of pure reason), analogical reasoning can be protected against arbitrary and fantastic constructs or illegitimate metaphysical postulates. In other words, there can be no thought without the universal criterion of reason that limits itself.\textsuperscript{166} Inventions of thought must be a priori corrected or disciplined according to the universal criterion of reason. Inventions presuppose prevention. Making no distinction between the propaedeutic methodological science – i.e., the systematic ground of metaphysics – and metaphysics proper, Kant still identifies the limitation of reason with metaphysics proper. Yet, the idea of limitation of reason as the primary character of reason is a major step toward articulating the distinctness between the critical method of metaphysics and metaphysics proper.\textsuperscript{167}

1.2.2 The development of the critical method in precritical years

Kant shows a deeper appreciation of the crucial significance of the question of the method of metaphysics four years after Dreams of a Spirit-seer in his Inaugural Dissertation, where

\textsuperscript{166} At this point, Kant has not developed his critical distinction between “limits” [Schranken] and “boundaries” [Grenzen] either. Kant explains this distinction in the first Critique (KrV A761–789). In Prolegomena, he also opposes his critical notion of boundary with Hume's psychological-empirical notion of limits: “Boundaries (in extended things) always presuppose a space that is found outside a certain fixed locations, and that encloses the location; limits require nothing of the kind, but are mere negations that affect a magnitude insofar as it does not possess absolute completeness. Our reason, however, sees around itself as it were a space for the cognition of things in themselves, although it can never have determinate concepts of those things and is limited to appearances alone” (Prol 4:353).

\textsuperscript{167} Contrary to many readings of Dreams of a Spirit-Seer, this text does not demonstrate Kant's disillusionment with metaphysics as such. Kant does not seem to have any major reservation about the necessity and essential significance of metaphysics, even after his break with traditional metaphysics. In a letter to Lambert on December 31, 1765, Kant writes: "All of my endeavours are directed mainly at the proper method of metaphysics and thereby also the proper method for philosophy as a whole" (Br 10:65). Similarly, in a letter to Mendelssohn, at the time of publication of Dreams of a Spirit-Seer, on April 8, 1766, Kant notes: "I am far from regarding metaphysics itself, objectively considered, to be trivial or dispensable; in fact I have been convinced for some time now that I understand its nature and proper place among the disciplines of human knowledge and that the true and lasting welfare of the human race depends on metaphysics – an appraisal that would seem fantastic and audacious to anyone but you. It befits brilliant men such as you to create a new epoch in this science, to begin completely afresh, to draw up the plans for this heretofore haphazardly constructed discipline with a master's hand" (Br 10:70).
he takes up his earlier suggestion for grounding metaphysical cognitions of the physical world in terms of the limits of human reason. Moving in a critical direction, Kant examines “the two-fold genesis of the concept [of the world in general] out of the nature of the mind” in order “to secure a deeper insight into the method of metaphysics” (MSI 2:387). The a priori derivation of the method of metaphysics from “the natural character of reason alone” is a reliable ground for our cognitions since it is immune to any influence from the physical realm, ensures “the right use of reason,” and thus prevents analogical use of reason from falling into “the metaphysical fallacy of subreption” (MSI 2:411).\footnote{Prefiguring Kant’s idea of dialectical error in the first Critique, fallacies of subreption are “the illusions of the understanding ... by the covert misuse of [a] sensitive concept, which is employed as if it were a characteristic mark deriving from the understanding” (MSI 2:412). They misrepresent what stems from the physical as metaphysical. In Dreams of a Spirit-Seer, Kant generally locates illusions as entities of imagination. Inaugural Dissertation takes a step further to outline the general mechanism that gives rise to illusions. A full systematic account of the significance of illusion for the health of pure reason has to wait another decade or so to be worked out in the transcendental dialectic of the first Critique.} The separation of the sensible and the supersensible through such method, the determination of “the laws of reason” – “the fundamental concepts of things and of relations, and the axioms themselves” that “are given in a fundamental fashion by the pure understanding itself” – is supposed to immunize metaphysics against subreptive fallacies (MSI 2:411).\footnote{In Inaugural Dissertation and in the first Critique, Kant sometimes uses “understanding” to refer to “reason.” In the quoted passage, Kant also uses “axiom” in the sense of “principle.” In the transcendental doctrine of method in the first Critique, “axiom” and “principle” are used respectively for mathematical and metaphysical cognitions.} Metaphysics must rely on a method, or a propaedeutic science, to prepare its material, to self-generate (self-give) its objects or matter prior to any use. In natural science and mathematics, “use gives the method” (MSI 2:410) whereas in scientific metaphysics “method precedes all science” (MSI 2:411).\footnote{It is on this critical point – the primacy of method of metaphysics over the science of metaphysics proper – that Hegel disagrees with Kant. This is central to Hegel’s criticism of Kant’s transcendental philosophy on a number of different issues. In Encyclopaedia Logic, Hegel writes: “the investigation of cognition cannot take place in any other way than cognitively.” Arguing against Kant’s claim on the non-cognitive nature of the}
forms its objects – a method through which pure reason gives itself its matter as it forms itself –, metaphysics cannot be reliable as a science. Reason runs the risk of mistaking its logical use with its real use since it lets “the illusions of sensitive cognitions ... masquerade under the guise of cognitions of the understanding” (MSI 2:413) and import analogues borrowed from the physical realm into metaphysical realm.\(^{171}\) That is how the virtual presence of God in the world is confused with a physical-local presence (MSI 2:414). To avoid such illusions, a reliable a priori criterion – a transcendental critique – for distinguishing the logical and real uses of reason must be devised.

To prevent subreptive fallacies of pure reason, we need a “propaedeutic science,” a preparatory methodological ground for metaphysics, “which teaches the distinction between sensitive cognition and the cognition which derives from the understanding” (MSI 2:395), between the sensible and supersensible sources of cognition in the human mind.\(^{172}\) The concepts of understanding are “acquired concepts” rather than “innate concepts” (MSI 2:395). Elaborating the propaedeutic science of reason, Kant also speaks of an “elenctic” or “a negative use” that preserves reason “from the contagion of errors” (MSI 2:395) and critical method, Hegel describes critique as “the mistaken project of wanting to have cognition before we have any cognition” Hegel [1830] (1991), pp. 34 & 82. Hegel also discusses this issue in Science of Logic in a section titled “With what must the science begin?” Hegel [1812-16] (1969), pp. 67-78. Excluding analogy from his dialectical methodology, Hegel does not seem to see how the critical method can be at once immanent to and separate from cognitions. By contrast, Kant’s use of analogy allows the transcendental to be both immanent and irreducible to cognitions. Despite significant differences between Kant and Hegel, we should avoid presenting them in terms of a facile opposition, as some Hegelians and many Kantians do. The affinities between Kant and Hegel are sometimes concealed as they mean very different things by the same terms. For instance, in the passages above, in contrast to Kant, Hegel uses terms such as “cognition” and “cognitive” in a sense that includes what Kant considers to be the method of cognition.

\(^{171}\) The “logical use of the understanding” is “the use by which we simply subordinate cognitions to one another.” The “real” use of the understanding is that in which “the fundamental concepts of things and of relations, and the axioms themselves, are given in a fundamental fashion by the pure understanding itself” (MSI 2:411).

\(^{172}\) Later in the first Critique, Kant suggests that the critical method of pure reason – which separates the sensible and the supersensible in real terms and connects them in modal-apodictic terms – is in essence un-teachable. Thinking cannot be taught. It can only be originally acquired.
obtains a dogmatic form that applies to "the general principles of the pure understanding, such as are displayed in ontology or in rational psychology" (MSI 2:395). Roughly speaking, the distinction between the negative use and positive use of reason is the original form of the later critical distinction between the transcendental doctrine of method and the transcendental doctrine of elements, a methodological-speculative sense of critique and a relational-objective sense of critique.\footnote{More precisely, the negative use of reason in \textit{Inaugural Dissertation} is among early formulations of what becomes the discipline of pure reason in the first \textit{Critique}. The negative use of pure reason is self-directed, i.e., at once directed at and by reason. Through this self-directed dynamic, critical reason outdoes itself, i.e., lives.} Despite these insights, Kant does not elaborate the method of metaphysics – how the distinction between the sensible and the supersensible in cognition is mediated, how this distinction becomes the genetic ground for all other distinctions within the dogmatic cognitions of pure reason. In \textit{Inaugural Dissertation}, Kant remains committed to a cognition grounded in things in themselves. He also has “neither the intention nor the opportunity of discoursing ... on such a distinguished and extensive theme” (MSI 2:411). Only in the last section and in passing does he describe three species of subreptive illusion in which sensitive cognitions present themselves under the guise of cognitions of the understanding. The systematic origin and nature of these subreptive illusions remains undetected or unaddressed, and metaphysics remains without a systematic method. Kant’s systematic examination of subreptive illusions has to wait another ten years or so to be taken up in the transcendental dialectic.

Without being named as such, the question of the method of metaphysics resurfaces two years later, in a letter to Herz, on February 21, 1772. The separation of the sensible and the supersensible in \textit{Inaugural Dissertation} brings about a new question that Kant concedes to have “silently passed over” (Br 10:131): how can intellectual representations in
metaphysics be applicable to the physical world a priori? Kant asks: “What is the ground of the relation [Beziehung] of that in us we call ‘representation’ to the object?” (Br 10:130); “if such intellectual representations depend on our inner activity, whence comes the agreement that they are supposed to have with objects – objects that are nevertheless not possibly produced thereby?” (Br 10:131).\(^1\) Constituting “the key [Schlüssel] to the whole secret of metaphysics, hitherto still hidden from itself” (Br 10:130), this question ultimately leads Kant to the discovery of the critical method.\(^2\) The letter rules out two possible explanations of the source of agreement or conformity between the representation and the object: “intellectus ectypus” and “intellectus archetypus.” In the former, the intellect “would derive the data of its logical procedure from the sensuous intuition of things,” and the object causes representation as its effect. This a posteriori account cannot explain the a priori conformity in metaphysical cognitions. In the latter, the intellect’s “intuition is itself the ground of things” and the object is “created by the representation (as when divine cognitions are conceived as the archetypes of things)” (Br 10:130). Such creative power, however, is beyond human cognition. Thus, the a priori “conformity” between the

---

174 In the first Critique, Kant uses three terms to denote “relation”: Verhältnis, Beziehung, and Relation with the following connotations. Verhältnis connotes a relation in which neither side is the origin of the other. The givenness of the other side is just presupposed. Verhältnis is usually used for relation among objects of sensibility within pure forms of intuition, or objects of thought under the concepts of understanding. Beziehung connotes a relation in which one side is the origin or a priori condition of the other. It is in a sense a non-relational relation, and is often used to describe the relation between the methodological-subjective condition of thinking (the rational-speculative whole of cognition) and objects, or the relation between the sensible-subjective condition of intuiting (the intuitive whole of time and space) and objects. In other words, Verhältnis involves an unavoidable reciprocity (inter) whereas Beziehung contains one-directional generation or internal conditioning (intra). The Latin Relation is occasionally used as one of the headings in the tables of judgements and categories. Kant is not always strict in his use of these terms. They can also be used in a posteriori and a priori senses, and may involve some overlaps. In order to avoid further complication, I use “relation” in the sense of Verhältnis, presupposing the givenness of the other side(s) and its (their) reciprocity. The use of “relation” in the sense of Beziehung will either be associated with its German equivalent or be explicitly qualified as a modal or non-relational relation.

175 The etymological connection between Schlußel (key) and Schluf (end or conclusion) happens to indicate the ultimately genetic significance of the critical method or the key to the whole secret of metaphysics.
representation and the object cannot be explained in terms of either sensible or intellectual intuition. There must be a way that reason can generate (form) a priori – as distinct from being empirically given or divinely created – the matter of its cognition, and be internally related [beziehen] to possible objects regardless of their existence or non-existence.

In the letter, Kant does not explicitly equate this task with the method of metaphysics. His direct exclusion of a mathematical method of determining objects, nonetheless, indicates that his search for a methodological remedy for the a priori conformity of representation and the object in metaphysical cognitions. Kant reiterates his earlier position that mathematics represents objects quantitatively, and as a result its representations are in a priori conformity with the object.\textsuperscript{176} Metaphysics, however, contains “relationships involving qualities,” and cannot rely on “the concepts of the quantities” (Br 10:131).\textsuperscript{177}

The question remains: how can reason generate a priori concepts of qualities (things) – i.e., systematically form or gives itself the matter of its cognition a priori in order to represent objects – without presupposing their empirical givenness in sense? Kant’s response to this question is primarily in terms of the critical methodology of pure reason.

1.3 The critical-methodological remedy and its presentation

1.3.1 The critical remedy to the problem of metaphysics

It takes Kant almost ten years to develop his critical-methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics, in particular to the question he originally raises in the 1772 letter to Herz.

\textsuperscript{176} Many interpreters characterize the letter to Herz as a strong indication of Kant’s critical turn, heedless of his search for the methodological grounding, or transcendental-speculative origin, of the a priori relation between pure concepts of understanding and objects. The critical turn is first and foremost genetic-methodological and concerns pure reason rather than the understanding proper.

\textsuperscript{177} Kant develops this contrast methodologically in the transcendental doctrine of method in the first \textit{Critique} (KrV A714-723/B742-751).
Herz. As it turns out, the “key to the whole secret of metaphysics,” “the ground of the relation [Beziehung] of that in us we call ‘representation’ to the object” (Br 10:130), is ultimately the critical method of pure reason. This method is essentially the self-enactment of pure reason which internally blocks pure reason’s objective-relational extension into the supersensible, prevents the dialectical concealment of the unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible, generates pure reason as a whole or system of possible ends, and thus supplies a negative-modal-apodictic ground in terms of which representation and the object are a priori related. The thing in itself cannot be the
immediate ground of metaphysical cognition of the object; such ground must be generated critically-methodologically, i.e., through constant negative-modal-apodictic self-enactment of pure reason. The representation of the object is in essence pure reason’s self-enactment (self-presentation), which grounds the object purely speculatively, as a possible end within an organic system of possible ends, as something that can be cognized as an object. This necessary methodological ground or organic system is presupposed throughout the transcendental logic, in the operation of the understanding to constitute sensible objects in the transcendental analytic and to relate to supersensible objects in the transcendental dialectic.180

1.3.2 The presentation of the critical-methodological remedy in the first Critique

Despite the ground-breaking character of Kant’s critical-methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics, the first Critique presents it in a manner that tends to obscure its methodological nature.

The order of presentation in the first Critique defers the discussion of the critical method of pure reason to the end. This order aims to reveal the a priori conditions of metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects regressively, from the conditioned to
conditions. Accordingly, the critical method of pure reason, which enacts the purely speculative systematicity of metaphysical cognition of sensible objects, is presented after the givenness of objects in the transcendental aesthetic, their schematization in the transcendental analytic, and the illusory completeness of their metaphysical cognition in the transcendental dialectic.

The obscurity in Kant’s discussion of the crucial function of the critical method, however, cannot be simply attributed to the order of presentation in the first Critique. To be sure, this order complicates the presentation of the first Critique. Yet, it is not the source of obscurity with regard to the fundamental role of the critical method in the systematic grounding of the transcendental elements of pure reason. The order, Kant emphasizes, only mirrors the natural or customary life of pure reason (KrV A5). Kant’s exposition is obscure largely due to the manner this order is implemented. Kant does not systematically address methodological questions as he proceeds in each section. It is not fully clear how each section, each condition, requires and leads to a more fundamental one.\footnote{An outline of how the critical methodological grounding of reason is disguised in the transcendental aesthetic, transcendental analytic, and transcendental dialectic can be found in the introduction above.} The reader has to struggle to find that the critical method is \textit{at once} the denial of metaphysical cognition of supersensible objects – the constant separation of the sensible and the supersensible in real terms – \textit{and} the generation of the immanent systematic logic of metaphysical cognition of sensible objects – the constant connecting of the sensible and the supersensible in modal-apodictic terms. The structural simultaneity of the disruption and formation of pure reason in its critical method is not explained.

Two passages from the opening sections of the two major parts of the transcendental logic, the transcendental analytic and transcendental dialectic, exemplify
how the critical methodological grounding of pure reason is implied and yet buried or displaced in Kant’s exposition prior to the transcendental doctrine of method. Kant’s own explanation in Prolegomena, that he follows a synthetic method of instruction in his presentation – i.e., a method that proves the truth that we already know rather than a method of discovering the truth that we do not know – only confirms the hidden presence of the critical method of pure reason throughout the transcendental doctrine of elements (Prol 4:263). Kant, nevertheless, does not clearly acknowledge the necessity of such presence and its appearance in retrospection.

The first instance takes place in the opening passage of section 14 of the first Critique, titled: “Transition to the transcendental deduction of the categories.” Apparently written with an eye on his February 21, 1772 letter to Herz, Kant presents the critical remedy to the question raised in his letter, without making its negative methodological nature explicit:

There are only two possible cases in which synthetic representation and its objects can come together, necessarily relate to [beziehen] each other, and, as it were, meet each other: Either if the object alone makes the representation possible, or if the representation alone makes the object possible. If it is the first, then this relation [Beziehung] is only empirical, and the representation is never possible a priori. And this is the case with appearance in respect of that in it which belongs to sensation. But if it is the second, then since representation in itself (for we are not here talking about its causality by means of the will) does not produce its object as far as its existence is concerned, the representation is still determination of the object a priori if it is possible through it alone to cognize something as an object. But there are two conditions under which alone the cognition of object is possible: first, intuition, through which it is given, but only as appearance; second, concept, through which an object is thought that corresponds to this intuition. (KrV A92/B124-5)

In this passage, Kant replaces the second case in the letter to Herz, the divine creation of objects, with “representation in itself.” This replacement is primarily a methodological shift, from grounding metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects in things in themselves to
grounding them in the modal-apodictic character of human reason. In the passage, Kant passes over the revolutionary character of his methodological shift, and does not explain the foundational role of the critical method as the a priori ground (origin or whole) of relation to objects. Representation in itself performs critically-methodologically (purely speculatively) that which God’s creation does intellectually-intuitively. It “alone makes the object possible” rather than creating the object or what Kant calls “its causality by means of the will.” Although Kant does not tell the reader where representation in itself comes from and how it alone – regardless of the existence or non-existence of the object – makes the object possible, the passage indirectly points to his methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics.

Kant unequivocally rules out both the divine guarantee and the empirical correspondence between the representation and its object. He also excludes an explanation in terms of the logical functions of the understanding proper as the ground for such correspondence.\textsuperscript{102} The understanding proper and its logical functions in judgements

\textsuperscript{102} In my reading, the opening passage of section 14 contains the moment of transition from “subjective conditions of thinking” – i.e., in essence the methodological-speculative ground of the categories – to their objective deduction or their “objective validity” with regard to appearances (KrV A89/B122). To be sure, Kant’s use of “subjective conditions” is vague and refers to pure imagination and the critical method of pure reason. But, as I have already indicated, the subjective nature of pure imagination presupposes the critical method of pure reason. Hence, I interpret this transition to be in essence one from the purely speculative methodological grounding of pure reason to the objective-relational grounding of understanding, from the original acquisition of the categories in the transcendental doctrine of method to the validity of their a priori object-relatedness in the transcendental analytic. In the preface to the first edition of the first Critique, Kant points to the opening passage of section 14 (KrV A 92-3) as a brief account intended to “produce the complete conviction” in the subjective deduction of categories (KrV A xvii). My reading of “subjective deduction” in terms of the critical method of pure reason differs from non-metaphysical and merely metaphysical interpretations of the passage that ignore the methodological nature of the subjective deduction of categories. E.g., in his anti-metaphysical reading of the first Critique, Longuenesse describes “representation in itself” as “an act of representation, or at least a disposition to represent.” She considers this act or disposition to be a “reflection” through which empirical concepts are formed. See Longuenesse [1993] (1998), pp. 17-26. Given the comparative nature of Longuenesse’s notion of reflection, it is unclear how an a priori determination “alone” (italics added) can make the object possible, and allow one “to cognize something as an object.” Longuenesse’s suggestion to reread the transcendental aesthetic through the transcendental analytic cannot supply a self-standing ground to cognize something as an object. Transcendental analytic itself presupposes
The epigenetic nature – the transcendental-speculative necessitation – of representation in itself leads Kant to abandon the language of “conformity” in the letter to Herz for the language of *making* the object possible. Representation in itself “alone” – in complete independence from the existence or non-existence of objects – “makes the object possible” (emphasis added), as the transcendental possibility of the object is not itself objectively-relationally present and must be *made possible* (*purely speculatively present*), i.e., constantly methodologically necessitated or generated. That is, the transcendental possibility of the object must be *absolutely*, i.e., *negatively-modally-apodictically*, *posited*.

Representation in itself refers to a moment prior to the possible givenness of objects and their objective-relational categorial constitution in the understanding. This is the moment of a priori origination, negative conception, or original formation of pure concepts of understanding, i.e., the formation of genus or archetypal design (form) of pure reason prior to the distinction between two (object-related) species of representation, intuition and concept, sensibility and understanding, the transcendental aesthetic and transcendental logic. In the passage, Kant refers to the distinction between intuition and concept only after his characterization of the generative function of representation in itself

---

183 The epigenetic nature – the transcendental-speculative necessitation – of representation in itself leads Kant to abandon the language of “conformity” in the letter to Herz for the language of *making* the object possible. Representation in itself “alone” – in complete independence from the existence or non-existence of objects – “makes the object possible” (emphasis added), as the transcendental possibility of the object is not itself objectively-relationally present and must be *made possible* (*purely speculatively present*), i.e., constantly methodologically necessitated or generated. That is, the transcendental possibility of the object must be *absolutely*, i.e., *negatively-modally-apodictically*, *posited*.

Representation in itself refers to a moment prior to the possible givenness of objects and their objective-relational categorial constitution in the understanding. This is the moment of a priori origination, negative conception, or original formation of pure concepts of understanding, i.e., the formation of genus or archetypal design (form) of pure reason prior to the distinction between two (object-related) species of representation, intuition and concept, sensibility and understanding, the transcendental aesthetic and transcendental logic. In the passage, Kant refers to the distinction between intuition and concept only after his characterization of the generative function of representation in itself

---

183 I do not identify logical functions of the understanding *proper* with all logical functions in the table of judgements. Chapter four discusses the grounding of the table of judgements in the transcendental doctrine of method.
in complete independence from objects. In essence, representation in itself is the negative modal-apodictic self-presentation of pure reason in its epigenesis as a whole of possible ends, a purely speculative ground in which the representation and its object are indistinguishable, as they both refer to the same possible end within pure reason’s whole of possible ends. Representation in itself proceeds from the intrinsic need of pure reason to preserve its unity in the supersensible and to generate the systematicity of understanding in relation to sensible objects in the unity of apperception.

One should not confuse the modal-apodictic a priority of purely speculative reason to self-generate its whole and to organize the matter of metaphysical cognitions (the object) with the relational a priority of the logical functions of the understanding proper or the a priori functions of the transcendental power of judgement in pure imagination. These functions presuppose the existence of objects either legitimately (as in the transcendental analytic) or illegitimately (as in the transcendental dialectic). The absolute need or necessity of pure reason to form itself as a system or whole of possible ends, as representation in itself, in the supersensible, enacts metaphysical cognitions of sensible

---

184 Heidegger’s phenomenological interpretation of the first Critique, which takes transcendental schematism of the analytic of principles as the ultimate ground of the unity of intuition and concept in pure imagination, suffers from such problem. See Heidegger [1973] (1997a), pp. 62-77. A more recent version of this position can be found in Makkreel (1990), pp. 9-42. Makkreel takes the productive power of presentation in pure imagination, “a faculty of the original presentation of the object (exhibitio originaria)” (Anth 7:167), rather than the epigenetic function of pure reason in the transcendental method, to be the ultimate a priori source of image-formation. He does not acknowledge that the productive power of pure imagination presupposes the possibility of the existence of objects, the delimitation of the field of transcendental possibility, whereas the methodological function of pure reason originally necessitates such possibility. The grounding of the analytic of concepts in the analytic of principles and later in the reflecting power of judgement cannot stand on its own, and requires further grounding in the transcendental doctrine of method. Critique is primarily the determination of the field in which the power of judgement can be used, rather than the mere use of the – reflecting or determining – power of judgement. The failure to distinguish the methodological function of pure reason from the productive function of pure imagination derives from equating the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of pure reason with its relational analogue in pure imagination. Such identification undermines the a priori negative grounding of pure imagination and all object-related faculties in critical philosophy.
objects epigenetically, a priori grounds them (makes them possible) in the epigenetic-
methodological unity of pure reason, even though in the passage Kant does not make
explicit this crucial methodological moment that inaugurates the possibility of objective
deduction of the categories.

The second passage that indicates Kant’s oblique reference to the critical method of
pure reason is in the opening section of the transcendental dialectic. The introduction to
the transcendental dialectic implies a methodological sense of reason – the methodological
grounding of the a priori object-relatedness of representation prior to any relation to
sensible objects – under the title of “pure use of reason.” Here the pure use of reason seems
to replace the real use of reason in *Inaugural Dissertation*, where “the fundamental
concepts of things and of relations” are given by pure reason itself (MSI 2:411). Kant
introduces the pure use of reason through a question:

Can we isolate reason, and is it then a genuine source of concepts and judgements
that arise solely from it and thereby refer it to objects; or is reason only a merely
subordinate faculty that gives cognitions a certain form, called ‘logical’ form,
through which cognitions of the understanding are subordinated to one another?
(KrV A305/B362)

Posing this crucial question, Kant fails to systematically engage it. He speaks ambiguously
of “pure use of reason” without clearly distinguishing its dialectical (illusory-positive) and
methodological (critical-negative) senses. To be sure, Kant does not want to introduce the
discipline of pure reason before the transcendental doctrine of method. But he could have
indicated more clearly that the first part of the question can represent both a dialectical
(illusory-positive-relational) and a critical-methodological sense of pure reason. Instead,
Kant chooses to address the pure use of reason “only provisionally” in terms of “a
subjective law of economy for the provision of our understanding” (KrV A305-6/B362).
There is no discussion of the pure use of reason in terms of the universal methodological (negative or disciplinary) use of reason, which preserves pure reason in the supersensible and is immanent to each and every use of pure reason in the sensible. Kant does not embark on a comprehensive account of methodological reason as the purely speculative origin (original unity) of concepts and judgements. The path that Kant takes is a long and multifaceted one through discussion of a host of dialectical errors of pure reason.

The transcendental dialectic expands Kant's earlier analysis of subreptive illusions in *Inaugural Dissertation* in order to diagnose their systematic source. The opening sentence of the preface to the first edition of the first *Critique* encapsulates Kant's diagnosis:

> Human reason has the peculiar fate in one species of its cognitions that it is burdened with questions which it cannot dismiss, since they are given to it as problems *[aufgegeben]* by the nature of reason itself, but which it also cannot answer, since they transcend every capacity of human reason. (KrV A vii)

In response to such diagnosis, Kant does not use “the incapacity of human reason as an excuse” (KrV A xii) to deny the need to satisfy the systematic demand or speculative interest of pure reason. Rather, he devotes the largest section of the first *Critique* to investigate the systematic paradox of pure reason in its three major forms – paralogisms, antinomies, and the ideal of pure reason –, locating the origin of the paradox in pure reason’s attempt to satisfy its systematic demand or interest in relational-objective terms.

In dealing with self-given metaphysical problems, pure reason extends itself beyond possible experience, and illegitimately presupposes the givenness of supersensible objects – the soul, the world, and God – in a relation, in pure imagination. It uses the relational model of the understanding – a model in which the actual or possible givenness or existence of objects is presupposed in pure imagination – to think of supersensible objects.
The transcendental dialectic is pure reason’s attempt to satisfy systematic (purely speculative) needs of metaphysical cognitions objectively-relationally. Despite the risk of dialectical errors, pure reason cannot be indifferent to its purely speculative interest, and has to find a way to satisfy it. Hence, Kant attempts to detect the transcendental source of dialectical errors in order to prevent them through satisfying legitimate needs of pure reason in a non-relational manner. The central issue of critical philosophy then is not whether but how to think of the supersensible in order to satisfy the purely speculative interest of human reason. The transcendental dialectic addresses this issue primarily negatively.

After a detailed examination of the ways in which reason, failing to satisfy its speculative interest, ends up in dialectical errors, one expects Kant to discuss how pure reason is not simply an extension of the understanding, how pure reason precedes the understanding in order to instruct it negatively and meet systematic demands or speculative interests of pure reason in a non-relational manner, in complete independence from sensibility (pure imagination). The transcendental dialectic, however, tends to obscure most indications that point to the negative (disciplinary) use of pure reason. At several points, the negative presence of the discipline of pure reason in the transcendental dialectic is displaced into the practical use of reason. This has led many interpreters to assume that for Kant the truth of the speculative interest of pure reason lies exclusively or primarily in its practical interest.185 Such interpretation can be true only in positive terms,

185 E.g., Gabriel and Žižek claim that Kant’s distinction between the phenomenal and the noumenal precludes the self’s return to itself since it does not belong to either world. For them, “[t]his is where practical reason enters the picture: the only way to return from ontology back to the domain of the Self is freedom. Freedom unites the two worlds, and it provides the ultimate maxim of the Self: ‘subordinate everything to freedom’” Gabriel and Žižek (2009), p. 3. This widespread interpretation relies only on Kant’s suggestion that the satisfaction of the speculative interest of reason in positive terms takes place in practical reason. Gabriel and
but it misses the more primary negative satisfaction of the speculative interest of pure reason through the discipline of pure reason. To claim that the purely speculative interest of reason is satisfied only practically reduces pure reason to its objective manifestation in the moral domain, deprives critique of its negative (disciplinary) character, and relegates it to a doctrine. Even the appendix to the transcendental dialectic – where Kant explains the specification of objects of nature and indicates the irreducibility of the speculative interest of reason to its practical interest – does not address how the speculative interest of pure reason can be satisfied.

The transcendental dialectic presupposes a negative-apodictic-methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics without being conscious of it. Hence, the transcendental dialectic cannot present itself affirmatively.\(^{186}\) It only warns reason about

---

\(^{186}\) Žižek overlook that this positive satisfaction presupposes the disciplinary sense of critique through which pure reason generates itself as the negative whole of metaphysical cognitions, originally making the distinction between the phenomenal and the noumenal (separating them really and connecting them modally-apodictically). That the phenomenal-noumenal distinction presupposes and is enacted through the critical method of pure reason seems to be completely forgotten in most interpretations of critical philosophy. Contrary to what Gabriel and Žižek claim, the most basic sense of Kant’s critical philosophy does not lie in reading transcendental logic in ontological terms. The uniqueness of critical philosophy primarily consists in grounding an ontological understanding of transcendental logic in the critical method of pure reason. The neglect of the critical method, particularly the discipline of pure reason – the primary sense of freedom in critical philosophy – can be seen in interpreters as diverging as Deleuze and Guyer. See Deleuze [1963] (1984), p. 27 & Guyer (2005), p. 279. As I discuss in chapter two, the primary sense of transcendental self or human freedom is pure reason’s modal-apodictic self-enactment, genetic self-determination, in the discipline of pure reason. Moral freedom or self-determination presupposes this primary sense of freedom. Moral ends are part of reason’s whole or system of possible ends.

My point here should not be mistaken with Hegel’s critique of Kant’s approach to antinomies in The Encyclopaedia Logic: “Kant stopped at the merely negative result (that how things are in themselves is unknowable), and did not penetrate to the cognition of the true and positive significance of the antinomies. This true and positive significance (expressed generally) is that everything actual contains opposed determinations within it, and in consequence the cognition, and more exactly, the comprehension of an object amounts precisely to our becoming conscious of it as a concrete unity of opposed determinations” Hegel [1830] (1991), p. 93. In my reading, Kant grounds the negativity of antinomies – whether the merely logical negativity of rationalism or the object-related negativity of empiricism – in the generative negativity of the critical method. The negativity of antinomies is polemical, and presupposes the epigenetic apodictic negativity of critique. The primary sense of critical negativity – the corrective/preventive negation of pure reason – is prior to relational negations of the understanding and the power of judgement in pure imagination. The epigenetic-methodological negation of pure reason, as it is built into the structure of the first Critique, abstracts from pure imagination where the transcendental dialectic operates. The transcendental-
transcendental errors, without a priori correcting/preventing them. Kant’s transcendental remedy to the problem of metaphysics should not be understood as a merely theoretical advice or suggestion not to make knowledge claims about the supersensible and pursue the speculative interests of pure reason merely in practical terms. Strictly speaking, critique is the realm of transcendental necessity rather than that of advice, suggestion, or possibility. In its methodological sense, critique generates possibilities precisely because it is in essence a single apodicticity detached from them. The single non-relational (modal) apodictic way to satisfy the speculative interest of pure reason requires a break from pure imagination whereas the transcendental dialectic operates within pure imagination and under its influence as it presupposes the givenness or existence of supersensible objects. Despite abstracting from specific objects of sense, pure reason cannot completely separate itself from sensibility in general (pure imagination), the possible existence or non-existence of objects, in the transcendental dialectic. The abstraction from sensible objects does not protect pure reason against “the unnoticed influence of sensibility” (KrV A294/B350).187

speculative life of pure reason is the constant struggle to sustain this abstraction from sensibility in general. This abstraction, which separates the sensible and the supersensible, in turn apodictically forms sensibility in general through critical-methodological negation. Philosophy is a constant struggle of thought to save itself from naturalism. In the first Critique, this struggle or negation is the discipline of pure reason. Contrary to Hegel’s reading of Kant, this negation is not a “merely negative result.” The discipline of pure reason generates the whole of possible ends of reason and thereby lays the ground for the positive use of reason.

187 Kant considers this unnoticed influence as the primary source of dialectical errors of pure reason. For an outline of different positions on Kant’s analysis of the primary source of dialectical errors, see Grier (2001), pp. 4-8. Despite her acknowledgement of the need of reason “to establish its necessary subjective function in securing systematic unity and completion of knowledge” (Ibid. p. 304), Grier interprets this necessary subjective function ultimately in terms of the idea of “focus imaginarius” rather than the methodological self-enactment of the whole of possible ends of reason in the transcendental doctrine of method. Her interpretation does not ground the unavoidable nature of transcendental illusion in the methodological-disciplinary or organic nature of pure reason. Transcendental illusion is unavoidable since pure reason must transfer the subjective necessity of its inventions to the understanding. Transcendental error is the mistake of pure reason to present its subjective necessity as the objective necessity of supersensible objects. Grier explains the unity of pure reason in terms of ideas of reason rather than its methodological self-enactment. To be sure, Kant himself sometimes expounds the unity of reason in this manner. Explaining the unity of reason in terms of ideas of reason, nevertheless, can imply that they are independent of the methodological use of reason, detached from the apodictic-methodological condition of thinking in which ideas are transcendently
Kant’s awareness of the limits of this abstraction is manifested in his move to separate the transcendental doctrine of method from the transcendental doctrine of elements, critical reason from reason as an extension of the understanding.

As it stands, Kant’s exposition does not clearly articulate the systematic function of the transcendental dialectic as a necessary step or organic drive to arrive at pure reason’s critical prescription for, or an apodictic prevention/correction of, dialectical errors, i.e., the critical methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics. Despite Kant’s argument to avoid relational-objective approaches to the problem of metaphysics, his exposition of the true or illusory object-relatedness of understanding in the transcendental logic does not adequately point to his critical methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysics. Kant’s refusal to provide a more comprehensive explanation of the critical-methodological nature of pure reason as the underlying negative ground for the systematicity of object-relatedness of the understanding is understandable to the extent that the transcendental dialectic cannot affirmatively engage in an exposition of the methodological sense of critique of pure reason. The transcendental-speculative or disciplinary use of reason – i.e., the abstraction from sensibility in general, its relational model, its unnoticed influence and dialectical errors – can take place only in the transcendental doctrine of method. Yet, the transcendental dialectic does not even provide an account of its negative prescription

---

used. This manner of explanation sometimes comes across as an arbitrary invocation of ideas. It is understandable that Kant’s regressive procedure to arrive at the methodological unconditioned condition of metaphysics sometimes leads him to explain the unity of reason in terms of ideas of reason. From the standpoint of the transcendental doctrine of method, however, this explanation remains inadequate. We should not interpret Kant’s explanation of the unity of reason in terms of ideas of reason in a manner that conceals the absolutely necessary epigenetic or self-enacting nature of this organic unity. Concepts of understanding or ideas of reason presuppose the methodological epigenesis of reason. Prior to the ideals and ideas of reason and concepts of understanding – which operate within pure imagination – is the discipline of pure reason, which remains independent of pure imagination. All ideals and ideas of reason as well as pure concepts of understanding are systematically derived from the original conception of reason in the transcendental doctrine of method. It is the originary character of such a conception that does not let the concepts of understanding, as well as ideas and ideals of pure reason be exhaustively represented.
adequate to avoid pursuing the speculative need or the most fundamental demand of pure reason for systematality in relational terms. It does not supply a clear narrative as to how the failure of the transcendental dialectic organically motivates the transcendental doctrine of method. An indirect but clearly worked-out exposition of the critical methodological remedy of pure reason to the problem of metaphysics prior to its direct presentation in the transcendental doctrine of method could have rid Kant’s text of unnecessary obscurity in discussion of the relation between understanding and reason.

As the two above examples from the opening sections of the transcendental analytic and transcendental dialectic indicate, Kant’s presentation in the transcendental logic does not succeed in depicting the critical-methodological grounding of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason. The first Critique does not clearly demonstrate how the transcendental doctrine of method operates as the systematic ground of the transcendental analytic and transcendental dialectic. This significant deficiency in the first Critique is a major obstacle to understanding the critical project as a whole. This deficiency has led most interpreters in the last two centuries to focus on the relational-objective sense of critique, overlook its negative methodological grounding, and ultimately take critical philosophy in the direction of positivism, be it psychological, merely logical, metaphysical, epistemological, moral, or aesthetic.

1.3.3 The need for a genetic-methodological interpretation of the first Critique

It is thus mostly left to the reader of the first Critique to dig deeper and elaborate the critical method of pure reason as the transcendental correction of dialectical errors, as much of a remedy as the problem of metaphysics is likely to receive. Only a close reading of the transcendental doctrine of method – which contains Kant’s transcendental program –
can exhibit the primary sense of critique as the methodological remedy to the problem of metaphysic, as the systematic correction of systematic errors of pure reason. Such reading can demonstrate that the first *Critique* is not primarily a treatise on the ground of Newtonian physics, epistemology, or even ontology (metaphysics).

---

188 Kant does not try to teach natural scientists the method of their sciences. In his preface to the first edition of the first *Critique*, he writes: "Now and again one hears complaints about the superficiality of our age's way of thinking, and about the decay of well-grounded science. Yet I do not see that those sciences whose grounds are well laid, such as mathematics, physics, etc., in the least deserve this charge; rather, they maintain their old reputation for well-groundedness, and in the case of natural science, even surpass it" (KrV A xi). In the preface to the second edition of the first *Critique*, Kant insists that metaphysics has to learn from physical sciences how to arrive at a method. He even suggests that his own method is "imitated from the method of those who study nature" in the sense that "we can cognize things a priori only what we ourselves have put into them" (KrV B xviii). The primary goal of the first *Critique* is to articulate the method of pure cognitions of reason (metaphysics) rather than its mixed cognitions such as physics. In chapter two, I discuss Kant's transcendental appropriation of Bacon's method of study of nature for examining pure reason.

189 Strictly speaking, prior to the nineteenth century, epistemology does not exist as an independent sub-discipline of philosophy. The subject matter of epistemology is included in logic and psychology. Spinoza's *Ethics* and Hume's *Treatise* are examples of the early modern philosophical texts whose theories of cognition are articulated primarily through and as logic and psychology. Contrary to most contemporary epistemological discourse, neither the tradition of early modern logic nor Kant detaches the question of philosophical cognition from the question of metaphysics (the science of the supersensible). In particular, Kant does not use the term *epistemology* [Erkenntnistheorie]. Nor does he define critique primarily in epistemological terms. Contrary to the identification of epistemology as the subject matter of the first *Critique*, in his introduction to the first edition, Kant writes: "certain cognitions even abandon the field of all possible experiences, and seem to expand the domain of our judgements beyond all bounds of experience through concepts to which no corresponding object at all can be given in experience." "And precisely in these latter cognitions, which go beyond the world of the senses, where experience can give neither guidance nor correction, lie the investigations of our reason that we hold to be far more preeminent in their importance and sublime in their final aim than everything that the understanding can learn in the field of appearances, and on which we would rather venture everything, even at the risk of erring, than give up such important investigations because any sort of reservation or from contempt or indifference" (KrV A 2:3). The emergence of epistemology as a distinct sub-discipline of philosophy goes back to the mid-nineteenth century and beginnings of neo-Kantian school. In 1859, Ueberweg argues for an epistemological foundation in philosophizing. His goal is to understand the contemporary contrast between idealism and realism primarily in epistemological terms. After Ueberweg, Zeller characterizes the starting point of Kant's philosophy – the critical method – epistemologically. In his 1862 inaugural address at Heidelberg, "On the Meaning and Task of Epistemology," Zeller introduces an epistemological programme that denies the subjective-methodological character of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason – which is at the time understood to be psychological – in favour of the objective-relational characterization of rational cognitions. The attempt to subordinate critical methodology to the objective logic of physical or historical sciences is later developed by the Marburg and Southwest schools of neo-Kantianism. For a discussion of the emergence and proliferation of different epistemological philosophies in the 1850s-1860s German philosophy, see Köhnke (1991), pp. 108-148.

190 To be sure, Kant's idea of transcendental logic, the logic of a priori object-relativeness, reintroduces ontology into logic in its broad sense in the early modern tradition. Transcendental logic proper, however, derives from the transcendental method that remains detached from possible and actual objects. The transcendental method of pure reason is the transcendental-speculative logic of transcendental-objective logic (transcendental logic proper). The transcendental-genetic incorporation of ontology into logic is central to Kant's critical philosophy. Kant does not privilege ontology or metaphysics proper as the ultimate form of...
In its most basic sense, critique of pure reason is pure conviction [Überzeugung] or reason’s faith/belief [Vernunftglaube or Ur-glaube] in itself, the negative-modal-apodictic self-enactment or discipline of pure reason in terms of which cognitions can be formed. That is to say, critique (freedom) of pure reason is the methodological necessitation of, and the necessary belief-formation for, metaphysical cognitions of pure reason. There can be no metaphysical cognition without a necessary negative reference to God – reason’s faith/belief in itself – as the complete spontaneity of metaphysical cognition.

As it is embodied in the structure of the transcendental doctrine of method, the transcendental-speculative life – the organic wholeness or systematicity – of pure reason precedes and exceeds the categories of theoretical reason, the ideas of practical reason, and even the ideal of the highest good – what we can know, what we should do, and what we may hope for. The discipline of pure reason – human reason’s organic life form – is more than the relational content or matter that pure reason can aim for (the canon or correct use of pure reason in pure imagination). That is, the whole or system of possible ends of pure reason is more than any or even the sum total of these ends. The living organicity or epigenetic systematicity of pure reason – i.e., pure reason in its complete separation or purity from sensibility in general – must in a certain sense negate or withdraw from objectification. It must refuse being transformed into cognition. This is even necessary

philosophy. Neither epistemology nor metaphysics (ontology) is the prima philosophia. Critical philosophy is in essence the generative method of ontology or metaphysics.

191 In a sense, this refusal is the irreducibility of the modal-transcendental negative character of pure reason – the discipline of pure reason – to pure concepts of understanding as well as ideas and ideal of pure reason; that is to say, the irreducibility of the self-enactment or negative generativity of pure reason to its products. Strictly speaking, the categories, ideas and ideals of pure reason remain, one way or another, linked to sensibility. They are products of understanding and reason within pure imagination. In his opening paragraph to the Ideal of pure reason, Kant explains: “no object at all can be represented through pure concepts of the understanding without any conditions of sensibility, because the conditions of the objective reality of these concepts are lacking, and nothing is encountered in them except the pure form of thinking,” that is, the
for enacting the objectivity of objects as ends of our theoretical and practical actions (cognitions). Human cognition, whether theoretical or practical, is necessarily dogmatic and yet it is distinct from dogmatism. In short, human reason pursues many ends in its transcendental-speculative life, and yet such life itself is not just another end among others. The transcendental-speculative life of pure reason is primarily an end to be cared for and preserved purely speculatively (critically-methodologically), rather than to be brought about objectively.

***

The negative or self-dividing essence or immanent excess of the transcendental-speculative life of pure reason, the essential irreducibility of the generative negativity (critique) of pure reason to a positive science or doctrine, the primary sense of human freedom in Kant’s critical philosophy, is what I take up in the next chapter. Such examination is indispensable if we are to appreciate critique of pure reason as a purely speculative self-subsisting whole or a negative systematic ground that is genetic to theoretical, practical, and reflecting parts of critical philosophy, if we are to avoid interpretations in which critique – the self-enacting discipline of pure reason. Kant continues: "Ideas .. are still more remote from objective reality than categories; for no appearance can be found in which they may be represented in concreto." “But something that seems to be even further removed from objective reality than the idea is what I call the ideal, by which I understand the idea not merely in concreto but in individuo, i.e., as an individual thing which is determinable, or even determined, through the idea alone” (KrV A567-568/B595-596). Despite being more distant from sensibility than the categories proper, ideas and ideals of reason are not completely independent of sensibility as such (pure imagination). After all, ideas and ideals of reason are formed in terms of the relational model that the categories supply. In the transcendental dialectic, Kant shows how the ideas and the ideal of pure reason are formed due to the unnoticed influence of sensibility. The abstraction that forms ideas and ideals of reason in the transcendental dialectic is not transcendentally disciplined, and thus remains under the influence of sensibility. The negative (disciplinary) form of thinking is the essence of the transcendental: it is immanent to the categories, ideas, and ideals, and yet remains separate from sensibility as such. That is to say, the discipline of pure reason is the most radical form of abstraction or negation in critical philosophy: the abstraction of pure reason from itself: only in incessant abstraction from itself (natural dialectical reason) can pure reason isolate itself from sensibility and its influence. The self-dividing abstraction of pure reason is the transcendental-speculative heartbeat of pure reason in critical philosophy. This incessant excessiveness or immanent abstraction is the epigenetic negation – i.e., critique – of pure reason.
discipline or incessant generativity of pure reason’s faith/belief in itself – degenerates into a doctrine, dogma, ideology, or unbelief [Unglaube].
In its primary sense, a critique of pure reason is the self-generation of pure reason as a system or whole of possible ends. The self-generation takes place in the discipline of pure reason. The present chapter discusses the discipline of pure reason in four sections. Interpreting the first paragraph of the introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method, the first section demonstrates how the dialectical failure to ground metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects in supersensible objects motivates pure reason to redeem or generate itself as a system or whole of possible ends in the discipline of pure reason. Analyzing the second paragraph of the introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method, the second section discusses the basic functions of the transcendental doctrine of method in the first *Critique*. As Kant’s prefaces to the first *Critique* also confirm, the transcendental doctrine of method is necessary to a priori correct (transcendentally prevent) dialectical errors, to determine the form and content of metaphysical cognitions, and thus to make them transcendentally-speculatively systematic, certain, and clear. Focusing on the introduction to the discipline of pure reason, the third section examines how pure reason performs its disciplinary function. Through negative-modal-apodictic judgements, pure reason enacts itself as reason’s faith/belief or transcendental-speculative compulsion, and epigenetically necessitates, systematically generates or absolutely posits, the whole of possible ends of pure reason. The fourth section discusses the main body of the chapter on the discipline of pure reason in order to show how this discipline – the negative apodictic use of reason – systematically grounds dogmatic, polemical, and hypothetical uses of reason. Denying undisciplined uses of these methods in the
supersensible, the discipline of pure reason a priori corrects paralogisms, antinomies, and
the ideal of pure reason, and prepares the negative transcendental-speculative ground for
the positive satisfaction of systematic needs of pure reason in relational, qualitative, and
quantitative terms in the canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason.

2.1 Pure reason’s dialectical failure and the disciplinary inception of critique

2.1.1 The original loss of God

In his two-paragraph introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method, Kant
adumbrates the task of the transcendental method of pure reason. Comparing “the
quintessential whole [Inbegriff] of all cognitions of pure and speculative reason” to an
edifice (KrV A707/B735).\footnote{I use quintessential whole as the least inaccurate phrase among current English equivalents for Inbegriff. The etymological link between Inbegriff and Begriff, which happens to reflect their epigenetic philosophical connection in critical philosophy, is hidden in English. Inbegriff is first and foremost the transcendental-disciplinary whole or transcendental-speculative origin of Begriff or the categories of the understanding. Originating from Old High German grif (grip or hold), the Middle High German (eleventh to fourteenth century) term Begriff (concept) originally means “Umfang und Inhalt einer Vorstellung,” i.e., “the scope and content of a representation.” Inbegriff is an eighteenth-century neologism that denotes “Gesamtheit der auf einen Begriff bezogenen Einzelheiten,” i.e., “the entirety (whole) of a concept’s related singulars.” See Das Herkunfts-wörterbuch, Duden Band 7, 4. Auflage (2006), Mannheim: Dudenverlag, p. 301. In this sense, Inbegriff is the systematic embryonic whole of possible content (ends) of Begriff. Equivalents such as “the sum total” and “the sum” for Inbegriff, which are used in English translations of the first Critique, imply the priority of parts – the transcendental elements, relational content, or matter – of pure reason over its systematic whole, objectifying the disciplinary whole or organic form of pure reason. They connote that the whole of pure reason is the result of gradual accretion of its elements, and tend to confuse the order of methodological grounding with the order of presentation in the first Critique. As I discuss below, the quintessential whole of pure reason should not be understood in objective (positive) terms. One way or another, such understanding transforms critique of pure reason into positivism. The transcendental systematic whole of pure reason is in essence a disciplinary self-enclosing self-enactment of pure reason which has epigenetic a priority over its elements, genetically containing all possible content (ends) of metaphysical cognitions. In this sense, Inbegriff is the apodictic modality – the original acquisition or epigenetic-systematic form – of pure reason prior to any relation to objects through Begriff. Inbegriff is reason’s end in general and Begriff is its enactment in possible relation to objects. Begriff, the concept, re-enacts Inbegriff, the formation of the boundaries of pure reason in object-related terms. The abstraction or negativity that is indispensable in concept formation is the re-enactment of the methodological abstraction or negativity that forms pure reason.} Kant retrospectively, i.e., from the standpoint of the
transcendental doctrine of method, assesses what has been accomplished in the
transcendental doctrine of elements, determines what needs to be done in the doctrine of
method, and outlines how these transcendental needs of pure reason structure the doctrine of method.\textsuperscript{193}

In his retrospective assessment of what has been accomplished in the transcendental doctrine of elements, Kant writes: “we have made an estimate of the building materials [\textit{Bauzeug}] and determined for what sort of edifice [\textit{Gebäude}], with what height and strength, they would suffice.” The dialectical expectation to build “a tower that would reach the heavens,” however, is disappointed as “the supply of materials sufficed only for a dwelling that was just roomy enough for our business on the plane of experience and high enough to survey [\textit{übersehen}] it.”\textsuperscript{194} Although the transcendental dialectic was initially conceived as a natural way to complete metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects by grounding them in supersensible objects, now in hindsight it seems a “bold undertaking” that “had to fail from lack of material” (KrV A707/B735), i.e., from the original absence or

\textsuperscript{193} Kant uses the distinction between the doctrine of elements and the doctrine of method in the first and second \textit{Critiques}. The third \textit{Critique} is not exactly divided in terms of this distinction. The transcendental doctrine of method in the first \textit{Critique}, however, contains the primary sense of the critical method of pure reason since it is the locus of the systematic conditions of the use of the faculties of theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement. The division of the first \textit{Critique} into doctrine of elements and doctrine of method is “the division of this science [\textit{critique}] from the general viewpoint of a system in general” (KrV A15). The transcendental doctrine of method in the second \textit{Critique} deals with “the way in which one can make objectively practical reason subjectively practical as well,” grounding “legality of actions” in the “morality of dispositions” (KpV 5:151). In the third \textit{Critique}, Kant acknowledges that “the division of a critique into a doctrine of elements and a doctrine of method that precedes the science cannot be applied to the critique of taste” (KU 5:354). The critique of taste or aesthetic theory is not a science. Kant uses the doctrine of method in the teleological power of judgement as “a negative influence on procedure in theoretical natural science” (KU 5:417). Teleology is not a doctrine, and belongs to the critique of the power of judgement. Kant emphasizes the systematic necessity of distinction between elements and method, parts and whole, relational content (matter) and transcendental-systematic form of pure reason at many other occasions. E.g., in \textit{Opus Postumum}, he writes: “\textit{Progress (progressus) in knowledge (qua science in general)} begins with the collection of the elements of knowledge, then connects them [in the] method [\textit{Art}] in which they are to be arranged (systematically). For the division of this enterprise into a doctrine of elements and a doctrine of method constitutes the supreme division; the former presents the concepts, the latter their arrangement in order to found a scientific whole” (OP 21:386).

\textsuperscript{194} This passage implies the distinction between the sensible – “the plane of experience” – and the negative-modal-apodictic presence of the supersensible in pure reason, which is “high enough to survey [\textit{übersehen}]” the plane of experience. The elevation indicates the separation of the critical method from its elements, from sensibility in general. As I discuss below, the transcendental doctrine of method, particularly the discipline of pure reason, is the negative self-enactment of pure reason, which functions as the negative-modal-apodictic supersensible ground of metaphysical cognitions of the sensible.
loss of supersonsible objects in objective terms. As we shall see, the epigenesis of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method is reason’s incessant self-movement to redeem itself in the face of the original loss of God. 195

Explaining his assessment of the inevitable failure of reason in the transcendental dialectic, Kant draws an analogy between the transcendental dialectic and the Tower of Babel, suggesting a similarity between the conceit of the people of the earth in the biblical story and the arrogance of pure reason in extending itself beyond its prerogative. The people of earth and pure reason both identify human cognition with divine cognition (creation). Whereas God creates (knows) without limitation, human invention (cognition) requires limitation to a priori correct (prevent) dialectical errors. Kant suggests that for the human being to ignore this distinction is to incur grievous consequences. As in Genesis (11.1-9), those who once had “the same language and the same words” are “scattered ... over the face of the whole earth” and cannot “understand one another’s speech,” so in the transcendental dialectic, in the lack of any limitation, “the confusion of languages ... unavoidably divide[s] the workers over the plan and disperse[s] them throughout the world, leaving each to build

195 I use the original absence or loss of supersonsible objects in distinction from the relational absence or loss of sensible objects, which presupposes the possible givenness of objects. This sense of original is neither genealogical nor historical. Pure reason’s late awareness of the absence of supersonsible objects in objective terms renders such absence subjectively (methodologically) original. Original refers to the always-alreadyness of the absence or loss of God in pure reason. This original loss can be acknowledged necessarily late, only through retrospective consciousness, or self-consciousness, of its modal-epodic boundaries in the discipline of pure reason. Also, in the rationalist tradition that Kant deals with in the transcendental dialectic, supersonsible objects are ultimately grounded in God. Thus, we can reduce the original absence of supersonsible objects to the original absence or loss of God. Kant argues that God is the only supersonsible being whose existence human reason needs to presuppose (WDO 8:137-8). This presupposition – which itself rests on what Kant calls reason’s moral faith/belief – derives from pure reason’s need to preserve itself as a whole or system of possible ends. Theoretical and practical needs of pure reason for systematicity are in essence pure reason’s need for self-preservation in theoretical and practical domains [Gebiete]. This need or purely speculative interest of pure reason, however, remains irreducible to the objective forms it takes in these domains. As I discuss below, the modal-epodic formation of the field [Feld] – reason’s faith/belief in itself or transcendentally dwelling of reason – in terms of which object domains are originally delimited, is pure reason’s transcendentalexial speculative self-preservation in the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersonsible, in abstraction from all theoretical, practical, and reflecting uses or interests of pure reason.
on his own according to his own design” (KrV A707/B735). In either case, the original unity – whether the wholeness of pure reason or the oneness of humanity – is violated.196

2.1.2 Transcendental humiliation of pure reason

Kant’s analogy between the transcendental dialectic and the Tower of Babel is not mere coincidence. It indicates that Kant’s negative methodological delimitation (self-grounding) of pure reason functions as the a priori grounding of metaphysics. The negative lesson of the transcendental dialectic, like the moral of the biblical story, informs the disciplinary

196 The idea of the original absence or loss of God in objective terms, or the self-loss of human being, neither starts nor ends with Kant. E.g., Luther writes: “In his nature God cannot die. But now that God and man are united in one person, when the man dies, that is rightly called the death of God, for he is one thing or one person with God.” Quoted in Moltmann [1973] (1974), p. 234. Pascal makes a remark in a similar direction: “as soon as the Christian religion reveals the principle that men are by nature corrupt and have fallen away from God, this opens one’s eyes so that the mark of this truth is everywhere apparent; for nature is such that it points at every turn to a God who has been lost, both within man and without, and to a corrupt nature.” Pascal [1669] (1966), p. 180. Schiller interprets human being’s “self-loss,” the locus of aesthetic revelation and education, as that in which one does “nothing but feel.” He describes this self-loss as “to be beside oneself; i.e., to be outside one’s own self” Schiller [1794] (2001), p. 119. Taking the aestheticization of self-loss one step further, Schlegel turns it into “the real essence” of the romantic self, the productive essence of poetry, which will be forever “becoming and never be perfected” Schlegel [1797-1801] (1991), p. 31. Schleiermacher’s claim on the divine presence in the world and the soul presents a romantic reaction to discourses on the absence or loss of God. He repeats Kant’s purely speculative and negative grounding of metaphysical cognitions in the absent God positively, in terms of the “intuition of the universe” as “the highest and most universal formula of religion.” Schleiermacher presents a case for the critical-hermeneutic revival of Spinoza’s “living deity” Schleiermacher [1799] (1996), p. 11 & p. 24. Hegel argues for elevating the historical loss of God in Christianity to a speculative loss, the historical grief to an “infinite grief” that is “a moment of the supreme idea.” In this way, we have “the speculative Good Friday in place of the historic Good Friday,” and “the highest totality” achieves “its resurrection solely from this harsh consciousness of loss, encompassing everything, and ascending in all its earnestness and out of its deepest ground to the most serene freedom of its shape” Hegel [1802] (1988), pp. 190-1. Hegel, however, does not recognize the modalization of the original absence of God in Kant’s critical philosophy. Is not transcendental dialectic in retrospect pure reason’s harsh consciousness of the absence or loss of God in objective terms? Does not this self-consciousness resurrect pure reason’s systematic whole in the discipline of pure reason? Is not the discipline of pure reason the primary sense of freedom in critical philosophy, which a priori shapes all cognitions of pure reason? Nietzsche announces the death of God, and points to its simultaneously nihilistic and affirmative implications. Nietzsche [1887] (1974), p. 167. In Being and Time, Heidegger attempts to sever the awareness of human self-loss from its theological lineage and to redefine self-loss in terms of existential guilt or ontological "notness" and ultimately the transcendental temporality of Dasein. Heidegger [1927] (1996), p. 263 & p. 264. The uniqueness of Kant’s critique consists in its internalization of the original absence of God as the negative-modal-apodictic essence of reason, i.e., the transcendental-speculative negativity of pure reason. In its primary sense, critique of pure reason is the transcendental mourning or infinite grief of the original loss of God in the world. The memory of this loss is inscribed in the genetic structure of critical reason, motivating reason to redeem itself. The original absence of God becomes the essence of living human reason. Pure reason lives in regenerating its desire for the supersensible in the form of reason’s faith/belief in itself.
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formation of pure reason as a whole or transcendental-systematic grounding of metaphysics. The humiliation that is the fate of the human species in the biblical story is one and the same as the self-formation (delimitation) of pure reason as a whole. Transcendental humiliation is pure reason's belated awareness of the original absence or loss of supersensible objects in objective terms, a necessarily retrospective recognition of reason's dialectical transgression of its proper boundaries.\textsuperscript{197} Transcendental-speculative self-negation grounds transcendental-objective cognitions of reason. The propriety of acts of understanding (i.e., the property of objects of possible experience) derives from the original appropriation, retrospective intelligibility, of the matter of reason in the transcendental doctrine of method.\textsuperscript{198} Put differently, pure reason's metaphysical

\textsuperscript{197} The theme of humiliation or humility is not limited to Genesis, and can be found in several other places in the Old and New Testaments. E.g., St. Luke 14.11 reads: “For whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.” Kant’s transcendental use of humiliation of pure reason prefigures Nietzsche’s moral psychology of Christian asceticism. Nietzsche presents humility as a character trait in slave morality, which moderns inherit from Christianity. See Nietzsche [1887] (2006), pp. 78-9. Humiliation makes us not only human but inexorably all too human. In Human, All Too Human, Nietzsche presents an “improved" version of St. Luke 14.11: “He that humbleth himself wants to be exalted” Nietzsche [1878-1880] (1996), p. 48. Nietzsche’s criticism of Christianity in On the Genealogy of Morality, however, does not simply dismiss it. For Nietzsche, there seems to be no way to bypass the ascetic ideal, the modern legacy of Christianity. And yet, ironically, the ascetic ideal may betray its own historical origins, its originary cultural values, and contribute to a stronger form of life affirmation.

\textsuperscript{198} The methodological use of the idea of humiliation as a way to determine the limits of human cognition does not start with Kant. Logic or the Art of Thinking, to which the first Critique has an obvious structural resemblance, is an early modern example. In its last (fourth) part “On Method,” Arnauld and Nicole discuss the negative-instructive value of speculations on things that we are incapable of knowing: “The benefit we can derive from these speculations is ... to teach us to recognize the limits of the mind”; “it is beneficial to make the mind sometimes feel its own weakness by considering these objects that surpass it and in surpassing it abase and humiliate it” Arnauld & Nicole [1683] (1996), p. 233. Kant’s language of “humiliation” in the transcendental doctrine of method, as well as his key point on a “felt need of reason” or reason’s “insight into its lack” (WDO 8:139-140) in the 1786 essay on the pantheism controversy seem to present a critical version of Arnauld’s and Nicole’s suggestion about benefits of feeling one’s own weakness and limits in humiliation. Although Kant states that reason does not feel, in the 1786 essay, he uses the language of “feeling.” This language concedes an immanent lack in human reason. Feeling indicates the quintessential vulnerability of human beings; it is a confession to finitude. Transcendently speaking, humiliation is not a form of feeling. Rather, feeling is a form of humiliation, a species of the discipline of pure reason in the power of judgement. Individuation or specification is a species of speculation that is invested in and covered over by the relational-objective form individuation/specification takes. Many interpreters of Kant ignore the central role of purely speculative reason in specification in the power of judgement, and explain it merely in terms of reflecting judgements. E.g., see Makkreel (1990). To be sure, reflecting judgements play a central role in specification. Yet, reflecting judgements presuppose pure reason’s negative-modal-apodictic self-enactment or self-
knowledge of sensible objects originates from retrospective acknowledgment of the original absence or loss of God in objective terms.

Thus, it is not God but the retrospective awareness of his original loss in objective terms that humiliates – negatively forms or delimits – reason, grounding its metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects. Transcendental humiliation is reason's modal-apodictic self-affection, prior to being affected by objects. There is no self in the modern sense (i.e., transcendental-speculative self-consciousness) prior to the experience of the original loss of God or transcendental-speculative self-affection. Critique is the disciplinary presence – i.e., always-already-ness – of the absence of God in objective terms in human reason. The internalization of the original absence of God, i.e., the modalization of the dialectical failure

---

199 Reason's awareness of the original loss of God is a negative analogical reference to God. This unique correspondence of immanence and analogy, the genetic method and analogical method, in the discipline of pure reason is unaddressed in most interpretations of Kant.

200 Kant’s account of the original absence of God in objective terms should not be mistaken with what is generally called negative or apophatic theology (via negativa). Negative theology – e.g., in works of Dionysius and Eckhart – seems to assert the hyper-essentiality of God above Being, whereas critique does not make any assertion about God even when it presupposes God’s existence. Such presupposition is primarily the transcendental mourning or remembering of God’s absence or original loss as the apodictic modality of living human reason, rather than the positing of God as an objective presence. Also, Kant finds apophatic theology’s appeals to mystery problematic. He is suspicious that a general appeal to mystery replaces reason with intuition and feeling, opening the way for religious enthusiasm [Schwärmerei]. A legitimate reference to God can take place only modally-apodictically, through the discipline of pure reason. This negative reference is modal. That is to say, a legitimate reference to God is necessarily through reason’s faith/belief in itself. This is the only way the postulates of practical reason on a future life and the existence of God can be enacted. For Kant, one cannot rationally postulate God except through reason’s faith/belief in itself. Postulating a future life or the existence of God is an act of necessary faith/belief, a transcendental-speculative compulsion not a theoretical premise. Kant distinguishes reason’s legitimate and illegitimate appeals to God in a few different ways. In Prolegomena, he introduces a distinction between a necessarily “symbolic anthropomorphism” and a hypothetical “dogmatic anthropomorphism” (Prol 4:357). In Religion, a distinction between “a schematism of analogy” “as means of elucidation” and “a schematism of object-determination (as means for expanding our cognition)” (RGV 6:65) separates legitimate and illegitimate appeals to God. Despite Kant’s discussion of God and rational theology in the transcendental dialectic and its appendix, the primary locus of critical (negative) reference to God is the transcendental humiliation of reason, i.e., reason's original conception – modal self-enactment – in reason’s faith/belief in the discipline of pure reason. The symbolic presence of and schematic analogy with God presuppose reason’s disciplinary self-enactment in the transcendental doctrine of method, i.e., the transcendental mourning of the original loss of God. The gap between the elements and method, matter and form, is the mark of the original loss of God and the condition of reason’s faith/belief in itself.
of reason as an immanent necessity, forms (preserves) reason as an incessant generative negativity or disciplinary whole prior to its object-related parts. Transcendental discipline or humiliation makes us human in the modern sense. It "changes animal nature into human nature" (Päd 9:441). Transcendental humiliation [Demütigung] is reason’s original disposition [Gemüt], default mood, apodictic modality [modus logicus] or transcendental-speculative boundary of pure reason.

---

201 Transcendental humiliation is the primary form of human reason’s experience of its finitude. Kant discusses this experience in an aesthetic context in the analytic of the sublime in the third Critique: we take refuge in morality from a threatening sublime nature. In this sense, humiliation is the experience of being "fearful without being afraid of" an object (KU 5: 260-261). Transcendental humiliation in the first Critique, however, is irreducible to either an experience of the sublime or an ethics of humility. Transcendental humiliation, or the discipline of pure reason, remains more than theoretical, practical, and reflecting uses of pure reason. Interpretations of Kant’s moral philosophy as an ethics of humility do not ground Kant’s ethics of humility in the transcendental humiliation of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason. E.g., see Grenberg (2005). Kant describes the role of transcendental humiliation in the moral domain in this way: "the moral law unavoidably humiliates every human being when he compares it with the sensible propensity of his nature. If something represented as a determining ground of our will humiliates us in our self-consciousness, it awakens respect for itself insofar as it is positive and a determining ground" (KpV 5:74). This passage indicates how the respect for the moral law, which is supposed to motivate our moral actions, is a form of transcendental humiliation or the discipline of pure reason in the moral domain.

202 In his writings, Kant sometimes assumes a hierarchy of sexes, races, and religions based on the degree of their putative historical development towards this disciplinary archetype of a rational human. That is one of the ways in which Kant, along with many other enlightenment thinkers, see no discrepancy between reason’s universality and their defense of what we now view as sexism, racism, and religious discrimination. Can an archetype – even a merely disciplinary one – be neatly detached from its historical origins and from what it tries to prefigure? Can a transcendental archetype be formed through modalizing historical types without being affected by the historical content it modalizes? What is the limit of the abstraction that delimits pure reason? These are questions that Kant’s transcendental philosophy faces at its limits.

203 In the passage, Kant refers to "animal nature" in humans. Instinctively determined, animal nature in non-human animals does not need self-discipline. The "animal nature" in humans is distinct from the "animal nature" in non-human animals. In humans, animal nature can be used for evil. For this reason, Kant defines human being as "an animal which, when it lives among others of its species, has need of a master"; this master is self-discipline: "the highest supreme authority... ought to be just in itself and yet a human being" (IaG 8:23).

204 Here I do not use mind as an equivalent for Gemüt. The translation of Gemüt into mind tends to hypostatize pure reason and obscure its negative nature. The use of mind as a metaphysical/psychological substance in early modern and contemporary discourses on the 'philosophy of mind' can render this term ineffective, if not misleading, for understanding Kant’s critical-methodological grounding of metaphysics. Kant does not ground metaphysical cognitions in terms of any notion of substance. The ground of metaphysics is a transcendental-speculative disposition, rather than a transcendental-objective position. Transcendental-speculative self is a generative negativity, a quintessential whole emerging from modal-apodictic self-relation or self-enactment rather than a phenomenal or noumenal entity. Presenting critical philosophy primarily in terms of the mind-world contrast distorts its most original sense. Throughout the text, I use mind in the sense of reason’s original transcendental disposition that functions as the a priori negative condition of all positivity.

205 Modus means the measure of assessment. Apodictic modality of pure reason is the necessary negative measure in which reason dwells, judges itself, and shapes everything after its pure image [Vorbild]. Such pure
In his 1786 essay on the pantheism controversy, Kant discusses the transcendental disposition or apodictic modality of reason as its “necessary need” (WDO 8:141) for a pure conviction [Überzeugung] or reason’s faith/belief [Vernunftglaube or Ur-glaube] in itself.\footnote{206} As pure reason’s conatus, the transcendental discipline of pure reason – the transcendental-speculative self – expresses the absence of God in the world and the negative-modal-apodictic presence of God in pure reason.\footnote{207} The transcendental-

\footnote{206} Reason’s faith/belief in itself is reason’s transcendental compulsion or discipline to acquire methodologically what cannot be attained objectively. Reason’s faith/belief in itself precedes and exceeds metaphysics proper. The German verb glauben (to believe) is the eighteenth-century version of Middle High German gelouben whose English and Dutch equivalents at the time were geliefen and geloven respectively. The term geloven has kept its original sense in the contemporary Dutch as well. These terms stem from the German lieb (love), ultimately Old High German lib (life or body). See Das Herkunfts-wörterbuch, Duden Band 7, 4. Auflage (2006), pp. 279-280 & p. 485. As its etymology indicates, Glaube (faith/belief) refers to a life or love. For human reason, to live is primarily to believe in, i.e., to love God (agape). Reason’s faith/belief in itself is the transcendental-speculative whole or negative genetic embodiment [Inbegriff] of pure reason’s purely speculative desire or love for the absent God. Such a whole or negative embodiment is the detached ground of all objectification. In Kant’s usage, Aberglaube (superstition) refers to “the complete subjection of reason to facts” (WDO 8:145) especially in the “alleged outer experiences (miracles)” (RGV 6:53). Unglaube (unbelief) usually denotes reason devoid of its desire for the supersensible, the degeneration of reason into a mechanical dogmatism or logical positivism. In this sense, reason is severed from its original metaphysical desire for the supersensible and tends to morph into skepticism or nihilism. Aberglaube and Unglaube replace the generation [Erzeugung] or transcendental testimony [Zeugnis] of purely speculative reason in the discipline of pure reason with the empirical “testimony of preserved facts [Zeugnisse bewähre Facta]” (WDO 8:145) or the hypostatized “dogmatic conviction [dogmatische Überzeugung]” (WDO 8:146). The discipline of pure reason – the transcendental testimony [Zeugnis] of purely speculative reason, pure conviction [Überzeugung], or reason’s faith/belief in itself – is the ground, boundary, or Ur-glaube that fulfills and renews reason’s metaphysical desire for the supersensible, the absent God, in a purely speculative manner.

\footnote{207} This characterization of critique is useful for situating it in relation to the early modern metaphysics of substance in Spinoza and Leibniz. It shows critique’s undoing of their positive models of expressionism. Contrary to Spinoza’s identification of God with nature, Kant’s reference to God is purely speculative, in complete independence from sensibility. Pure reason’s conatus or force is immanent to sensibility but, unlike Spinoza’s account, only analogically. Kant does not accept Leibniz’s description of the human being as a monadic substance that expresses the divine substance. Later in his 1790 essay against Eberhard, Kant presents a reading of Leibniz’s metaphysics in terms of “three peculiarities”: 1) the principle of sufficient reason; 2) the doctrine of monads; 3) the doctrine of pre-established harmony. Kant explains his transcendental-methodological, “merely subjective” or purely speculative, rendition of each peculiarity: the
speculative self is in essence pure reason’s self-formation or self-preservation in reason’s faith/belief in itself. The transcendental-speculative self is born in desiring the objectively lost or absent God. Reason’s faith/belief in itself, transcendental humiliation, grips pure reason from within. One can never choose to be humiliated. Indeed, oneness/selfhood is affected in transcendental humiliation. The transcendental-speculative selfhood or reason’s faith/belief in itself is a purely speculative inner force, a transcendental compulsion rather than a psychological consumption. This selfhood takes three object-related forms in the critical system: the transcendental unity of apperception in the theoretical domain, moral autonomy in the practical domain, and the reflecting power of judgement in the aesthetic/teleological field.

In his brief introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method, Kant speaks of the transcendental humiliation of pure reason only by analogy to the biblical story, without using the term *humiliation* [*Demütigung*]. He describes pure reason’s retrospective assessment of the transcendental dialectic quite hastily, and makes explicit his conclusion – the ineluctability of pure reason’s transcendental humiliation – only later in the first chapter of the transcendental doctrine of method, where he introduces the discipline of pure reason:

principle of sufficient reason “was for him [Leibniz] a merely subjective one, having reference only to a critique of reason.” Kant also reads the doctrine of monads metaphorically: “the innateness of certain concepts, as an expression of a fundamental faculty with respect to a priori principles of our cognition, which he [Leibniz] uses merely against Locke, who recognizes only an empirical origin, is likewise incorrectly understood if it is taken literally.” On the idea of a pre-established harmony, Kant notes that Leibniz “was merely indicating that we would have to suppose thereby a certain purposiveness in the dispositions of the supreme cause” (UE 8:247-251). Critique satisfies the need for a priori harmony through pure reason’s self-enactment. Kant’s interpretation of Leibniz in this essay is more than a mere polemic against Eberhard, and contains a critical argument for the methodological grounding of a metaphorical sense of substance (appearance) in the subject. In its strictly methodological (disciplinary) sense, a critique of pure reason is the negative modal monadology of the subject.
Kant stresses the need for reason’s discipline or self-enactment prior to any object-related acts. The discipline of pure reason is the negative-modal-apodictic presence of the absent God as the perfect model of formation and ordering of ends.\textsuperscript{208}

2.1.3 The generative gap of pure reason

Kant’s use of the biblical analogy to communicate the transcendental humiliation of pure reason in the supersensible only indicates what is already built into the genetic structure of a critique of pure reason\textsuperscript{209}. Even though Kant does not elaborate it sufficiently, the division of the first Critique between the transcendental doctrine of elements and the transcendental doctrine of method is the embodiment of transcendental incorporation of the objectively

\textsuperscript{208} Kant discusses God in terms of reason’s failure to attain objective completeness in the transcendental dialectic, without making any cognitive claim about God. In his 1783-84 lectures, Kant explains that human reason’s need for complete determinateness, i.e., “a maximum” (V-Phil-Th/Pölitz 28:996), motivates its reference to God. In 1786, Kant speaks of reason’s need to assume God “as a supreme intelligence and at the same time as the highest good” (WDO 9:137). The third Critique (1790) invokes God to show the essence of human cognition, insisting that “it is not at all necessary here to prove that such an intellectus archetypus is possible, but only that in the contrast of it with our discursive, image-dependent understanding (intellectus ectypepus) and the contingency of such a constitution we are led to that idea (of an intellectus archetypus)” (KU 5:408). The analogy with divine cognition is necessary to establish the finite completeness or systematicity of metaphysical cognitions.

\textsuperscript{209} Kant uses the language of humiliation, scandal, and embarrassment in similar occasions when reason lacks an objective ground. In such occasions, reason must invoke a merely subjective ground which directly or indirectly rests on pure reason’s negative methodological self-enactment. In the preface to the second edition of the first Critique, Kant writes: “it always remains a scandal [Skandal] of philosophy and universal human reason that the existence of things outside us (from which we after all get the whole matter for our cognitions, even for our inner sense) should have to be assumed merely on faith, and that if it occurs to anyone to doubt it, we should be unable to answer him with a satisfactory proof” (KrV B xxxix). Kant implies that the transcendental aesthetic and transcendental logic, which presuppose the possible existence of objects outside us, cannot operate without reason’s faith, i.e., the discipline of pure reason through which objects are made possible. Pure reason becomes aware of the purely speculative methodological grounding of its metaphysical cognitions in reason’s faith only at the end of the first Critique. Likewise, in the preface to the third Critique, Kant acknowledges the “embarrassment [Verlegenheit] ... in those judgments [Beurteilungen] that are called aesthetic, which concern the beautiful and the sublime in nature or in art” (KU 5:169).
unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible as the immanent lack or generative gap of pure reason. This structural gap, through which pure reason preserves itself, incessantly motivates and is bridged through reason’s faith/belief in itself (self-certainty or self-confidence).

In the transcendental doctrine of elements, sensible objects are given in the transcendental aesthetic and their metaphysical cognition is analytically completed in the transcendental analytic. Afterwards, in the transcendental dialectic, pure reason extends itself into the supersensible in order to ground metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects in supersensible objects. Yet, operating in terms of the relational model of sensibility, pure reason falls victim to the unnoticed influence of sensibility and its potentially ensuing transcendental errors: it assumes the givenness of supersensible objects in a relation, and covers over what is subsequently manifested to be an objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible. Transcendental illusions are “natural and unavoidable” (KrV A298/B354) since “human reason always strives for freedom” and when it first breaks its fetters the first use it makes of its long unaccustomed freedom has to degenerate into a misuse and a presumptuous trust in the

---

210 Few interpreters of the first Critique distinguish between transcendental illusion and transcendental errors of pure reason. E.g., see Allison (1983) & Kitcher (1990). For Allison’s later modification of his position, see Allison (2004), pp. 307-332. These interpretations do not appreciate that “[t]ranscendental illusion ... does not cease even though it is uncovered and its nullity is clearly seen into by transcendental criticism" (KrV A297/B353). The persistence of transcendental illusion stems from the need to transfer the “subjective necessity of a certain connection of our concepts on behalf of the understanding” (KrV A297/B353). Transcendental error presupposes transcendental illusion, and passes off such subjective necessity as “an objective necessity, the determination of things in themselves” (Ibid), displacing its source in the very act of transference. Among interpreters who distinguish transcendental illusion and transcendental error, Grier explains transcendental illusion in terms of “the subjective or logical requirement for systematic unity of thought,” and interprets Kant’s reference to “subjective” necessity in terms of pure imagination rather than the critical method of pure reason. See Grier (2001), pp. 8 & 10. To be sure, transcendental illusion is a product of imagination. Yet, pure imagination can ground neither truth nor illusion without being transcendently-speculatively disciplined by the modal-apodictic judgement of pure reason. The subjective necessity of transcendental illusion in pure imagination originates from the methodological apodicticity or discipline of pure reason, which connects our concepts epigenetically, prior to their formation as object-related representations.
independence of its faculties from all limitations, leading to a persuasion of the sole authority of speculative [theoretical] reason which assumes nothing except what it can justify by objective grounds and dogmatic conviction; everything else it boldly repudiates. (WDO 8:145-6)

Transcendental illusion about the existence of supersensible objects in objective terms occupies pure reason with “frivolously playing with fancies” (KrV A710/B738), makes it overly invested in insubstantial trivial subtleties, and delays its awareness of the original absence of supersensible objects in objective terms.

In the transcendental doctrine of method, reason has to belatedly face its dialectical failure to access supersensible objects. It concedes that it “must suffer” “the loss of its hitherto imagined possessions” (KrV B xxxi), the loss of what was never in its power to acquire. Systematic metaphysics in the transcendental doctrine of method becomes possible only through experiencing the impossibility, failure, and hopelessness of traditional metaphysics in the transcendental dialectic.211 In other words, some ‘atheistic’ steps in regard to the knowledge of God are necessary for reason's moral faith/belief in God. Such faith/belief can emerge only from the transcendental disillusionment of pure reason, from ruins of all hopes to know God.212 Only in and through losing God can pure

211 To put this point in Adorno’s language in Negative Dialectics: “The secret of Kant’s philosophy is the unthinkability of despair” Adorno [1966] (1973), p. 385. In a section titled “Rescuing Urge and Block” in “Meditations on Metaphysics,” Adorno builds on the idea of block, which he originally formulates in his 1959 lecture course on the first Critique: “Kant’s rescue of the intelligible sphere is not merely the Protestant apologetics known to all; it is also an attempted intervention in the dialectic of enlightenment, at the point where this dialectic terminates in the abolition of reason” (Ibid). In Adorno’s interpretation, the block functions as critical reason that negates reason and thereby rescues it from complete self-annihilation. Adorno does not discuss the block in terms of the discipline of pure reason.

212 Heine formulates the rationalistic turn in Protestant theology: “when religion sought help from philosophy, German scholars have performed countless experiments on it, in addition to putting it in its new costume ... one of its [religion’s] veins was opened and the blood of superstition was slowly drained out of it; or, without the images, the attempt was made to remove all historical content from Christianity and keep only the moral part. In this process, Christianity became pure deism.” Calling Kant “the great destroyer in the realm of thought” who “far surpassed Maximilian Robespierre in terrorism,” Heine adds: “[t]his book [the first Critique] is the sword with which deism was executed in Germany” Heine [1835] (2007), p. 65 & pp. 78-79.
reason establish a legitimate relation to him in faith/belief. The full systematic meaning of the transcendental doctrine of elements – particularly that of the transcendental dialectic – can be disclosed only retrospectively, in the transcendental doctrine of method, where pure reason is methodologically enclosed.\textsuperscript{213} Only in recognition of its transcendental-dialectical loss or trauma – i.e., through the transcendental incorporation of the loss as a modal-apodictic negativity or self-discipline – can reason acquire itself originally, i.e., redeem or form itself as a whole of possible ends. Reason's suffering in the dialectic opens a new way to satisfy its systematic need for self-preservation. Kant builds this method as a genetic structure, a generative gap or self-division, through which pure reason incessantly enacts itself.

One cannot overestimate the significance of the dialectical experience of pure reason for its self-formation. There can be no critique, no determination of the boundaries of pure reason, without the possibility, and indeed the necessity (ineluctability), of transgressing them in the transcendental dialectic. The transcendental lessons of the transcendental dialectic are acquired (originally enacted) only in the transcendental doctrine of method, through pure reason's retrospective acknowledgement of its natural and inevitable transgression of its boundaries. Such acknowledgement is a self-determination that equips reason “to parry attacks,” “moves it to rest satisfied with a limited but undisputed property,” brings about “the conviction [Überzeugung] ... from that of the certainty of a small possession,” and “elevates reason and gives it confidence in itself”\textsuperscript{213}

\textsuperscript{213} The rigorism of critique of pure reason in its strictly disciplinary function is at once self-enclosing and self-disclosing. In other words, the discipline of pure reason at once motivates and destroys the rigidity of (dogmatic) metaphysical cognitions of pure reason. Without appreciating this generative-disciplinary rigorism, we are bound to understand dogmatic cognitions of pure reason in terms of dogmatism rather than criticism. Critical philosophy approaches dogmata critically rather than dogmatically. Dogmata can be understood as dogmata only critically.
(KrV A768/B796 & A795/B823). The transcendental doctrine of method incorporates the major lesson of transcendental dialectic into the genetic structure of pure reason. The unavoidable objective incompleteness of pure reason in the supersensible becomes the negative-modal-apodictic, i.e., methodologically unconditioned, condition of pure reason’s self-preservation in the supersensible, determining the epigenetic-systematic form or whole – the boundaries and immanent logic – of metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects. The whole [Inbegriff] or inner self-enactment of pure reason is the a priori genesis or genetic-systematic form of Begriff, the immanent conception of the concept [Begriff] in general, and is transcendentally-speculatively built into all concepts and their possible uses in judgements and syllogisms.214 From a critical-methodological standpoint, transcendental illusion is immanent to truth. The “transcendental attempts of pure reason,” Kant states, “are all conducted within the real medium of dialectical illusion, i.e., the subjective which offers itself to or even forces itself upon reason as objective in its premises” (KrV

214 In his transcendental deduction of the categories in the first edition of the first Critique, Kant indicates the necessary presence of such a whole [Inbegriff] or reason’s self-enactment in pure concepts of the understanding: “The word ‘concept [Begriff]’ itself could already lead us to” the insight that the a priori cognition “consists solely in the consciousness of this unity of synthesis.” “For it is this one consciousness that unifies the manifold that has been successively intuited, and then also reproduced, into one representation. This consciousness may often only be weak, so that we connect it with the generation [Erzeugung] of the representation only in the effect, but not in the act [Actus] itself, i.e., immediately” (KrV A103). Many interpreters of Kant claim that Deduction A follows mathematical, psychological, or ontological models of imagination. E.g., see respectively Longuenesse [1993] (1998), Vaihinger [1922] (1967), and Heidegger [1973] (1997a). These readings overlook the negative-modal-apodictic ground of both versions of transcendental deduction. At its core, the oneness of consciousness, the original unity of apperception, is the negative-modal-apodictic consciousness of oneness of pure reason in its discipline, i.e., reason’s self-formation as a quintessential whole [Inbegriff] that immediately (purely speculatively) generates pure thought in its genetic systematic completeness. The unity of synthesis is not primarily mathematical, psychological, merely logical, epistemological, or phenomenological. Nor is it a logical function of the understanding proper in judgements. This unity is in essence disciplinary-methodological. The categories bear objective validity only if pure reason forms itself negatively, and thus acquires its objective-relational content purely speculatively. Pure reason must transcendentally-methodologically generate the metaphysical structure of the world before the understanding can transcendentally-objectively discover it. To ignore the epigenetic essence of finite human reason in apodictic methodological ‘creation’ of the world is to miss the transcendental idealist nature of critique altogether.
A792/B820). Transcendental methodological reason has to wrest truth from the hold of transcendental illusion.\footnote{The modalization of natural dialectical transgression of pure reason, which disciplines pure reason, also manifests itself in Kant's analogy between the history of development of pure reason and Genesis in his 1786 review of Herder's Ideas for the Philosophy of History of Humanity. Dismissing Herder's literal history of humanity based on his reading of Scripture, Kant acknowledges the need for using conjectures for "accompanying reason and ... the recreation and health of the mind" (MAM 8:109). He offers a conjectural history in which "the path that philosophy takes in accordance with concepts" is in "accord with that which the story [Genesis chapters 2 to 6] provides" (MAM 8:110). Human reason becomes "an end" in itself in four steps parallel to the biblical story (MAM 8:114). In the first step, "instinct, that voice of God which all animals obey, must alone have guided the novice. It allowed him a few things for nourishment, but forbade him others (Genesis 3:2-3)" (MAM 8:111). But the human being starts to disobey the nourishment instinct: "reason soon began to stir and sought through comparison of that which gratified with that which was represented to him by another sense than the one to which instinct was bound ... to extend his knowledge of the means of nourishment beyond the limits of instinct (Genesis 3:6)" (MAM 8:111). In the second step, the human being moves from "the instinct of nourishment" to "the sexual instinct." Moving beyond the function of sex "for the preservation of the kind, “human being soon found that the stimulus to sex, with which animals rests merely on a transient, for the most part periodic impulse, was capable for him of being prolonged and even increased through the power of the imagination ... he found that it prevents the boredom that comes along with the satisfaction of a merely animal desire. The fig leaf (Genesis 3:7) was thus the product of a far greater manifestation of reason than that which it had demonstrated in the first stage of its development” (MAM 8:112). Anticipating Nietzsche's account of negation in slave morality, Kant points out the crucial role of negation for the idealization and formation of reason in the second step: "Refusal was the first artifice for leading from the merely sensed stimulus over to ideal ones" (MAM 8:113). At this stage, the sociability of human beings starts to take a more definite shape. The third step of reason, is "the deliberate expectation of the future"; this "faculty of not enjoying merely the present moment of life but of making present to oneself the coming, often very distant time, is the decisive mark of the human advantage of preparing himself to pursue distant ends in accordance with his vocation — but also simultaneously it is the most inexhaustible source of cares and worries which the uncertain future incites and forms which all animals are exempt (Genesis 3:13-19)" (MAM 8:113). Enjoyment and suffering in their distinctly human sense seem to derive from this faculty. In the last step, the internal control of reason with regard to the immediate satisfaction of its nourishment and sexual instincts, takes the form of control over animals: human being "comprehended (however obscurely) that he was the genuine end of nature, and that in this nothing that lives on earth can supply a competitor to him. The first time he said to the sheep: Nature has given you the skin you wear not for you but for me, then took it off the sheep and put it on himself (Genesis 3:21), he became aware of a prerogative that he had by his nature over all animals, which he no longer regarded as his fellow creatures, but rather as means and instruments given over to his will for the attainment of his discretionary aims" (MAM 8:114). This step is the establishment of society with fellow human beings, and the complete separation of human species from others. Complete determination of the nature of human species becomes the domination of human species over other species. Kant concludes his account with discussing the simultaneously creative and destructive bearings of reason's inevitable transgression: "Before reason awoke, there was neither command nor prohibition and hence no transgression; but when reason began its business and, weak as it is, got into a scuffle with animality in its whole strength, then there had to arise ills and, what is worse, with more cultivated reason, vices, which were entirely alien to the condition of ignorance and hence of innocence" (MAM 8:115). The possibility of transgression, thus, becomes internal to (any use of) reason. That is how human reason falls. Kant speaks of a human "fall" which has a "moral side" and also a "physical side." "The history of nature thus begins from good, for that is the work of God; the history of freedom from evil, for it is the work of the human being. For the individual, who in the use of his freedom looks merely at himself, there was a loss in such an alteration; for nature, which directs its ends with the human being to the species, it was a gain. The individual therefore has cause to ascribe all ills he suffers, and all the evil he perpetrates, to his own guilt, yet at the same time as a member of the whole (of a species), also to
As it stands, the structural division of the first *Critique* between the elements and method is not a merely technical arrangement extrinsic to the philosophical content of critical philosophy. This division is immanent to pure reason, occurring within cognition in general, between the sensible and “that which is supersensible but yet belongs to reason” (MS 6:206). Through this immanent self-division, pure reason separates its negative supersensible kernel from sensibility and its inevitable natural illusions, forms itself as a disciplinary whole of possible ends, and thus critically-methodologically fills the gap between the sensible and the supersensible. The content (ends) of all cognitions of pure reason are transcendentally-speculatively determined in terms of this genetic form or whole of possible ends, prior to any givenness of objects in intuition. That is to say, the

---

admire and to praise the wisdom and purposiveness of the arrangement” (MAM 8:115-6). The individual human being suffers from her own guilt and enjoys her struggle towards divine wisdom and purposiveness. Drawing on Rousseau, Kant speaks of “the unavoidable conflict of the culture with the nature of the human species as a physical species in which each individual was entirely to reach his vocation” (MAM 8:116). Kant views a transcendental sense of education (discipline) as the remedy for the conflict between culture and nature: “From this conflict (since culture, according to true principles of education [Erziehung] of human being and citizen, has perhaps not yet rightly begun, much less having been complete) arise all true ills that oppress human life, and all vices that dishonour it, nevertheless, the incitements to the latter, which one blames for them, are in themselves good and purposive as natural predispositions, but these predispositions, since they were aimed at the merely natural condition, suffer injury from progressing culture and injure culture in turn, until perfect art again becomes nature, which is the ultimate goal of the moral vocation of the human species” (MAM 8:117-8). There is a parallel between Kant's transcendental correction of culture-nature conflict and a passage in Rousseau's *Geneva Manuscript* which presents his version of *medicina mentis*: “let us attempt to draw from the ill itself the remedy that should cure it. Let us use new associations to correct, if possible, the defect of the general association .... Let us show him in perfected art the reparation of the ills that the beginnings of art caused to nature” Rousseau [1754-6] (1978), p. 162. In Kant's transcendental philosophy, the remedy of human reason's intrinsic deficiencies and ills is the discipline of pure reason, i.e., the cultivation/correction [Zucht], the self-created or second nature that heals natural deficiencies of human reason. Through its power of repetition, the discipline of pure reason appropriates and modalizes its history, and submits the sensible to its own modally-apodictically formed spontaneity.

---

216 Kant expresses the *modal-apodictic* nature of pure reason’s critique or boundary determination in the last chapter of his chapter of the analytic of principles, titled “On the ground of the distinction of all objects in general into phenomena and noumena,” Kant writes: “we have no insight into the possibility of such noumena, and the domain outside of the sphere of appearance is empty (for us), i.e., we have an understanding that extends farther than sensibility *problematically*, but no intuition, indeed not even the concept of a possible intuition, through which objects outside the field of sensibility could be given, and about which the understanding could be employed *assertorically*. The concept of a *noumenon* is therefore merely a *boundary concept*, in order to limit the pretension of sensibility, and therefore only of negative use. But it is nevertheless not invented arbitrarily, but is rather connected with the limitation of sensibility, yet without being able to posit anything positive outside of the domain of the latter” (KrV A255/B310-311).
structural division or generative gap of reason functions as the structure through which reason forms its content a priori. Such formation is structurally performed in the first Critique. Kant insists on presenting the first Critique in a way that reveals “the structural organization of a quite peculiar faculty of cognition in their natural connection” (Prol 4:263). In its order of presentation, the first Critique internalizes the history of reason, and re-enacts this history as the apodictic modality or essence of critical reason. That is to say, the presentation of critique is its self-enactment. Critique appropriates the natural history of reason methodologically, i.e., as its genetic essence, in order to redeem itself or constantly form its natural spontaneity.

2.1.4 Generative gap: the immanent exposure of pure reason to death

Incorporation of the inevitable objective incompleteness of pure reason into its genetic structure as a generative gap – a self-disciplinary transcendental structure – in order to produce pure reason’s methodological completeness or systematicity implies, that pure reason is immanently exposed to degeneration at the very moment of self-generation. There can be no (re)-generation without the imminent risk of degeneration, without reason’s encounter with that which threatens its unity from within. That is to say, the generative gap or self-division of pure reason simultaneously destroys (de-naturalizes) and generates (re-naturalizes) pure reason. This structural simultaneity embodies the revolutionary nature of critique. There can be no revolution without the risk of devolution.

Given his interpretation of the history of pure reason from the “age of criticism” (KrV A xi), Kant views the transcendental degeneration of pure reason primarily in terms of reason’s being deprived of the generative gap, modal-apodictic negativity or self-discipline. This deprivation starts with the failure of reason to acknowledge the objectively
unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible. The failure leaves reason defenseless in the face of the gap, unprepared to generate itself as a whole and fill the gap between the sensible and the supersensible in terms of pure reason’s self-discipline.

Kant usually speaks of the imminence of the transcendental degeneration (death) of pure reason in terms of dogmatist rationalist slumber/laziness and skepticist empiricist negativity or self-destruction. In this sense, the imminent risk of degeneration is present in the natural unavoidability of the transcendental dialectic. Transcendental dialectic leads reason toward degeneration (dogmatism or skepticism) or regeneration (transcendental criticism).

Dogmatism and skepticism respectively seek an objective ground for pure reason’s metaphysical cognitions in order to assert or deny such ground. Being implicated in the transcendental dialectic, dogmatism and skepticism do not recognize the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible. Like a child or adolescent who does not comprehend his or her mortality, dogmatism and skepticism are unaware of or fail to appreciate properly the inevitable objective incompleteness – i.e., mortality or finitude – of human reason. For dogmatism, death is not yet a question. Oblivious to the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible, dogmatism uses the merely logical negativity of the principle of contradiction, seeks the objective ground of reason in, and moves stealthily to, the supersensible side of the gap. Dogmatism thus deprives pure reason of the generative negativity through which reason regenerates itself. Dogmatism is “a pillow to fall asleep on”; it puts “an end to all vitality, which ... is precisely

---

217 Philosophically speaking, Kant views critique as the mature life of pure reason: “The first step in matters of pure reason, which characterizes its childhood, is dogmatic. The ... second step is skeptical, and gives evidence of the caution of the power of judgement sharpened by experience. Now, however, a third step is still necessary, which pertains only to the mature and adult power of judgement” (KrV A761/B789).
the benefit conferred by philosophy.” For skepticism, death is an irrelevant question as it is relegated to a restless negation within sensibility. Ignoring the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible, skepticism seeks the objective ground of reason in, and slips toward, the sensible side of the gap, engaging in the object-related negativity within sensibility. Skepticism “has nothing with which it can exert influence upon a lively reason, since it lays everything aside unused” (VNAEF 8:415).

Having acknowledged the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible, transcendental criticism does not even seek an objective ground. Critical reason grounds itself methodologically, i.e., through self-discipline, or self-formative negativity. This discipline is formed as human reason encounters its mortality or finitude. The primary indication of the inevitable objective incompleteness or mortality of human reason in the first Critique is the division between the transcendental doctrine of elements and the transcendental doctrine of method. Reason’s discipline is its self-formation as it goes through and incorporates this internal division. In this sense, critique acknowledges the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible, and incorporates it as a generative gap. Reason lives through opening itself up to and embracing the risk of death as an immanent un-objectifiable negativity or self-discipline. In his essay on the pantheism controversy, Kant characterizes this as “a negative principle in the use of one’s faculty of cognition.” Critique is the un-objectifiable modal-apodictic negativity of “reason’s faith” (WDO 8:141), which preserves pure reason in the supersensible:

To make use of one’s own reason means no more than to ask oneself, whenever one is supposed to assume something, whether one could find it feasible to make the ground or the rule on which one assumes it into a universal principle for the use of reason. This test is one that everyone can apply to himself; and with this
examination he will see superstition and enthusiasm disappear, even if he falls far short of having the information to refute them on objective grounds. For he is using merely the maxim of reason’s self-preservation. (WDO 8:146) 218

Through this negative maxim, reason constantly regenerates itself and overcomes degeneration and the deadening effects of its natural spontaneity, whether in the form of dogmatism’s lazy reason or skepticism’s restless reason. With its mature attitude to its mortality, critique is the human reason that, as we read in Phaedo, is prepared for death. The maturity of reason in critique arrives necessarily late. And this lateness becomes a structural feature of critical reason.

2.1.5 Generative gap: the structural lateness of critique

As embodied in the structure of the first Critique, transcendental humiliation or discipline is pure reason’s necessarily late or delayed negation of its natural spontaneity in the doctrine of elements. Self-generation takes place retrospectively by necessity, in the doctrine of method. There would have been no transcendental dialectic, and subsequently no humiliation in the doctrine of method, if pure reason could have originally realized the original absence or loss of God. This delay is not primarily temporal or historical. It does not rest on Kant’s transcendental conception of time or on any linear, progressive, or teleological conception of history. As indicated by the structurally necessary gap between object-related metaphysical cognitions in the doctrine of elements and their transcendental-systematic grounding in the doctrine of method, pure reason’s late

218 Here the maxim of pure reason’s self-preservation is formulated in a manner parallel to the categorical imperative: “act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law” (GMS 4:421). The categorical imperative is the re-enactment of the apodictic methodological principle of self-preservation – the discipline of pure reason – in the moral domain. This discipline is the transcendental-speculative maxim of transcendental-moral maxims. There can be no maxim – a self-limiting principle of action – in the moral domain without presupposing the maxim of reason’s self-preservation – the self-enactment of pure reason – which forms the maximum (limits) of moral maxims, that is, moral domain as such. Accessed through the discipline of pure reason, the moral law takes the form of a command or categorical imperative.
awareness of the original loss of God, or delayed self-consciousness, is a natural character of human reason: “it is ... a customary fate of human reason in speculation to finish its edifice as early as possible and only then to investigate whether the ground has been adequately prepared for it” (KrV A5).

The propaedeutic science of critique is inevitably “late and dangerous” (KrV A5). Pure reason can only prepare for – i.e., transcendentally criticize – that of which it is generally aware. The transcendental-systematic grounding of metaphysical cognitions is necessarily retrospective. Pure reason can prepare for future metaphysics only through retrospective incorporation of its past and recasting of its natural history. Pure reason’s awareness of its natural spontaneity does not take place in the transcendental aesthetic or transcendental analytic. It arises in the transcendental dialectic as pure reason falters in its attempts to extend itself into the supersensible. That is to say, pure reason can determine its boundaries (or criticize itself) in the transcendental doctrine of method only after having naturally, or unconsciously, transgressed these boundaries in the transcendental dialectic. To put the point in juridical terms: reason cannot be the judge (form) and the accused (matter) in the tribunal (critique) of reason, unless there is a structural delay in

\[219\] In this sense, Kant’s genetic-methodological notion of critique implies a modern theory of literary criticism. Strictly speaking, literature arises as the object of literary criticism. Criticism is an independent generative, rather than parasitic, activity. It is an art that forms or generates its object. And this object does not need to be itself a work of literature or an artwork in a narrow sense of the term. Kant himself never elaborates his genetic-methodological notion of critique as literary or art criticism. Early German romantics develop a generative notion of literary criticism, even though they do not seem to appreciate the epigenetic nature of Kant’s critical method in the first Critique. E.g., Schlegel identifies “the essence of the critical method” with the unity of “the object and idea, in a preestablished harmony” Schlegel [1797-1801] (1991), p. 57. For a discussion of the Roman-Christian-European historical roots as well as the philosophically modern nature of literature, see Derrida [1998] (2000), especially pp. 15-43. For discussions of the early German romantic view of the generative role of literary criticism for literature, see Nancy & Lacoue-Labarthe [1978] (1988). Neither of these works, however, locates the generative sense of criticism in the discipline of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method. Rather, they tend to think of generative criticism as that which at least in some major respects breaks with Kant’s transcendental criticism in the first Critique.
pure reason to perform this dual function. This structural delay is the origin of the primary sense of a priority in critical philosophy.

The structural lateness of pure reason is central to Kant’s critical conception of enlightenment.\footnote{Although Kant mentions the lateness of critique here and builds this lateness into the genetic structure of pure reason in the first Critique, he does not sufficiently explain its crucial significance for the critical project as a whole. The idea of lateness of philosophy is often attributed to Hegel, especially his characterization of philosophy as “the owl of Minerva” that “begins its flight only with the onset of dusk” Hegel [1821] (1991), p. 23. Hegel’s insight on the lateness of philosophy is sometimes interpreted primarily teleologically rather than epigenetically. The epigenetic nature of Kant’s critical philosophy has been overlooked much more. The lack of attention to Kant’s emphasis on the lateness of critique seems to go hand in hand with the neglect of genetic questions at the heart of the first Critique. Genetic questions are necessarily late: they can arise only in retrospect, retroactively. In the first Critique, genetic questions are the result of reason’s failure in the transcendental dialectic to make metaphysical cognitions systematic. These questions emerge in the doctrine of method, although Kant does not present them with sufficient clarity. The idea of the lateness of critique goes back to Kant’s 1766 Dreams of a Spirit-seer, where he explicitly speaks of “a science of the limits of human reason”; Kant states that this science is “at once the least known and the most important, although it is also an advantage which is only attained at a fairly late stage and after long experience” (TG 2:368).} It motivates pure reason to come to grips with the original loss of God, to think for itself, and to ground metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects in itself. The light of the critical version of German enlightenment [Aufklärung] – reason’s methodological self-clarification through the objective separation and disciplinary connection of the sensible and the supersensible in cognition – shines through the structural division of the first Critique. In this division, pure reason’s late awareness of the original absence of God in objective terms takes the form of its transcendental humiliation or discipline. In its critical sense, enlightenment is primarily self-disciplinary and epigenetic rather than cultural, political, social, economic, scientific, or even moral.\footnote{In Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim (1784), Kant criticizes culturalist and innatist, popularist and scholastic, notions of enlightenment. The self-generative nature of reason is the distinctive mark of a critical notion of enlightenment: “Since nature gave the human being reason, and the freedom of the will grounded on it, that was already a clear indication of its aim in regard to that endowment. For he should now not be guided by instinct or cared for and instructed by innate knowledge; rather he should produce everything out of itself” (laG 8:19). Recasting reason’s natural history, critique inaugurates the idea of a universal history with a cosmopolitan aim.} The negative apodictic modality of pure reason is the philosophical mood of modernity. In the absence of any objective ground or divine guarantee, emerging from human being’s “self-incurred minority,” thinking for
oneself requires “resolution and courage” (WA 8:35), the strength to sacrifice and suffer failure. Reason has to face the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible, alone, and discipline itself – generate its methodological unity – as the primary way of coping with this immanent gap. For Kant, philosophical modernity consists in reason's self-consciousness, or its need to be constantly on guard or disciplined in face of the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible, to keep pace with one's natural spontaneity, and to purify oneself from that which cannot be originally acquired and thus may lead to dialectical errors. In other words, modernity is freedom as critique: reason’s transcendental-speculative self-making or genetic self-determination.

Kant understands the structural lateness of reason as the most necessary function in its transcendental-speculative life. This lateness denaturalizes, purifies, and recasts the elements of human reason within an organic whole. The structural lateness of methodological reason is its retrospective earliness or epigenetic a priority with regard to its elements. Rarely acknowledged, this epigenetic a priority is the primary sense of a

This critical notion of enlightenment in Kant prefigures the early German romantic emphasis on the heroic nature of original thinking and poetic production. E.g., referring to the heroic delicacy of bridge-building over the abyss of the supersensible, the first version of Hölderlin's Patmos reads: "Near is/And difficult to grasp, the God./But where danger threatens/That which saves from it also grows./In gloomy places dwell/The eagles, and fearless over/The chasm walk the sons of the Alps/On bridges lightly built" Hölderlin [1826] (1990), p. 245.

In his 1784 essay An Answer to the Question: What Is Enlightenment? Kant speaks of criticism in terms of freedom or the disciplinary use of reason underlying “the public use of reason.” In this purely speculative use, pure reason is not subordinated to any end, and “must always be free” (WA 8:37). Failing to appreciate the uniqueness of Kant's critical notion of enlightenment, many of Kant's contemporaries and post-Kantians identify it with a conventional notion of abstract reasoning, and miss the distinctively generative nature of critical methodological abstraction, i.e., the purely speculative and retrospective appropriation of reason's natural history or spontaneity. Kant's discussion of freedom of thought in his 1784 essay on enlightenment, 1786 essay on the pantheism controversy, as well as his late political writings are largely interpreted in terms of their immediate historical-political context. In critical philosophy, freedom of thought is primarily the purely speculative form of reason, a methodological self-enactment, which belongs to the self-generation of thinking independent of external restrictions. In Kant, freedom of thought is the disciplinary genetic self-determination of pure reason, rather than a simple allegiance to political liberalism.
priority in critical philosophy: the a priority of the discipline (whole) of pure reason with respect to its parts. Through its retrospective epigenetic a priority, pure reason forms the naturally given in terms of its discipline, or the transcendentally-methodologically self-given. In this way, “we can cognize of things a priori only what we ourselves have put into them” (KrV B xviii).

The retrospective epigenetic a priority of methodological reason to form its elements (matter) is the systematic backbone of Kant’s critical philosophy, the systematic condition of possibility of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason. Unlike a merely logical notion of possibility in rationalist innatism or a psychological notion of possibility in empiricist *generatio aequivoca*, the transcendental possibility is neither eternally nor merely temporally present. Transcendental possibility can only exist *as methodologically necessitated* (transcendentally-systematically delimited). *Apodicticity is the absolute positing or the disciplinary systematic form – boundary – of transcendental possibility.*

The essence of critical reason is not simply present in or to reason as produced images, innate ideas, or a set of ideal conditions. Rather, it lies in the retrospectively self-enacting nature, or late negation, of reason to separate itself from its natural dialectical illusions, to form its natural spontaneity, to make itself present to itself, to catch up with itself. In short, the essence of critical reason is its self-disciplinary genesis. The structural lateness or retrospective epigenetic a priority of pure reason makes objective incompleteness a vital part of the organic completeness or systematicity of pure reason, and forms the

---

224 Most interpretations of *a priori* in the first *Critique* focus on the transcendental apperception in the transcendental analytic, and neglect that prior to the unity of apperception lies the discipline of pure reason. E.g., see Zöller (1989) and Kitcher (2006).

225 This fundamental point is ignored in most interpretations of the first *Critique*. The discipline of pure reason is not presented as the organic systematic ground of critical philosophy, prior to its arguments, including the transcendental deduction of the categories.
transcendental possibility of objects in a manner that accommodates the becoming of ontological reality. In this sense, a critique of pure reason is transcendentally-systematically inclusive and empirically inconclusive.226

2.1.6 Discipline: the health or organic wholeness of pure reason

Kant regards the structural lateness or retrospective epigenetic a priority of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method as necessary for pure reason to preserve itself in the face of death and threats to its health or organic wholeness. In this sense, the critical method is philosophical logic as medicina mentis, i.e., a transcendental-speculative mediation, remedy, or medicine of the mind. In its methodological sense, critique is healthy [gesund] reason, i.e., reason in its organic soundness or wholeness.227 Through its retrospective epigenetic a priority, critical-methodological reason purifies its matter, incorporates transcendental dialectical threats of degeneration (death) into its genetic

---

226 Ignoring the structurally late negation of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method, some attribute the most basic notion of negativity in critical philosophy to imagination. E.g., Žižek writes: “What Kant neglects is the fact that the primordial form of imagination is the exact opposite of this synthetic activity: imagination enables us to tear the texture of reality apart, to treat as effectively existing something that is merely a component of a living Whole.” “If there is some truth in Heidegger’s contention that Kant retreated from the abyss of imagination, his retreat thus concerns, above all, his refusal to bring to light Imagination in its negative/disruptive aspect, as the force of tearing the continuous fabric of intuition apart” Žižek (1999), p. 31 & p. 32. Similar to Heidegger, Žižek does not seem to appreciate that imagination cannot form itself without being negatively-modally-apodictically limited (grounded) in and by purely speculative reason. Neither the disruptive nor the synthetic power of imagination with regard to intuition can operate in the absence of the modal-apodictic negation or primordial self-formation of pure reason. Such negation (epigenetic formation) does not essentially belong to imagination. The negative ground or pure form [Vorbild] of the image [Bild] is separate from the image, and belongs to the modal-apodictic self-enactment of pure reason. Contrary to what Žižek claims, in its most essential sense, the negativity of critique lies primarily in modal-apodictic judgements of pure reason, which determine its boundaries, rather than infinite judgements. Žižek’s confusion of the negativity of infinite judgements and that of apodictic judgements violates one of the most essential distinctions in Kant: the distinction between the titles of quality and modality in the tables of judgements and categories. The negativity of infinite judgements presupposes the possible existence of objects and is inevitably relational, whereas that of modal-apodictic judgements is purely speculative and self-relational.

227 The English heal and German heil originally mean to be whole, to be sound. Kant defines “sound [gesund] understanding” as that in which reason subjects itself to its own disciplinary (remedial) function, “judges correctly” (Prol 4:369), and forms itself as a whole. Kant and Hegel appreciate the indispensable role of mediation (the move to remedy or recover) for the wholeness of reason as a system of ends, although they understand it very differently.
structure, and preserves its organic wholeness. There can be no life without the natural and inevitable possibility of sickness and death. Similarly, no transcendental prescription – correction – is possible without a preview of health concerns and risks as well as their methodological appropriation into the immune system of reason. In a sense, an organic system of living human reason can preserve its health only through the methodological incorporation of reason’s spontaneous and yet inevitably transgressive (self-destructive) dialectical drive as a formative drive into the genetic structure of pure reason. The critical method of pure reason is the redemption of transcendental-dialectical illusion: reason is at once salvaged by and from transcendental illusion, a poison [Gift] that can destroy and/or redeem reason.\textsuperscript{228}

\textsuperscript{228} As already indicated, the generative or redemptive sense of critique, which is at the core of Kant’s critical project to salvage metaphysics and transform it into a science, is later taken in other directions by early German romantics and German Idealists, although no one seems to locate it in the first Critique. This most basic sense of critique is largely ignored throughout the nineteenth century. E.g., Hegel does not see the affinity between this redemptive sense of critique and his notion of the negative. In the twentieth century, thinkers such as Benjamin and Adorno seem to develop their own versions of critical theory partly through appealing to the basic structure of Kant’s generative or redemptive conception of critique, although they do not interpret the first Critique epigenetically. In his first dissertation (1919) “The Concept of Criticism in German Romanticism,” Benjamin discusses how Schlegel’s productive notion of literary criticism is formative of its object (poetry). In his last (1940) essay “On the Concept of History,” Benjamin uses a generative sense of criticism to discuss the concept of history: “the idea of the past” “is indissolubly bound up with the idea of redemption.” “The past carries with it a secret index by which it is referred to redemption” Benjamin (2003), p. 389 & p. 390. In this sense, redemption refers to “hope in the past.” Benjamin’s notion of “historical materialism” can be understood as the structural-philosophical opening of history to redeem or form its matter. Likewise, in his Finale fragment to Minima Moralia, Adorno indirectly speaks of the impossible but necessary task of facing the unspeakable loss that ‘fills’ the world after the Holocaust: “[t]he only philosophy which can be responsibly practiced in the face of despair is the attempt to contemplate all things as they would present themselves from the standpoint of redemption. Knowledge has no light but that shed on the world by redemption: all else is reconstruction, mere technique.” Redemption is the impossible “demand … placed on thought,” which is necessary “for the sake of the possible.” Adorno [1951] (1978), p. 247. Despite considerable structural affinity between Adorno’s notion of philosophy as redemption and Kant’s generative or redemptive conception of critique, Adorno sometimes reads Kant in a manner that reduces the generative or redemptive abstraction of the critical method to a crude conventional version of enlightenment rationalism. E.g., see Adorno & Horkheimer [1944] (2002). My claim about the structural affinity between Benjamin’s or Adorno’s notion of criticism and Kant’s genetic-methodological sense of critique is strictly philosophical, rather than an account in intellectual history. I do not identify Kant’s critical philosophy as the only or even primary historical influence on Benjamin’s or Adorno’s philosophical positions, although they do not conceal the formative influence of critical philosophy on their thinking. E.g., see Benjamin’s expression of his appreciation of Kant’s philosophy in Weber (2008), p. 11.
Kant uses the medical metaphor of health/therapy to describe the incessant negativity of critique, which is vital for reason’s self-preservation or self-generation. In his *Nachlass*, he describes the relation between critical-methodological reason and the transcendental dialectic in this way: “The critique of pure reason is a prophylactic against a sickness of reason that has its germ in our nature” (Refl 18:79). Likewise, in 1796, Kant writes of critique:

> It is the *health* (*status salubritatis*) of *reason*, as effect of philosophy. But since human health ... is an incessant sickness and recovery, the mere *dietary* of practical reason (a sort of gymnastics thereof) is not yet sufficient to preserve the equilibrium which we call health, and which is poised upon a knife-edge; philosophy must also act (therapeutically) as a medicine (*materia medica*). (VNAEF 8:414)²²⁹

As Kant emphasizes, the health or organic wholeness of pure reason is at the same time its exposure to sickness and death. Pure reason can survive only by embracing death (objective incompleteness) in its mortality. The life of pure reason is a *simultaneous* self-destruction and self-generation, an incessant sickening and recovery, self-loss and self-preservation, a redemptive or regenerative “knife-edge” or limit experience that lies prior to the mere dietary (positive) or categorical regulation of practical reason. The discipline of pure reason heals reason after its pathological experience in the transcendental dialectic. It imparts a disciplinary or negative form to the intrinsically deficient matter of pure reason in order to treat its objective incompleteness and to make pure reason healthy, an organic whole.²³⁰ That is how the disciplinary prevention (correction) of pure reason informs its

---

²²⁹ Kant’s use of medical analogy is based on the affinity he sees between the health of the body and the health of the mind. In *The Conflict of the Faculties* (1798), Kant briefly explains this affinity: “Although medicine is an art, it is an art that is drawn directly from nature and must therefore be derived from a science of nature”; in this way, the medical faculty is “much freer than the other two higher faculties [theology and law] and closely akin to the philosophical faculty” (SF 7:27).

²³⁰ The relation between the transcendental dialectic and the transcendental doctrine of method roughly parallels the relation between sickness and health. Gadamer’s account of sickness and health in *The Enigma of Health* might provide more insight into the objective failure of reason in the transcendental dialectic and the
legitimate objective inventions. Put differently, the discipline of pure reason enacts an “imminent perpetual peace” (VNAEF 8:413, italics added), a peace whose imminence makes it self-perpetuating. This peace has the “advantage of constantly activating the power of the subject, who is seemingly in danger of attack, and thus of also promoting, by philosophy, nature’s intention of continuously revitalizing him, and preventing the sleep of death” (VNAEF 8:416).231

2.2 The task of the transcendental doctrine of method

2.2.1 Critical method: the systematic grounding of metaphysical cognitions

Kant concludes the opening paragraph of his introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method reminding the reader that, despite its failure in the transcendental dialectic, reason cannot abstain from building its transcendental dwelling. This conclusion points to the task ahead in the transcendental doctrine of method. The satisfaction of pure reason’s systematic need for self-preservation, which originally motivates the transcendental

---

231 Here Kant’s language of “perpetual peace” indirectly refers to death. In his remarkable opening sentence of *Toward Perpetual Peace* (1795), Kant writes: “It may be left undecided whether this satirical inscription on a certain Dutch innkeeper’s signboard picturing a graveyard was to hold for human beings in general, or for heads of state in particular, who can never get enough of war, or only for philosophers, who dream of that sweet dream” (ZeF 8:343). The retreating character of perpetual peace, the imminence that draws reason towards the withdrawing perpetual peace, determines the incessant therapeutic treatment – critique – of pure reason. We need to distinguish between negation in the sensible, or the anarchical restlessness of skepticism, and the self-negation of pure reason in the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible, or the incessant generation of criticism. Skepticism is the gradual degeneration of internal wars of dogmatism into complete anarchy and war (KrV A ix) whereas criticism is pure reason’s perpetual enactment of an imminent perpetual peace – a virtual death (self-destruction) – as the condition of life of pure reason, including its factional activities in dogmatism and skepticism. As Kant’s passage indicates, the imminence of perpetual peace remains in a sense undecidable as it involves the threat to and promise of peace. The imminence is infinitely self-dividing, indistinguishable between war and peace.
dialectic, should be pursued differently. Rather than giving in to its theoretical ambitions, reason should build its transcendental dwelling in methodological terms:

Now we are concerned not so much with the materials as with the plan, and having been warned not to venture some arbitrary and blind project that might entirely exceed our entire faculty [Vermögen], yet not being able to abstain from the erection of a sturdy dwelling, we have to aim at an edifice in relation to the supplies given to us that is at the same time suited to our needs. (KrV A707/B735)

The primary task of the transcendental doctrine of method is accordingly to redeem the natural spontaneity of reason in the transcendental doctrine of elements according to a plan, and to satisfy reason's necessary need for transcendental dwelling. Given that the transcendental dialectic contains the precritical history of reason, the transcendental doctrine of method functions as the redemption of what is lost or concealed in this history: the systematic completion of metaphysical cognitions. From a critical-methodological standpoint, the transcendental-speculative life of pure reason is an incessant regeneration or redemption of its history. Given its inherent objective incompleteness, the doctrine of method can only supply regenerative structures necessary for its transcendental dwelling.

With the retrospective assessment of the transcendental dialectic and the determination of what the critical method of pure reason needs to accomplish, the second paragraph of Kant’s introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method outlines how pure reason, performing its methodological function, builds its dwelling. Kant presents the four pillars of the transcendental-methodological dwelling of pure reason:

By the transcendental doctrine of method, therefore, I understand the determination of the formal conditions of a complete system of pure reason. With this aim, we shall have to concern ourselves with a discipline, a canon, an architectonic, and finally a history of pure reason. (KrV A707/B735)

Neither merely logical, nor objective-relational, nor merely ideal-teleological, these formal conditions are wholes. And wholes are embryonic forms of reason's self-enactment rather
than objective totalities. These conditions function as organic structures or systematic conditions, which make pure reason systematic, and protect it against dialectical errors. They satisfy methodologically what reason fails to achieve objectively. In its discipline, pure reason generates itself as the faculty of thinking in general, a whole of possible ends, and acquires the relational-objective content (matter) of metaphysical cognitions purely speculatively. The canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason respectively determine the complete systematic conditions of practical, theoretical, and reflecting uses of reason, organizing the content of the whole of possible ends of reason in terms of final, essential, and individual ends of pure reason. Thus, there is no end that pure reason can pursue which is not transcendentally-systematically acquired through its fourfold transcendental-methodological conditions.232

In the second paragraph of the introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method, Kant also reminds the reader that the determination of formal conditions of a system of pure reason used to be done “under the name of practical logic.” In Kant’s account, the schools sought the determination of these formal conditions but “accomplished only badly” since they relied on general logic. Not “limited to any particular kind of cognition of the understanding (e.g., not to the pure cognition of the understanding) or to certain objects,” general logic “cannot, without borrowing knowledge from other...

232 If we take these fourfold conditions seriously, interpretations of critical philosophy that engage only with one or some of them cannot represent Kant's position on the systematicity of pure reason accurately. These four conditions (embryonic wholes) are enacted in apodictic, disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements. Kant adds or reinterprets these judgements to the traditional table of judgements in order to make it transcendentally systematic. Kant does not claim that he has discovered these judgements. Rather, he shows their irreducibility to the traditional pairings of judgements of general logic. In apodictic judgements, pure reason generates itself as a whole of possible ends. In disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements, pure reason negatively instructs (disciplines or forms) the relational, qualitative, and quantitative systematicity of the understanding in pure imagination. Chapter four discusses the role of these judgements in the transcendental systematicity or completeness of the table of judgements.
sciences, do more than expound titles for *possible methods* and technical expressions that are used in regard to that which is systematic in all sorts of sciences* (KrV A708/B736).

Kant contrasts the problematic nature of “*possible methods*” of the general logic with the apodictic nature of the critical method of pure reason.233 The problematic method of general logic does not rely on sensibility, but it is not a priori applicable to sensibility either. By contrast, the critical method is in complete independence from and a priori applicable to sensibility. The critical method is the epigenetic self-enactment of pure reason, or the primary sense of practice in critical philosophy. In this sense, critique is pure reason’s transcendental-speculative practice or self-disciplinary experimentation (negative self-enactment) in the supersensible. The purely speculatively and experimental nature of

---

233 An example of contemporary readings of Kant with little appreciation of the apodictic nature of critical philosophy is Lyotard’s *Lessons on the Analytic of the Sublime*. Taking the manner of aesthetic judgements [*modus aestheticus*] rather than the method [*modus logicus*] of apodictic judgements as the ground of the critical system, Lyotard writes: “aesthetic judgement conceals ... a secret more important than that of doctrine, the secret of the ‘manner’ (rather than the method) in which critical thought proceeds in general.” Appealing to Kant’s distinction between manner and method, Lyotard suggests that the “mode of critical thought should by definition be purely reflective (it does not already have the concepts it seeks to use)” Lyotard [1991] (1994), p. 6. Lyotard’s passages contain at least four major problems in his interpretation of critical philosophy: 1) Lyotard’s account overlooks that the freedom of aesthetic manner presupposes the transcendental-speculative apodictic or compulsion [*Zwang*] of the critical method of pure reason. The theoretical, practical, and empirical disinterestedness of pure aesthetic judgements in regard to the existence of objects is possible only within the methodological-speculative interest of pure reason. In other words, pure feeling is the re-enactment of the methodological self-enactment of pure reason in the power of judgement rather than the self-enactment of pure reason itself. 2) Contrary to what Lyotard suggests, the critical method is not doctrinal. At many occasions, Kant unequivocally discusses the disciplinary nature of the critical method. The transcendental doctrine of method opens with the discipline of pure reason. 3) Lyotard attempts to unify the two major parts of the third *Critique* in aesthetic rather than teleological terms. The privileging of the aesthetic over teleology (in Lyotard) as well as the privileging of teleology over the aesthetic (in the analytic readings to which Lyotard reacts) overlook that aesthetic and teleology belong to the reflecting power of judgement which operates within pure imagination and must be itself grounded apodictically-methodologically. That is to say, the unity of aesthetic and teleology ultimately lies in the negative-modal-apodictic self-enactment of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason. 4) Contrary to Lyotard’s claim, in its transcendental-speculative sense, reason *originally acquires* the concepts it seeks to use, regardless of objects to which they might be applied. This is also the case when we have a particular without a universal. For Kant, the absence of a universal for a particular cannot even become intelligible and be registered if pure reason – the purely speculative apodicticity of pure reason – is not already methodologically determined. The particular appears as contingent – without purpose – only in presupposing the universal apodicticity of the discipline of pure reason, i.e., in purposiveness of the power of judgement. Prior to the particularity of intuitions and the universality of concepts lies the methodological, apodictic, and *un*-objectifiable (negative) universality of the discipline of pure reason.
the critical method is reflected in the etymological origin of *critique, κρίνω* (to decide, distinguish, separate, or bring to trial).\(^{234}\) As early as *Inaugural Dissertation*, Kant calls the propaedeutic science of reason “a certain art of assaying [*artem quondam docimisticam*]” (MSI 2:412). The transcendental-speculative experimentation, trial, test, or testimony of pure reason in the supersensible, the disciplinary self-enactment of reason in pure conviction or reason's faith/belief in itself, is the universal “*practical logic*” – criterion or critique – of pure reason, the transcendental-speculative logic of negative (disciplinary) use of reason immanent to each and every use of human reason in the sensible field.\(^{235}\)

2.2.2 The critical method of pure reason in prefaces to the first *Critique*

Kant’s discussion of the general significance of “*practical logic*,” the transcendental methodological function of pure reason, particularly the disciplinary self-enactment of pure

\(^{234}\) For an historical survey of the use of the term *critique* prior to Kant's critical philosophy, see Tonelli (1978).

\(^{235}\) Kant uses the phrase “practical logic” in his lectures on logic before and after the publication of the first *Critique*. In *The Vienna Logic*, transcribed in 1780, Kant defines practical logic, the transcendental methodological use of reason, as a “universal logic” or “the logic of universal human reason” (V-Lo/Wiener 24:794), distinct from the analytic unity of reason through general logic (the principle of contradiction). In *Dohna-Wundlachen Logic*, transcribed around 1792, Kant defines the doctrine of method as “the practical part” of logic, which only “serves for the critique of cognition”: “The doctrine of method contains the precepts for the possibility of a system of cognition of the understanding and of reason” (V-Lo/Dohna 24:779). In his own copy of the first edition of the first *Critique*, Kant adds a note referring to critique in the methodological sense of “practical”: “the science of all principles of pure reason. (Practical).” Kant's characterization of the transcendental doctrine of method as the transcendental-speculative version of “*practical logic*” indicates the nature of critique as disciplinary self-enactment. As Tonelli shows, early modern logic consists of four major topics of invention, demonstration, semantic, and verification/correction. All these topics “were generically referred to as practical logic or method, although some of them were called ‘method’ pre-eminently. Thus, logic basically concerned also the origin, proper method, extent, and limits of human knowledge” Tonelli (1994), p. 3. Ignoring Kant's use of the expression “practical logic,” in an editorial footnote in their translation of the first *Critique*, Guyer and Wood see “an ambiguity in the definition of ‘practical logic’ in Kant's paradigm of a scholastic logic textbook.” They claim that the ‘practical logic’ is in fact concerned “with rules for action, or what Kant comes to call practical rather than theoretical reason.” Accordingly, it is Kant’s “moral philosophy and not merely his transcendental reflection which is the proper successor to the ‘practical logic’ of the schools” p. 751, fn3. This interpretation does not appreciate the historical philosophical connection between Kant and the tradition of early modern logic, reduces the genetic-methodological function of pure reason to moral actions, and ignores the primary role of the methodological self-enactment of pure reason as the genetic form of all acts of pure reason, including moral ones. Also, in the introduction to the doctrine of method, Kant does not speak of transcendental reflection at all. Overlooking the negative grounding of the critical system in the discipline of pure reason, this reading tends to transform critical philosophy into some form of moral positivism.
reason, is not limited to his two-paragraph introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method. In his two prefaces to the first Critique, Kant focuses on major methodological themes, the systematic significance of which is not duly appreciated. It is not fortuitous that both prefaces are devoted to methodological issues such as transcendental systematicity, certainty, and clarity of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason. Strictly speaking, a preface is the self-effacing retrospective inscription of an ending, a projected systematic whole or pre-scription, at the beginning of a book. And that is what pure reason’s transcendental method – the retrospective apodictic prefacing of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason prior to the contingent appearance of physical objects – attempts to accomplish.

Kant’s prefaces to the first Critique confirm that the disciplinary function of the transcendental method of pure reason is primarily a self-enactment, i.e., the most basic sense of practice in critical philosophy prior to any object-related act. Characterization of the first Critique as “a treatise on the method” (KrV B xxiii) in the second preface is not a passing remark. There, Kant describes critical philosophy “as the altered method of our way of thinking” (KrV B xvii) analogous to Copernicus’ new method in astronomy. Contrary to conventional readings, rather than a mere reversal of the subject-object epistemological relation, a Copernican approach in philosophy is first and foremost an internal methodological revolution in thinking about thinking in general, an understanding of thinking in terms of its own methodological needs to form itself systematically. An empiricist version of the subject-object reversal takes place prior to Kant in Berkeley’s idealism. An a priori reversal, however, can only be the result of a fundamental methodological revolution in the way thought conceives of and relates [beziehen] to itself. In fact, the a priority of the understanding proper in relation to objects is not absolute, and
cannot meet the demand of critique for philosophical apodictic certainty. The analogy with Copernicus conveys the reversal only if understood at the methodological rather than objective-relational level. The methodological self-formation of human reason is the a priori origin of our cognition of objects, regardless of their existence or non-existence: “reason has insight only into what it itself produces according to its own design” (KrV B xiii). The transcendental doctrine of method produces the original design or epigenetic-negative kernel of pure reason, and thus we can “establish something about objects before they are given to us” (KrV B xvi) in a relation in the transcendental aesthetic. Prior to any relation between the understanding and the object, pure reason generates itself methodologically, as “a unity entirely separate and subsisting for itself” (KrV B xxiii). Kant makes the formative role of purely speculative unity of pure reason more explicit as he points to “the nature of a pure speculative reason, which contains a truly articulated structure of members in which each thing is an organ, that is, in which everything is for the sake of each member, and each individual member is for the sake of all” (KrV B xxxvii-xxxviii).

Similarly, Kant’s insertion of the epigraph below, from Bacon, in the second edition indicates his emphasis on the negative essence of critique as the apodictic corrective (disciplinary) self-enactment of pure reason. To avoid transcendental errors, reason must purify itself:

> Of our own person we will say nothing. But as the subject matter with which we are concerned, we ask that men think of it not as an opinion but as a work; and consider it erected not for any sect of ours, or for our good pleasure, but as the foundation of human utility and dignity. Each individual equally, then, may reflect on it himself ... for his own part ... in the common interest. Further, each may well hope from our instauration that it claims nothing infinite, and nothing beyond what is mortal; for in
truth it prescribes only the end of infinite errors, and this is a legitimate end. (KrV B ii)\textsuperscript{236}

The epigraph reveals how Kant views his method, the methodological part of science of logic, in critical analogy with Bacon’s method of medicina mentis in natural sciences. In the second preface, Kant writes: “It took natural science much longer to find the highway [Heeresweg] of science; for it is only about one and a half centuries since the suggestion of the ingenious Bacon of Verulam partly occasioned this discovery and partly further stimulated it” (KrV B xii). Through a critical lens, we can read the epigraph as an attempt to correct/cultivate [züchten] human reason, to “prescribe ... the end of infinite errors,” to remedy dialectical errors. The methodological correction or cultivation occurs through transcendental speculation in which “each individual equally ... may reflect on it himself.” Such speculation is critique – “a work” rather than “an opinion” – that arises from the individual – “for his own part” – and yet is universal, “in the common interest,” since it abstracts from one's empirical-psychological life, “say[s] nothing” “of our own person.”

Transcendental speculation of reason grounds its theoretical and practical cognition, and lays “the foundation of human utility and dignity,” in “mortal” or living human reason.

Kant’s emphasis on the self-enacting disciplinary function of the critical method, a transcendental-speculative practice, for his philosophical project is not a new position in

\textsuperscript{236} All ellipses are Kant’s. The passage is from Bacon’s preface to The Great Instauration (1620). Similarly, in Novum Organum Scientiarum, Bacon writes: “the human understanding, from its peculiar nature, easily supposes a greater degree of order and equality in things than it really finds; and although many things in nature be sui generis and most irregular, will yet invent parallels and conjugates and relatives, where no such thing is.” In response to the “awkward and ill-regulated” character of invention in human reason, medicina mentis helps “remove despair and excite hope, by bidding farewell to the errors of past ages, or by their correction” Bacon [1620] (1990), p 110, p. 129, & p. 128. Correction or cultivation is one of the sub-disciplines of logic in the tradition of early modern logic, which Kant interprets critically and brings to the centre of his critical method. Among the fourfold theories of the early modern logic – invention, demonstration, semantics, and correction/verification –, Kant privileges the last one, and defines critique primarily as a science of a priori correction and verification. The idea of critical philosophy consists in the primacy of transcendental-speculative prevention (a priori correction) over transcendental-objective invention. Critique is the negative criterion for verification.
the second edition of the first *Critique*. The first preface covers critical methodological themes just as unequivocally.\(^{237}\) It includes a critical version of major methodological themes in the first seven chapters of Meier’s *Excerpts from the Doctrine of Reason*—the logic textbook on which Kant lectured from 1765 onward.\(^{238}\) Kant uses the first preface to provide a preview of key methodological themes—particularly the transcendental systematicity, certainty, and clarity of critique of pure reason—which underlie his exposition in the main body of the text but remain mostly implicit, especially before the transcendental doctrine of method. As Kant understands it, Meier’s book treats its main methodological themes—the issues concerning what both Meier and Kant, each in his own distinct methodological sense, call “cognition in general”—in the first seven chapters prior to the exposition of the elements of logic: concepts, judgements, and syllogisms. In a brief note, at the outset of chapter eight of his own copy of *Excerpts*, Kant writes: “previously cognition in general was treated, as *propaedeutic* to logic, now *logic itself* follows” (Log 9:4).

In the first *Critique*, Kant incorporates a concise version of these methodological discussions (“*propaedeutic* to logic”) into his preface to prepare the reader (for “*logic itself*”) while keeping intact the natural organization of pure reason—the presentation of

\(^{237}\) For a discussion of Kant’s use of common sense as well as scholastic terminology to refer to the method especially in the first edition of the first *Critique*, see Tonelli (1994).

the transcendental doctrine of elements prior to the transcendental doctrine of method – in the main body of his text.239

The methodological significance of Kant’s first preface to the first Critique can also be seen in its two overarching claims about the critique of pure reason: first, critique is the propaedeutic science of metaphysics which provides negative instruction and in this sense is methodological in nature; second, critique is genetically systematic, apodictically-philosophically certain, and transcendentally-speculatively clear.

Kant introduces the methodological nature of critique as the propaedeutic science of metaphysics in the opening paragraphs of the first preface. The preface starts with a retrospective philosophical account of the history of metaphysics whereby Kant recasts the history of metaphysics in terms of the paradox that comes to view only through his critical perspective. His philosophical history outlines three major methodological responses to the intrinsic or natural paradox of human reason: its incapacity to theoretically resolve

---

239 Dividing logic into concept, judgement, syllogism, and method goes back to the tradition of early modern logic. E.g., in Port-Royal Logic, logic is divided into “ideas,” “judgements,” “reasoning,” and “method.” See Arnauld & Nicole [1683] (1996). As a promoter of popular philosophy, which in eighteenth century Prussia is usually contrasted to school philosophy, Meier seems to modify this division for pedagogical considerations. The modification takes the form of an extensive discussion of methodological issues prior to his chapters on the concept, judgement, and syllogism. Meier does so without changing the formal order of the four parts of his book. He discusses at length (110 pages), in the first seven chapters of Part One, key methodological issues such as completeness, necessity, clarity, and certainty of cognitions, which are formally supposed to be presented in Part Two. As a result, Part Two, “Of the method of learned cognition,” ends up very short (7 pages) and mainly focused on merely technical issues of method. The domination of methodological issues in the first seven chapters of Meier’s textbook is also reflected in Kant’s lecture notes and manuscripts as they are put together in Jäsche Logic (1800). The introduction to Jäsche Logic, which contains more than half of Kant’s notes, covers methodological themes in the first seven chapters of Meier’s textbook. In contrast to Meier, Kant is strict in following the traditional fourfold division of logic in the main body of the first Critique. He uses his prefaces to outline the methodological issues he considers essential for framing the text and orienting the reader in her first encounter with the first Critique. Structurally speaking, Kant’s critical novelty lies in organizing the fourfold division of early modern logic into two distinct parts, elements and method, and adding an “aesthetic” to the elements and a “history” to the method. Kant divides Part One of Meier’s textbook into “propaedeutic to logic” and “logic itself,” and uses this new division as the primary structural division of the first Critique into the transcendental doctrine of method and transcendental doctrine of elements. Kant’s critical signature aims to ground the transcendental aesthetic and transcendental logic critically-methodologically.
metaphysical questions given “by the nature of reason itself” (KrV A vii). Accordingly, the failure of reason to make metaphysics a science originates from the rationalist-dogmatist, empiricist-skepticist, and popular-indifferentist methodological responses to the paradox. Rationalist dogmatism does not even detect the paradox. It remains oblivious that the possibility of metaphysics – which is necessarily a doctrine – cannot be grounded in doctrinal or “despotic” terms (KrV A ix). Empiricist skepticism detects the paradox, but it does not deal with it in terms of the nature of reason, andfacilely concludes the impossibility of metaphysics as an a priori science of physical objects. Not only is skepticism against dogmatic grounding, but it also abhors “all permanent cultivation of the soil” (KrV A ix), taking refuge instead in culture and custom. Indifferentism tries to evade the paradox, and exchanges “the language of the schools for a popular style,” but it “always unavoidably fall[s] back into metaphysical assertions” of the rationalist dogmatism it professes “so much to despise” (KrV A x). One way or another, the dogmatist, skepticist, and indifferentist methods fail to put reason on a path to remedy its natural paradox by preventing dialectical errors, correcting reason prior to its metaphysical cognitions.

Unlike these methods, Kant argues, critique is the apodictic method of pure reason which goes behind pure reason’s natural paradox to address its original motivation, i.e., the need for systematic completion of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason. As the “self-cognition [Selbsterkenntnis]” of pure reason prior to its dogmatic cognitions, critique satisfies the systematic need of pure reason (KrV A xii). In transcendental-speculative self-cognition (critique), reason deals “merely with reason itself and its pure thinking” (KrV A xiv). Viewing self-cognition as the transcendental-speculative practice of self-formation, Kant is careful to remind the reader that
by this [the critique of pure reason] I do not understand a critique of books and systems, but a critique of the faculty of reason in general, in respect of all the cognitions after which reason might strive independently of all experience, and hence the decision about the possibility or impossibility of a metaphysics in general, and the determination of its sources, as well as its extent and boundaries, all, however, from principles. (KrV A xii)

As Kant explains, critique is not primarily pure reason’s self-cognition in an objective sense or pure reason’s self-affection in an intuitive sense. Neither is it primarily a theory or doctrine containing a list of a priori conditions such as forms of intuition (time and space) and forms of thought (the categories), which make synthetic a priori judgements possible. Rather than a theory or doctrine [Lehre], critique is primarily a method [Lehrl], an art or method of thinking through which pure reason decides [κρίνω] on the possibility or impossibility of metaphysics in general. Rather than a mere theoretical choice, this decision is an ineluctable self-enactment of pure reason in the face of its impossibility. It cuts and separates the sensible from the supersensible in human cognition, in order to preserve (generate) pure reason as the negative, purely speculative, apodictic, and immediate ground of metaphysical cognitions. The self-enactment of this negative immediate

---

240 The early reviews of the first Critique misread Kant’s emphasis on the methodological nature of critique as a conventional form of idealism. Kant addresses these reviews through elaborating his distinction between the methodological self-cognition (self-formation) of pure reason in his critical apodictic idealism and other models of self-cognition in “the problematic idealism of Descartes” and “the dogmatic idealism of Berkeley” (Prol 4:372-380) & (KrV B 274).

241 As the methodological self-enactment or self-cognition of pure reason, critique can be thought as a transcendental-speculative version of the Delphic principle “Know yourself [gnōthi seauton]” and its Socratic practice through the negative method of elenchus, the method of testing and attestation. Critique is the primary form of evidence [elenchus], the measure by which all cognition is defined. That is why Kant defines critique (self-cognition) as the transcendental dwelling of pure reason. In his ontological-phenomenological interpretation of the first Critique, Heidegger interprets the self-cognition of pure reason in existential terms, as care in which Dasein dwells. He also introduces an existential interpretation of the ancient Care Fable to provide historical support for his claim. Heidegger [1927] (1996), pp. 183-186. Similarly, Foucault traces his notions of the technologies of the self and the disciplinary practices of power back to the classical Greek and Roman notion of epimeleia heautou, the care of the self. See Foucault [1983] (2001), p. 92. He occasionally implies that Kant’s notion of enlightenment is a modern form of the care of the self. See Foucault [1994] (1997a) & Foucault [1994] (1997b). Reading critique primarily in terms of a juridical model of self-cognition, Foucault does not seem to appreciate that for Kant the universal use of reason is the disciplinary epigenesis or methodological self-enactment of pure reason. Foucault defines his own notion of criticism in contrast to
ground [Grundsatz] of pure reason, which is also pure reason's most important safeguard against skepticism in general,\textsuperscript{242} necessitates the possibility of physical objects and their metaphysical cognitions, and thereby a priori ensures “reason’s full satisfaction” (KrV A xv).\textsuperscript{243}

To make his second methodological claim with regard to the systematicity, certainty, and clarity of critique, Kant characterizes critique as systematic organic determination or self-acquisition of the ends of pure reason. Critique makes pure reason transcendental philosophy, as “genealogical in its design and archeological in its method.” Missing the crucial role of transcendental dialectical transgression in the disciplinary self-generation of pure reason, he writes: “The point, in brief, is to transform the critique conducted in the form of necessary limitation into a practical critique that takes the form of a possible crossing-over [transgression]” Foucault [1994] (1997b) p. 315 & p. 314. Foucault’s transformation of an apodictic, disciplinary, and epigenetic notion of critique into a possible practical critique degrades rather than improve Kant’s critical philosophy. Foucault fails to see the epigenetic model of critique behind Kant’s use of juridical metaphors. That said, Foucault acknowledges that “the universal use of reason ... is the business of the subject himself as an individual.” Foucault [1994] (1997b), p. 307, italics added. Even though Heidegger and Foucault do not see the epigenetic grounding of critical philosophy, they notice an often-neglected character of critique, and acknowledge that Kant’s primary notion of universality must be enacted individually. The modal-apodictic universality of the discipline of pure reason – the innermost ground (boundary, form, or whole) of the faculty of thinking in general – underlies and transcends the objective-relational universality of the categories. Many interpreters overlook the underlying role of negative-modal-apodictic universality as the negative immediacy that conditions the objective universality of metaphysical cognitions. A critical appreciation of dogmatic objectification and objective universality requires rendering explicit their self-enacting, purely speculative, individual ground. There is no cognizing without pure reason’s individual-universal (quasi-monadic) disciplinary self-enactment, i.e., reason’s faith/belief in itself or pure conviction. The discipline of pure reason is the sameness that can never be the same, the sameness that remains the same only in exceeding or going outside itself, as it has to be constantly re-enacted individually.

\textsuperscript{242} Despite an overabundance of commentaries about the issue of skepticism in the transcendental deduction, few seem to appreciate that for Kant the objective deduction of the categories is not the primary locus of arguing against skepticism. Potential anti-skeptical side arguments in the transcendental deduction are not of primary significance for Kant’s deduction. The transcendental deduction of categories presupposes the defeat of skepticism by critique. Kant argues against skepticism, for apodictic philosophical certainty, \textit{primarily methodologically}, through the discipline of pure reason (reason’s faith/belief in itself) rather than objectively. Critical philosophy acknowledges that skepticism cannot and need not be avoided in objective terms, and accommodates the restlessness of skepticism in objective terms in order to uproot it methodologically.

\textsuperscript{243} In \textit{Jäsche Logic}, Kant notes: “\textbf{Immediately certain} judgements a priori can be called principles [Grundsätze], insofar as other judgements are proved from them, but they themselves cannot be subordinated to any other. On this account they are called \textit{principles} [Principien] (beginnings)” (Log 9:110, bold is added). Kant’s use of \textit{principle} [Princip] should be ultimately understood in terms of the negative-apodictic immediacy or ineluctability of purely speculative principle [Grundsatz] of pure reason. In this sense, critical philosophy does not ground metaphysics in a theoretical principle. A theoretical principle cannot be an immediately certain judgement. To put it differently, all metaphysical cognitions are in essence transcendental-speculative self-cognitions. The immediate (purely speculative) self-cognition of pure reason is the a priori origin of its cognition of objects. All metaphysical principles are derived from a single immediate negative-modal-apodictic ground: the discipline of pure reason.
genetically-systematically complete, as it determines "each of the ends" of pure reason and "all of them together" not "arbitrarily, but ... by the nature of cognition itself" (KrV A xiv). In other words, critique of pure reason is the epigenetic self-enactment of pure reason as a whole of possible ends in which transcendental-systematic self-formation is content-acquisition. A priori completeness of pure reason with regard to its possible ends (uses or cognitions) means the apodictic certainty of critique prior to any relation to objects in metaphysics proper. Once all possible ends of pure reason are acquired in terms of an a priori whole, its metaphysical cognitions have “apodictic (philosophical) certainty” (KrV A xv). Critique also renders pure reason transcendentially-speculatively clear as pure reason

---

244 Most claims about critique’s failure to be systematic rest on an inaccurate understanding of Kant’s conception of systematicity. Kant distinguishes between an epigenetic or embryonic completeness or transcendental-speculative systematicity of pure reason – “a complete enumeration of all of the ancestral concepts [Stammbegriffe] that comprise the pure cognition” – and a “completeness of the analysis ... which are to be provided in future” (KrV A14). Kant sometimes identifies the former with the genetic completeness of “the principles for a system” as distinct from “the completeness of the system” in the sense that it includes derivative concepts (KrV A82/B108). This distinction implies that the absence of analytical completeness, a derivative of genetic systematicity, in the first Critique or even in Kant’s critical corpus as a whole should not be taken as the incompleteness of critical philosophy. Reading Kant’s strong claims on the completeness and systematicity of critique as baseless, bogus, self-serving, unbalanced, overstated, or excessive, we would miss the most essential novelty of critical philosophy. The transcendental systematicity of pure reason is not a side issue or an afterthought. It is the heart and soul of Kant’s critical project. Nothing can sustain itself in the critical project without the systematicity of pure reason. The unity of philosophy or the systematicity of pure reason cannot be achieved cumulatively, through step-by-step analyses and syntheses of principles. It is either epigenetically enacted or it will never be. It is a matter of "all or nothing" (Prol 4:263), either a systematic epigenetic formation of all possibilities or impossible. Precisely here lies the revolutionary or transformative character of Kant's critical philosophy. In essence, critique is the incessant (re)birth of pure reason, rather than its progressive development and piecemeal extension. Critique “cannot be terribly extensive, for it does not deal with objects of reason, whose multiplicity is infinite, but merely with itself, with problems that spring entirely from its own womb, and that are not set before it by the nature of things that are distinct from it but through its own nature” (KrV B23). In short, the transcendental systematicity of pure reason is primarily the sameness of reason’s stem or source – i.e., pure reason’s self-enactment – rather than an objective totality.

245 Kant’s claim on the systematic completeness of critique in the transcendental doctrine of method in the first Critique implies that the second and third Critiques only elaborate what is already determined and outlined. The foundational role that Kant attributes to the first Critique for his critical project as a whole sheds light on his 1799 Dissertation against Fichte’s Wissenschaftslehre. Kant insists on “the completeness of pure philosophy within the Critique of Pure Reason,” and refers to the first Critique as “a fully secured foundation” for “the theoretical as well as the moral, practical purposes of reason” (Br 12:371). As I discuss in this and the next chapter, all possible ends of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason are purely speculatively determined in the transcendental doctrine of method. These ends function as schematic grounds (origins) in terms of which theoretical, practical, and reflecting (aesthetic/teleological) ends are embodied in object-related terms. Chapter four discusses how this systematicity is represented in the table of judgements.
generates all of its possible ends entirely out of itself and brings them before itself. Critique is

nothing but the inventory of all we possess through pure reason, ordered systematically. Nothing here can escape us, because what reason brings forth entirely out of itself cannot be hidden, but is brought to light by reason itself as soon as reason’s common principle has been discovered. (KrV A xx)

Having examined the speculative and disciplinary nature of the critical method of pure reason, now we will discuss how pure reason generates itself as a system or whole of possible ends.

2.3 Negative judgements of discipline: the self-formation of the whole of pure reason

2.3.1 The negative ground of transcendental philosophy

In his introduction to the chapter on the discipline of pure reason, Kant suggests that pure reason forms itself as the quintessential whole [Inbegriff] of possible ends, as the discipline of pure reason, through “negative judgements.” Despite performing such a crucial function, negative judgements, Kant tells us, “do not stand in high regard ... and it almost takes an apology to earn toleration for them, let alone favor and esteem” (KrV A708/B736). The sharp contrast between the foundational role of negative judgements of discipline in critical philosophy and the prevalent hostility, contempt, or neglect toward them in the tradition of early modern logic indicates the philosophically exceptional and anachronistic nature of Kant’s project to ground metaphysics in a negative speculative logic, or in the

---

246 As the primary sense of clarity in critical philosophy, the transcendental-speculative clarity of pure reason is the clarity with regard to the transcendental-speculative form of pure reason, the whole of possible ends of reason. This notion of clarity, enacted in the discipline of pure reason, is presupposed in the derivative analytical notion of clarity, i.e., the merely logical clarity of understanding proper with regard to its operation. Hence, the lack of analytical clarity in Kant’s presentation should not be taken as an absence of transcendental-speculative clarity. Any attempt to explain critical philosophy through reducing the disciplinary clarity of its transcendental-speculative boundaries to a merely logical analytical clarity can only distort and obscure the disciplinary nature of critical philosophy.
One cannot overstate the significance of negative judgements for the system of critical philosophy as a whole: “the entire philosophy of pure reason is concerned merely with this negative use” (KrV A711/B739, italics added), that is, the disciplinary use of reason in negative judgements which precedes and exceeds dogmatic (theoretical and practical), reflecting (aesthetic and teleological), polemical, and hypothetical uses of reason. Negative judgements of discipline generate reason as a whole of possible ends, determine the boundaries of reason, a priori correct dialectical errors, and immanently run through and transcendentally-speculatively hold together each and every act of reason. In essence, these judgements enact the epigenetic conception of negativity upon which practical and theoretical cognitions as well as aesthetic/teleological reflections stand.

2.3.2 Negative judgements of discipline vs. negative judgements of general logic

Negative judgements of discipline do not belong to general logic. They are not the same as negative judgements that are placed under the title of quality in the table of judgements. Negative judgements of quality are governed by the merely logical principle of contradiction, and abstract from all content of the predicate-concept. They only show the merely logical impossibility of attributing the predicate-concept to the subject-concept. In these judgements, “negation always affects the copula” (Log 9:104), and “the subject is posited outside the sphere of the predicate” (Log 9:103). Negative judgements of quality assert that “S is not P” regardless of what P is. By contrast, negative judgements of discipline “are negative not merely on the basis of logical form but also on the basis of their content” (KrV A708/B736). Here “content” should be understood as possible ends rather

---

247 This philosophical anachronism also reveals itself in historical terms in the failure of almost all contemporaries of Kant to appreciate the first Critique upon its publication. Critical philosophy embodies the essence of critical modernity as structural anachronism.
than as an immediately given sensible content. Excluding that which cannot be acquired as a possible end of pure reason, negative judgements of discipline demarcate the whole of possible ends of reason. They determine the boundary between what is transcendentally-speculatively possible and the impossible. The self-enactment of reason as a negative (disciplinary) whole in negative judgements of discipline is the acquisition or formation of content in general, prior to the distinction between the logical form of understanding and the empirical content of sensibility. In this self-enactment, reason acquires itself as an organic whole of possible ends. That is to say, negative judgements of discipline at once determine the genetic form and content of cognition in general, prior to any necessary or contingent relation to objects in theoretical, practical, and reflecting (aesthetic and teleological) uses of reason.

2.3.3 Negative judgements of discipline vs. infinite judgements

Negative judgements of discipline do not belong to the transcendental logic proper. They are not the same as infinite judgements. To be sure, infinite judgements are not concerned with the merely logical negation of the copula. In them, “the predicate ... is affected” and “the sphere of the predicate” is limited (Log 9:104). Infinite judgements take the content of predicate-concept into account, and affirm that “S is not-P.” These judgements, nevertheless, indefinitely delimit the content of a predicate-concept through presupposing the possible givenness (existence) of objects. Determining the content primarily through a relation to possible objects, infinite judgements are not entirely independent of sensible objects. They are not modal-transcendental. By contrast, negative judgements of discipline form pure reason itself, and thus determine the possible “content of pure cognition in general” (KrV A709/B737), regardless of the existence or non-existence of objects, prior to
any relation to objects. They form the methodological ground of possible ends (contents or objects), before objects are given in intuition or analyzed in the understanding. Prior to the possible relational givenness of objects, negative judgements of discipline enact the negative methodological law of pure reason’s self-givenness. The positive givenness of objects presupposes the negative self-givenness of reason.

2.3.4 Negative judgements of discipline: modal and apodictic

Negative judgements of discipline are modal. As such, they have “a quite special function ... which is distinctive in that it contributes nothing to the content of the judgement (for besides quantity, quality, and relation there is nothing more that constitutes the content of a judgement) thinking in general” (KrV A74/B99-100).248 These judgements enact “the method of cognition from pure reason” (KrV A712/B740, italics added), i.e., the corrective (critical) method of pure reason: they “have the special job of solely preventing error” (KrV A709/B737), prior to any relation to objects. As seen in the transcendental dialectic, the transcendental life of pure reason in the supersensible is naturally and inevitably plagued with “an entire system of delusions and deceptions.” Hence, pure reason needs a discipline, i.e., “a quite special and indeed negative legislation ... a system of caution and self-examination out of the nature of reason and the objects of its pure use, before which no false sophistical illusion can stand up.” Unlike “individual errors” which “can be remedied through censure” (i.e., the local use of the skeptical method of doubt), systematic errors in the transcendental dialectic can be corrected only methodologically, “through critique” (KrV A711/B739). Rather than one-by-one detection and analysis of transcendental dialectical errors of pure reason in relation to supersensible objects, negative judgements

248 Here Kant means “content” in an objective rather than transcendental-speculative sense of “possible ends.”
of discipline correct these errors systematically, i.e., through pure reason’s methodological determination of its boundaries, the self-enactment of the primordial modality (modal-apodictic unity) of pure reason in abstraction from its relationality:

where the illusion that presents itself is very deceptive, and where the disadvantage of error is very serious, there the negative in instruction, which serves merely to defend us from errors, is more important than many a positive teaching by means of which our cognition could be augmented. (KrV A709/B737)

In short, negative judgements of discipline prevent dialectical errors rather than extend metaphysical cognitions in logical or actual terms. These modal judgements are neither problematic nor assertoric. They only preserve what is absolutely indispensable for reason to sustain itself in the supersensible, independent of relation to objects.

Negative judgements of discipline are apodictic. That is, they respond to and satisfy the most basic transcendental-speculative need of pure reason to preserve itself in the supersensible. Unlike problematic judgements (“It is possible that ‘S is P’”) and assertoric judgements (“It is true that ‘S is P’”), negative judgements of discipline enact a purely speculative apodicticity (“It is necessary that ‘S is P’”). The apodictic identification of the subject-concept and the predicate-concept is prior to and therefore is not concerned with any particular relation between a subject and a predicate. This identification necessitates the non-relational or absolute ground, the quintessential whole [Inbegriff], in which subject-concepts and predicate-concepts can be related. That is why it applies to all subject-concepts and predicate-concepts. The apodicticity of negative judgements of discipline is the medium that forms or disciplines the possibility of relation between subjects and predicates in general. In other words, these judgements enact the discipline of pure reason, i.e., “the compulsion [Zwang] through which the constant propensity [of pure reason] to stray from certain rules is limited and finally eradicated” (KrV A709/B737).

Transcendental compulsion or the self-preserving force [conatus] of pure reason is distinct from the empirical (psychological) necessity of skills in culture [Kultur] and the dogmatic necessity of doctrine [Doktrin] in metaphysics proper. Culture “would merely produce a skill without first cancelling out another one that is already present” (KrV A709/B737). Doctrine would only present a dogmatic rule and leaves no room for negativity. Culture and doctrine both lack the apodicticity or compulsion of pure reason’s generative negativity or discipline.\(^{249}\) For Kant, one cannot deny the crucial significance of the negative judgements of discipline for the enactment of the transcendental compulsion of pure reason: “in its transcendental use … reason so badly needs a discipline to constrain its propensity to expansion beyond the narrow boundaries of possible experience and to preserve it from straying and error that the entire philosophy of pure reason is concerned merely with this negative use” (KrV A711/B739).

2.3.5 Negative judgements of discipline: corrective and generative

Negative judgements of discipline are generative. Determining boundaries of pure reason, they enact the transcendental-speculative necessity of transcendental compulsion rather

\(^{249}\) Transcendental compulsion is the primary sense of necessity in critical philosophy. Many interpreters assume an object-related sense of necessity in the understanding or a moral sense of necessity as the most important one. They neglect that the absolute necessity of theoretical and practical cognitions belongs to the apodictic nature of the critical method. In his Nachlass, in a passage written some time around 1776-78, Kant notes: “What was held at the start as a doctrine of pure reason is not its discipline, i.e., its correction [Zucht] and animadversion [animadversion]. The discipline is a limitation of the propensities or powers of the mind [Gemüthskräften] within their appropriate bounds. Discipline is negative. Not dogmatic. The mind [Geist] must not only be instructed [unterwiesen]: institution [Institution], but also be disciplined, i.e., be disaccustomed [abgewöhnt] from its bad habits [unarten]” (Refl 18:71). Kant suggests that discipline is the method [Art] of reason to build transcendental dwelling [Wohnung] through undoing or de-naturalizing its illusory dwelling or dialectical bad habits [unarten]. Kant’s articulation of discipline in this passage implies that, despite their differences, culture and doctrine, skepticism and dogmatism, are natural habits of reason which deprive reason of the vitality of its negative instruction (discipline), correction/cultivation [Zucht]. As forms of natural habituation of reason, culture and doctrine themselves need disciplinary regeneration. Pure reason regenerates itself in breaking from its own natural habits. To live, pure reason needs constant speculative (re)birth. This rebirth takes place in Zucht. The crucial significance of Zucht for critical philosophy is ignored. Even among the few interpreters who do not ignore it, Zucht is reduced to preparation for morality. E.g., Yovel writes: “the culture of discipline (Zucht) … is supposed to work on man’s inner will and prepare it for the rule of morality” Yovel (1980), p.184.
than the empirical necessity of culture or the dogmatic necessity of doctrine. The transcendental compulsion of pure reason functions as a correction or cultivation [Zucht] prior to any culture and doctrine. In this sense, negative judgements of discipline are at once corrective (preventive) and generative. Transcendental correction delimits or forms the boundaries of pure reason and in this sense it is transcendental generation. The denial of any cognitive claims about the supersensible in negative judgements of discipline is at the same time the formative ground of all cognitive (practical, theoretical, and empirical) claims about the sensible. Pure reason’s self-negation is an object-determination, regardless of the existence or non-existence of objects. The negative judgement of discipline is the judgement formative of all metaphysical judgements of pure reason. In this sense, it is the last judgement, i.e., judgement of/in synthetic a priori judgements.\(^{250}\)

Kant explains the “negative contribution” of the discipline of pure reason “in the formation [Bildung] of a talent,” or a natural spontaneity:

I am well aware that in the language of the schools the name of discipline is customarily used as equivalent to that of instruction [Unterweisung]. But there are so many other cases where the first expression, as correction [Zucht], must carefully be contrasted to teaching [Belehrung], and the nature of things itself also makes it necessary to preserve the only suitable expression for this difference, that I wish

\(^{250}\) Verene’s reading of Kant is typical of those that ignore the generative character of transcendental correction – the boundary-determination – of pure reason in negative judgements. Collapsing very different philosophical approaches into each other and reducing critique to a merely reflective form of argumentation, he writes: “Reflective critical thinking is the slogan of modern philosophy. Whether practiced as deconstruction, analytic metaphysics, or critical theory, philosophy stands by this slogan. We wander in the Dantean dark wood, sorting out truths from error, and then, because for every argument it is not beyond human wit to create counter-argument, resorting to them. Critical thinking is driven by a fear of error. It is unable to complete its own process because there is always more to criticize, including the most recent conclusion that criticism has produced. As criticism, philosophy is always threatened by fatigue. Its reasonings offer no final illumination or relief” Verene (2009), p. ix. This reading of Kant completely ignores the distinction between reflective functions of the understanding and purely speculative functions of reason, and does not appreciate that in Kant’s critical philosophy reflective functions of understanding are grounded in a purely speculative – modal-apodictic – function of methodological reason to sustain (constantly regenerate) itself as a whole of possible end. In chapter four, I discuss the negative judgements of discipline as the finite form of the Last Judgement.
that this word would never be allowed to be used in anything but the negative sense. (KrV A710/B738)

The self-limitation of reason in negative judgements of discipline functions as the formative drive [Bildungstrieb] that negates (forms) reason’s “lust for knowledge,” the “unremitting” natural spontaneity or “cognitive drive [Erkenntnistrieb]” of reason (KrV A708/B716). Rather than following the teaching of culture or doctrine, in its discipline, reason becomes its own disciple. Preparing its own material, it forms or cultivates/corrects [züchten] itself as a whole of possible ends. The disciplinary self-formation of its natural spontaneity is the only way reason can preserve itself, determine itself genetically, and enact the primary sense (transcendental-speculative) of freedom. It is only through self-discipline that pure reason can discipline and structure its acts of understanding and morality in nature.251

In negative judgements of discipline, the cognitive drive that unremittingly extends pure reason into the supersensible, and the formative drive that limits such extension, meet, making negative judgements of discipline the locus of transcendental-speculative violence of critical reason. This life-giving or generative violence separates the sensible and the supersensible in human reason, and gives birth to healthy reason and civil unity by connecting them modally-apodictically, i.e., in the discipline of pure reason. This generative violence is distinct from and prior to the morally indifferent destructiveness of inanimate nature in natural disasters (as Kant saw the 1755 Lisbon earthquake), the moral force of the categorical imperative (GMS 4:421), the immoral brutality of radical evil (RGV 6:29-53),

251 For Kant’s discussion of the formative role of discipline in pedagogical terms, see (Päd 9:441-454). Among the few who approximate a partial appreciation of the crucial significance of Kant’s point on reason’s self-discipline (self-cultivation) in the nineteenth century is Emerson. He devotes a chapter of his book Nature to “Discipline” in order to show that in essence “nature is a discipline.” Emerson also appreciates the retrospective nature or mournful mood of critique. Nature opens with this statement: “Our age is retrospective. It builds the sepulchers of the fathers. It writes biographies, histories, and criticism” Emerson [1836-1862] (1990), p. 33 & p. 15.
and the threat of nature as a power in the dynamically sublime (KU 5:260). Kant regards dogmatism and skepticism as despotic and anarchic forms of the philosophical savagery of reason. Dogmatists retain “traces of ancient barbarism” and skeptics are “a kind of nomads who abhor all permanent cultivation of the soil” and shatter “civil unity” (KrV A ix). Critique is the negative force, or self-instituting violence, of the discipline of pure reason which prescribes, runs through, and transcendentally-speculatively legitimizes – i.e., necessitates – all possible acts of pure reason. As the incessant self-splitting (self-cultivating) act of pure reason, critique seeks the enemy within itself and directs its violence internally

\[\text{[f]or speculative reason in its transcendental use is dialectical in itself. The objections that are to be feared lie in ourselves. We must search them out like old but unexpired claims, in order to ground perpetual peace on their annihilation. External quiet is only illusory. The seed of the attacks, which lies in the nature of human reason, must be extirpated; but how can we extirpate it if we do not give it freedom, indeed even nourishment, to send out shoots, so that we can discover it and afterwards eradicate it with its root? (KrV A778/B806)\]

\(^{252}\) The account of the discipline of pure reason presented here differs from interpretations that take Kant’s model of critique to be primarily juridical. The transcendental-speculative discipline or self-correction of pure reason is primarily epigenetic. Transcendental deduction of the categories presupposes the epigenetic formation of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason. The identification of critique with a juridical model has led to two kinds of response. The first one accepts this model. This path of interpretation, a major legacy of neo-Kantianism, has been widespread in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and persists in varieties of contemporary readings of Kant. The second one tries to ‘go beyond’ the juridical model through some form of meta-critique. Hamann is the first to propose the concept of meta-critique. Hamann [1759-1786] (2007), pp. 205-218. A contemporary version of a meta-critique, presented as a genealogical meta-deduction, can be found in Cutrofello (1994). Following Foucault’s revisiting of Kant’s concept of enlightenment, Cutrofello overlooks the transgressive movement and epigenetic nature of the discipline of pure reason, prior to the transcendental deduction. He fails to read Kant’s juridical and architectonic metaphors in terms of his biological metaphors of epigenesis. Foucault and Cutrofello ignore that Kant’s disciplinary conception of the transcendental is ineluctably transgressive. The disciplinary method of pure reason can be formed only through transgressing pure reason’s boundaries. Critical discipline incorporates transcendental-dialectical transgression retrospectively.

\(^{253}\) Kant’s approach here should be distinguished from Descartes’. Kant’s disciplinary recasting of the history of pure reason through critique re-appropriates, relives, and incorporates this history in pure reason whereas Descartes’ method of doubt seeks to annihilate this history altogether. Kant considers the maturity of pure reason as its transcendental mourning of the history and memories of its childhood which, now matured, it learns to relive and regenerate. Descartes, on the contrary, seeks to annihilate the history and memories of pure reason. This is evident in the opening sentences of his First Meditation: “Some years ago I was struck by the large number of falsehoods that I had accepted as true in my childhood, and by the highly doubtful nature of the whole edifice that I had subsequently based on them. I realized that it was necessary, once in the course of my life, to demolish everything completely and start again right from the foundations if I wanted to establish anything at all in the sciences that was stable and likely to last” Descartes [1628-1643] (1988), p. 76.
Thus, critique is the self-preserving violence of reason prior to its objective (theoretical and practical) legislation and subjective reflection; an internal revolution through which reason purifies itself from dialectical errors, i.e., forms itself as a whole of possible ends.254

2.3.6 Negative judgement of discipline: self-relational immediacy of pure reason

The enactment of critique as a permanent internal revolution through negative judgements of discipline implies that they are immediate judgements in which pure reason is brought before itself in a self-relation, i.e., in its apodictic modality or transcendental-speculative

---

254 No internal revolution or conversion is possible without some form of internal violence or trauma. Kant discusses the revolutionary – simultaneously disruptive and formative – nature of the discipline or internal generative violence of pure reason in religious, moral, aesthetic, and political contexts. In Religion, Kant writes: being “morally good (pleasing to God)” rather than merely “legally good” “cannot be effected through gradual reform but must rather be effected through a revolution in the disposition of the human being (a transition to the maxim of holiness of disposition). And so a ‘new man’ can come about only through a kind of rebirth, as it were a new creation (John, 3:5; compare with Genesis 1:2) and a change of heart” (RGV 6:47). In The Metaphysics of Morals, the discipline of pure reason takes the form of “the principle of a vigorous, spirited, and valiant practice of virtue, the cultivation of virtue, that is, moral ascetics” (MS 6:484). Virtuous life involves the suffering and pleasure of pure reason in the moral domain. The cultivation of virtue is the re-enactment, a virtual cultivation, of the discipline of pure reason in the moral domain. In the third Critique, the self-disciplinary internal revolution or rebirth of reason takes place through the logic of the dynamically sublime in nature, where we are “fearful without being afraid of” an object. In the same manner that “the virtuous man fears God without being afraid of him,” we find satisfaction and joy in the break from the terror of the sublime, “the cessation of something troublesome” (KU 5: 260-261). The fear of nature in the sublime is a species of pure reason’s fear of that which lies in ourselves (as indicated in the passage above). In his 1798 essay The Conflict of Faculties, Kant discusses the discipline of pure reason beyond its individual self-enactment in religion, morality, and aesthetic. Here the discipline of pure reason takes the form of a historical-political revolution in “moral predisposition” of “the human race.” In the essay, Kant sympathizes with the French Revolution – the historical, anthropological, and political expression of an internal revolution in human reason at the time –, despite the fact that “it may be filled with misery and atrocities” (SF 7:85). In all these cases, internal revolution or conversion is the virtual/analogical incorporation of complete self-destruction (impossibility) as an internally self-destructive self-formative drive, painfully opening up a host of religious, moral, aesthetic, or political possibilities.
mood. They enact modally-apodictically – in an immediate necessary self-relation – what, in the transcendental dialectic, reason fails to attain relationally: the systematicity of metaphysical cognitions. The constancy of the whole of pure reason as the ground of its metaphysical cognitions takes place through the incessant generation of pure reason’s self-relational immediacy prior to any immediate (intuitive) or mediated (conceptual) relation to objects. Pure reason is self-present in and through the transcendental disciplinary negation (formation) of what is present to it. Bildung is in essence Zucht, and Zucht is a form of Zwang.

The self-relational immediacy of reason is distinct from the intuitive immediacy of either empirical or pure intuition. In its empirical or mathematical use, reason does not need a negative and purely speculative immediate whole; it does not need a critique in the methodological sense. In the former, reason is “subjected to a continuous examination on the touchstone of experience” (KrV A710-11/B738-39). In the latter, concepts are “immediately ... exhibited in concreto in pure intuition, through which anything unfounded and arbitrary instantly becomes obvious” (KrV A711/B739). In the transcendental-speculative use of pure reason, in which reason disciplines itself in the supersensible in order to ground its metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects, the purely speculative, or self-relational, whole is absolutely indispensable. The discipline of pure reason is the purely speculative immediate ground of metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects. In the first chapter of the doctrine of method, Kant outlines the foundational role of the discipline of pure reason to satisfy the necessary need of pure reason for an immediate wholeness, and supply a purely speculative self-presence or immediacy for its metaphysical cognitions.

Unlike intuitive immediacy, which is positive and relational, the purely speculative
immediacy of discipline is essentially self-preserving and negative in the sense that “no false sophistical illusion can stand up but must rather immediately betray itself” (KrV A711/B739, italics added).

2.3.7 Negative judgement of discipline: Kant’s response to the pantheism controversy

In his 1786 essay on the pantheism controversy, Kant presents the purely speculative immediacy of the negative judgements of discipline as pure conviction or reason’s faith/belief in God. The question of what it means to orient oneself in thinking is in essence the question of how pure conviction or necessary reason’s faith/belief in God disciplines pure reason in its transcendental-speculative use in the supersensible. In his essay, Kant uses a variety of expressions to signify the discipline of pure reason: “only reason [bloß die Vernunft],” “that genuine pure human reason,” the “subjective ground of...”

---

255 Ironically, a passage in Nietzsche’s On the Genealogy of Morality reveals how Kant’s transcendental philosophy prefigures some basic elements of Nietzsche’s genealogical account of morality. This passage in turn illuminates Kant’s transcendental conception of compulsion [Zwang] and the immanent disciplinary nature of faith. For Nietzsche, the ascetic ideal – the ideal of self-preservation which “is basically just a modus of this denial” (of sensuality) and outlives its own historical Roman-Christian origins – becomes the ground of modern conception of truth. Nietzsche remarks: “the compulsion [Zwang] towards it [the denial of sensuality], that unconditional [unbedingte] will to truth, is faith in the ascetic ideal itself, even if, as an unconscious imperative, make no mistake about it, – it is the faith in a metaphysical value, a value as such of truth as vouched for and confirmed by that ideal alone (it stands and falls by that ideal). Strictly speaking, there is no ‘presuppositionless’ knowledge, the thought of such a thing is unthinkable, paralogical: a philosophy, a ‘faith’ always has to be there first, for knowledge to win from it a direction, a meaning, a limit, a method, a right to exist.” Nietzsche (2006), p. 112. In other words, the ascetic ideal can be generated through a philosophical faith of and in human reason. For Kant, the denial (negative formation or denaturalization) of sensuality as such, “the discipline of abstinence” (KrV A786/B814), is critique; the separation of the sensible from the supersensible in pure reason through which reason purifies itself from dialectical illusions and thus redeems itself. In Thus Spoke Zarathustra, Nietzsche presents his own redemptive philosophy: he depicts Zarathustra as a figure of regeneration and redemption, using the metaphor of bridge. As Zarathustra “cross[es] over the great bridge one day,” he responds to one of “the cripples and beggars” who asks to be persuaded to “believe in” his “doctrine”: “The now and the past on earth—alas, my friends, that is what I find most unendurable; and I should not know how to live if I were not also a seer of that which must come. A seer, a willer, a creator, a future himself and a bridge to the future—and alas, also, as it were, a cripple at this bridge: all this is Zarathustra.” “I walk among men as among the fragments of the future—that future which I envisage. And this is all my creating and striving, that I create and carry together into One what is fragment and riddle and dreadful accident. And how could I bear to be a man if man were not also a creator and guesser of riddles and redeemer of accidents?” “To redeem those who lived in the past and to recreate all ‘it was’ into a ‘thus I willed it’—that alone should I call redemption” Nietzsche [1883-5] (1954), pp. 250-1.
differentiation,” “reason’s feeling of its own need, “reason alone [allein],”\textsuperscript{256} “reason’s faith/belief,” “that single gem remaining to us in the midst of all the burdens of civil life,” and “the maxim of reason’s self-preservation” (WDO 8:134, 136, 140, 144, 146).\textsuperscript{257} Kant’s underlying philosophical goal in the essay is to reframe the stakes in the pantheism controversy in terms of the discipline of pure reason, and thereby, in contrast to Jacobi’s reading of the first Critique, demonstrate that the most fundamental sense of critique – the discipline of pure reason – is the self-determination or freedom of pure reason in reason’s faith/belief in God.\textsuperscript{258} Kant presents transcendental compulsion [Zwang] as the critical alternative and antidote to religious enthusiasm [Schwärmerei]. To orient oneself in thinking, in pure reason’s transcendental-speculative use in the supersensible, is to

\textsuperscript{256} Kant also refers to the discipline of pure reason in the title of his book on religion: Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason [Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft]. He uses bloß (from Old High German blōz meaning bare or naked) in a manner that negates (abstracts from) the objective interests of reason. Strictly speaking, “mere reason” denotes reason bereft of what objectively covers over it, that is, the discipline of pure reason, the critical-methodological reason prior to sensibility, understanding, and! practical reason. To be sure, “mere reason” includes theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of judgement methodologically-epigenetically, but it remains separate from, and irreducible to, any or all of them. Kant's account of “mere reason” as the discipline of pure reason or reason's faith/belief in itself implies that he does not reduce religion to morality. In Religion, the discipline of pure reason takes the form of what Kant calls “the pure religion of reason” (RGV 6:12), the individual-universal form of reason's faith/belief in God. The irreducibility of the religion of reason to morality is particularly evident in Kant's discussion of “parerga to religion within the boundaries of pure reason.” The pure religion of reason cannot completely detach itself from these parerga: “they do not belong within the religion of pure reason yet border on it” (RGV 6:53). Despite its risks, the recourse to the parerga is necessary for pure reason to remedy “the human's being own fault,” i.e., the human being's intrinsic "need" for "an incentive other than the [moral] law itself" (RGV 6:3). Reason's faith/belief in itself accommodates such need. The boundary that forms pure reason as a whole of possible ends, that separates the inside and outside of reason, is itself immanently exposed to infinite division and motivates the constant re-enactment of reason's faith/belief in itself. Kant also calls such re-enactment “reflective” faith (RGV 6:52). This pure religion of reason is not a doctrine or “dogmatic faith” (RGV 6:52) but the singular-plural first-person enactment of a self-disciplinary bond [ligare].

\textsuperscript{257} Human reason lives in a state of permanent need for self-preservation. Kant speaks of “a felt need of reason” which is not cognition (WDO 8:139) and yet explains that “[r]eason does not feel; it has insight into its lack and through the drive for cognition [Erkenntnstrieb] it effects the feeling of a need” (WDO 8:140). Kant’s use of the language of “feeling [Gefühl]” is not fortuitous. Structurally speaking, feeling is a form of believing, i.e., a species of modal-apodictic speculation. Kant uses the language of feeling in order to emphasize the immediate nature of reason’s “insight into its lack.”

\textsuperscript{258} A precritical recourse to God for modal grounding of existence is made in Nova Dilucidatio and The Only Possible Argument where Kant suggests that the absolute necessity of God modally belongs to things (PND 1:395), and existence must be “distinguished from any predicate” (BDG 2:73). The canon of pure reason and Kant’s essay on the pantheism controversy are perhaps his most developed versions of the argument for the transcendental necessity of reason’s moral faith/belief in God.
discipline oneself in terms of reason’s transcendental-spectative whole. This negative-modal-apodictic self-referential whole is reason’s faith/belief in itself which grounds transcendental illusion, transcendental hope, morality, and knowledge—all incorrect and correct uses of pure reason in the transcendental dialectic and the canon of pure reason.259

To make his argument, Kant starts with the first Critique’s structural division between a methodological sense of speculative reason – the discipline of pure reason to protect itself against dialectical errors – and a theoretical-speculative reason in the transcendental dialectic:

the high claims of reason’s speculative faculty, chiefly its commanding authority (through demonstration), obviously fall away, and what is left to it, insofar as it is speculative, is only the task of purifying the common concept of reason of its contradictions, and defending it against its own sophistical attacks on the maxims of healthy reason. (WDO 8:134)

Mendelssohn and Jacobi, each in his own way, equate speculative reason as such with demonstrative cognition, and thus overlook the self-preserving, purifying, or disciplinary function of pure reason, which methodologically addresses the need that originally motivates the transcendental dialectic.260 This is the most fundamental need of human reason for systematic completeness. “[A]ttaching to reason in itself” (WDO 8:136), this single need or necessity of pure reason is prior to its needs in theoretical and practical cognitions. The transcendental-spectative need or necessity of pure reason is its original

---

259 Referring to “the ideal of pure reason” in the first Critique, Heine notes: “[w]e must write Dante’s words: ‘Abandon all hope!’ above this section of the Critique of Pure Reason.” Heine [1835] (2007), p. 84. Heine’s characterization of the ideal of pure reason indicates what drives the move from the ideal of pure reason into the transcendental doctrine of method: Hope must presuppose reason’s faith/belief in itself. The loss and hopelessness of the transcendental dialectic clears the way for enacting reason’s faith/belief in the discipline of pure reason. Hope re-emerges through disillusionment, loss, and its ensuing faith/belief in the canon of pure reason. Chapter three discusses the methodological formation of hope in the critical system.

260 In Die Resultate der Jacobischen und Mendelssohnschen Philosophie (1786) (1984), Wizenmann shows some similarities between Mendelssohn and Jacobi. Despite his disagreement with Wizenmann’s conclusions, Kant acknowledges “the not insignificant inferences of the acute author of the Results” (WDO 8:134). The publication of Wizenmann’s book was a key factor in prompting Kant to intervene in the pantheism controversy. For historical details of this controversy, see Beiser (1987), pp. 44-126.
right before all rights in relation to objects, the negative self-legislation of pure reason prior to positive dogmatic legislation in relation to sensible objects, freedom or genetic self-determination prior to any metaphysical determination of objects. Kant explains:

now there enters the right of reason’s need, as a subjective ground for presupposing and assuming something which reason may not presume to know through objective grounds; and consequently for orienting itself in thinking, solely through reason’s own need, in that immeasurable space of the supersensible, which for us is filled with dark night. (WDO 8:137)

In the first Critique, Kant takes the right of reason’s need to be holy:

the original right of human reason ... recognizes no other judge than universal human reason itself, in which everyone has a voice, and since all improvement of which our condition is capable must come from this, such a right is holy [heilig], and must not be curtailed. (KrV A752/B780)

Neither juridical nor moral, this right is originary: the right of pure reason to transcendental-speculative life in the supersensible. This right enables pure reason to purify, acquire, or generate itself; i.e., to be whole, safe and sound, salvaged and healthy. Holiness is wholeness, a self-standing separateness. Kant’s discussion of the notion of orientation in thinking shows the holiness of pure reason in its disciplinary right as an inviolable whole in the supersensible: “to orient oneself in thinking in general means: when objective principles of reason are insufficient for holding-to-be-true [Fürwahrhalten], to determine the matter according to a subjective principle” (WDO 8:136). Kant devotes a good part of his essay to identify a methodological need, determination, or original right that apodictically underlies all other rights:

261 In the third Critique, Kant discusses this original right in an aesthetic context. In “judgements of taste nothing is postulated except such a universal voice with regard to satisfaction without the mediation of concepts” (KU 5:216). Kant discusses the subjective necessity of this universal voice in judgements of taste under the moment of “modality” (KU 5:236-240) and in “On taste as a kind of sensus communis” (KU 5:293-296).
It is quite otherwise with the concept of a first original being as a supreme intelligence and at the same time as the highest good. For not only does our reason already feel a need to take the concept of the unlimited as the ground of the concepts of all limited beings – hence of all other things –, but this need even goes as far as the presupposition of its existence, without which one can provide no satisfactory ground at all for the contingency of the existence of things in the world, let alone for the purposiveness and order which encountered everywhere in such a wondrous degree....Without assuming an intelligent author we cannot give any intelligible ground of it without falling into plain absurdities; and although we cannot prove the impossibility of such a purposiveness apart from an intelligent cause (for then we would have sufficient objective grounds for asserting it and would not need to appeal to subjective ones), given our lack of insight there yet remains a sufficient ground for assuming such a cause in reason’s need to presuppose something intelligible in order to explain this given appearance, since nothing else with which reason can combine any concept provides a remedy for this need. (WDO 8:138-9)

The original need or right of pure reason to be whole can be satisfied only through a negative-modal-apodictic reference to God as the original being. This is not a dogmatic invocation of God: “Mendelssohn erred here in that he nevertheless trusted speculation to the extent of letting it alone settle everything on the path of demonstration. The necessity of the first means could be established only if the insufficiency of the latter is fully admitted” (WDO 8:140). Kant acknowledges that “the discipline of the scholastic method (the Wolffian, for example, which he recommended for this reason) can actually hold back this mischief,” i.e., the dogmatic extension of reason into the supersensible, but it cannot “wholly get rid of it,” since, not being self-formative, the scholastic method cannot determine the boundaries of pure reason, and therefore, does not have an apodictic justification for prohibiting reason to make knowledge claims about supersensible objects. In transcendental philosophy, prohibition is primarily the negative imperative of pure reason’s self-preservation, a defense system of pure reason in the supersensible rather than a moral concept. Morality is a species of the apodictic modality of pure reason. Moral prohibition is a species of modal prohibition. For Kant, “only a critique of this same faculty
of reasons can fundamentally remedy this ill” (WDO 8:138) or pure reason’s dialectical transgression.\textsuperscript{262} Modal-apodictic prohibition – a transcendental-speculative compulsion or self-discipline – is the primary sense of freedom (reason). Critique of pure reason is the negative self-enactment of pure reason as “a subjective ground of necessity, i.e., a need in our reason itself to take the existence of a most real (highest) being as the ground of all possibility” (WDO 8:138).\textsuperscript{263}

Kant clearly distinguishes pure reason’s invocation of God in critical philosophy from Mendelssohn’s dogmatic and Jacobi’s naturalistic references to God by providing his alternative for terms such as “rational insight” and rational inspiration”: “it will be necessary to give this source of judging [Beurteilung] another name, and none is more suitable than reason’s faith/belief [Vernunftglaube]” (WDO 8:140). For Kant, “[a]ll believing is a holding-to-be-true [Fürwahrhalten] which is subjectively sufficient, but consciously regarded as objectively insufficient; thus it is contrasted with knowing” (WDO 8:141). This

\textsuperscript{262} In his essay on the pantheism controversy, Kant distinguishes the freedom of transcendental-speculative compulsion [Zwang] of pure reason from “civil compulsion” and “compulsion over conscience.” The freedom of transcendental-speculative compulsion is “the subjection of reason to no laws except those which it gives itself” (WDO 8:144 & 145). The primary form of these laws is the necessary law of reason’s self-givenness to satisfy the right of reason’s need, to preserve itself. Only negative-apodictic self-givenness of pure reason can protect it against threats to its wholeness (WDO 8:144 & 145). To ignore the necessity of the law of self-givenness (“reason’s superior lawgiving”) in the discipline of pure reason – i.e., “the maxim of reason’s independence of its own need (of doing without reason’s faith)” – is “an unbelief of reason” (WDO 8:146) which destroys freedom (reason). Contrary to liberal interpretations of Kant, reason’s faith is not a choice but the necessity – negative ground – of pure reason’s self-preservation.

\textsuperscript{263} Kant speaks of the need of reason to presuppose the existence of God “as a supreme intelligence and at the same time as the highest good.” Many interpreters of Kant’s essay read the role of God in a way that reduces the methodological sense of pure reason to practical reason. E.g., see Beiser (1987), pp. 114-126. Beiser identifies the methodological necessity of the discipline of pure reason with the categorical imperative. In my reading, the discipline of pure reason – reason’s faith/belief in itself – takes the form of reason’s practical faith/belief in God. This faith is not the same as the categorical imperative. Kant’s essay justifies the role of God primarily on the basis of the need/right of pure reason to be a systematic whole, to preserve and to orient itself in the supersensible. This means that the critical reference to God is primarily methodological – pure reason’s self-reference in terms of the original absence or loss of God – rather than practical. Any reference to God in practical terms presupposes the original loss of God in objective terms, i.e., the transcendental humiliation of reason. Such negative reference to God is necessary for avoiding enthusiasm [Schwärmerei] and remains distinct from anti-metaphysical readings of the ideal of the highest good.
terminological shift at once emphasizes both the methodological nature of critique as the non-cognitive purely speculative ground of cognition, and the rational ground of any faith/belief, thus challenging the binary logic at work in Mendelssohn’s and Jacobi’s arguments. Unlike Mendelssohn, Kant does not hold that everything in reason is cognitive or object-related. In contrast to Jacobi, Kant suggests that no faith/belief in God can be formed *completely* outside reason. Kant’s critical undoing of the rationalist and naturalist poles of the pantheism controversy allows him to show the uniqueness of reason’s faith/belief in itself as the ultimate ground of transcendental system: “only a reason’s faith/belief is one grounded on no data other than those contained in *pure* reason” (WDO 8:141). Here Kant italicizes “*pure*” and uses it in a negative-modal-apodictic sense, as complete independence of critical-methodological reason from its object-related interests, from everything except what is modally-apodictically self-given. In this sense, critique is the purity – modal-apodictic prohibition – of reason’s faith/belief in God. Purity is not a state of affairs but the incessant subjective (methodological) refusal of reason to be reduced to objective interests. Unlike opinions, whose insufficient objective ground of holding-to-be-true can be objectively completed and become knowledge, pure *reason’s faith/belief* can never be transformed into knowledge by any natural data of reason and experience, because here the ground of holding-to-be-true is merely subjective, namely a necessary need of reason (and as long as we are human beings it will always remain a need) to presuppose the existence of a highest being. (WDO 8:141)²⁶⁴

²⁶⁴ The untranslatable (un-objectifiable) nature of reason’s faith/belief in itself means that it is neither a theoretical proof nor can be transformed into one. Reason’s faith/belief in itself or pure conviction [*Überzeugung*] is a transcendental testimony [Zeugnis] through which pure reason enacts its oneness, and thus stems the infinite regress of theoretical questions. Pure conviction or reason’s faith/belief in itself is neither private nor public, and yet it is both in a purely speculative sense. As Pascal puts it in the opening paragraph of *Penseés*, “[t]he quality of witnesses is such that they must exist always, everywhere and wretched. He is alone” Pascal [1669] (1966), p. 33. Celan depicts the detached generativity of witnessing, the absolute solitude of testimony, in the last lines of his untranslatable poem *Aschenglorie*: “*Niemand / zeugt für den / Zeugen*” Celan [1940-1976] (2001), p. 260.
Kant’s argument for the disciplinary function of reason’s faith/belief in God is not a side-by-side accommodation of dogma and opinion, knowledge of facts in the world and idiosyncratic religious ‘choices,’ dogmatic assertions and problematic hypotheses. It indicates his epigenetic rigorism rather than political liberalism. Neither dogma nor opinion, reason’s faith/belief is the ineluctability of human reason to negate (form) its natural spontaneity and to generate itself as a whole or system in the supersensible. This purely speculative whole is the finite methodological analogue of the infinite spontaneity of intellectual intuition. It grounds metaphysical cognitions, and limits the arbitrary extension or infinite regress of cognitive reasoning. This, of course, does not imply that reason’s faith/belief and metaphysical cognitions are in a relation of ground and consequence, cause and effect. The discipline of pure reason – reason’s faith/belief in itself or pure conviction – is a genetic self-formation or transcendental self-grounding of reason, which grounds metaphysical cognitions only negatively-modally-apodictically.

With this account of the self-generation of pure reason as a system or whole of possible ends in negative judgements of discipline, we are now prepared to discuss the ways in which the discipline of pure reason negatively-systematically grounds the dogmatic, polemical, and hypothetical uses of pure reason and thus a priori corrects or

---

265 In the essay, Kant does not discuss faith in a historical sense as it is often understood in a liberal interpretation of Kant’s philosophy of religion. Kant’s notion of pure conviction or reason’s faith/belief in itself – the negative-modal-apodictic self-enclosure (quasi-monadic windowlessness) of reason – is the transcendental-speculative condition of possibility of exposure to historical religions and religions of revelation. In terms of methodological structure of pure reason, the discipline of pure reason is the negative ground of the canon of pure reason. The foundational role of reason’s faith/belief in itself or pure conviction in the first Critique is left unnoticed or distorted in most interpretations of critical philosophy. The hostility or at best indifference or negligence towards Kant’s references to the supersensible is a dominant feature of most interpretations of Kant’s critical philosophy. Reason’s faith/belief in itself is often objectified and reduced to religious dogma. E.g., Wilson writes: “The Transcendental Theory of Method describes the allowable use of reason in a polemical context, i.e., in the defense of religious dogma, and in this context Kant enunciates, as part of the ‘canon of pure reason,’ certain theological statements concerning supersensible reality” Wilson (1993), p. 83.
prevents transcendental dialectical errors in the supersensible. The discipline of pure reason supplies the ground for the legitimate pursuit of metaphysical ends of pure reason.

2.4 The disciplinary grounding of the transcendental dialectic

Kant devotes the first chapter of the doctrine of method to examining how the discipline of pure reason negatively-systematically grounds – a priori corrects or prevents – the transcendental dialectical errors of pure reason, and thus prepares the systematic ground for metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects. The unity of thought in general, the systematic completeness of metaphysical cognitions, cannot be achieved through the merely logical function of concepts of the understanding. Such unity or systematicity requires “concepts of reason” which “serve for comprehension [Begreifen]” (KrV A310-11/B366-7). Contrary to “merely reflected concepts” of the understanding, concepts of reason are “inferred concepts.” The inferential character of concepts of reason, however, exposes them to transcendental errors. Inferred concepts of reason are either objectively valid – “conceptus ratiocinati (correctly inferred concepts)” – or lack objective validity – “conceptus ratiocinantes (sophistical concepts)” (KrV A311/B368). Inferred concepts of reason are objectively valid only if they are a priori corrected, modally-apodictically determined, in the discipline of pure reason. In other words, pure reason’s comprehension [Begreifen] can take place only through the quintessential whole [Inbegriff], i.e., the

---

266 In Jäsche Logic, Kant grades cognitions “in regard to the objective content of our cognition in general.” He introduces seven distinct levels: 1) “to represent something [sich etwas vorstellen]”; 2) “to represent something with consciousness, or to perceive [wahrnehmen] (percipere)”; 3) “to be acquainted [kennen] with something (nosceres), or to represent something in comparison with other things”; 4) “to be acquainted with something with consciousness, i.e., to cognize [erkennen] it (cognoscere)”; 5) “to understand [verstehen] something (intelligere), i.e., to cognize something through the understanding by means of concepts, or to conceive [concipiren]”; 6) “to cognize something through reason, or to have insight [einsehen]” into it (prespicere); and finally 7) “to comprehend [begreifen] something (comprehendere), i.e., to cognize something through reason or a priori to the degree that is sufficient for our purpose.” For Kant, humans and animals share the first four. Through “comprehension,” Kant implies what can be seen as his transcendental-speculative version of the principle of sufficient reason: “all our comprehension is only relative, i.e., sufficient for a certain purpose” (Log 9:64-65).
negative-modal-apodictic whole or disciplinary self-enactment of reason. If inferred concepts of reason are not transcendentally disciplined (a priori corrected), they lack negative-modal-apodictic grounding and objective-relational validity, take syllogistic forms of the three categories of relation – i.e., substance, causality, and community –, and may give rise to the three dialectical errors: paralogisms, antinomies, and the ideal of pure reason.

As I discuss below, the first three sections of the first chapter of the transcendental doctrine of method aim to show how dialectical errors of pure reason “necessarily arise from the inappropriate pursuit of” dogmatic, polemical, and hypothetical methods of pure reason, “which might be suitable for reason elsewhere but not here” (KrV A712/B740), in the systematic grounding of metaphysical cognitions. Kant shows how dogmatic, polemical, and hypothetical uses of pure reason presuppose the discipline of pure reason for their own operations. In other words, the discipline of pure reason is the transcendental-speculative correction or prevention of transcendental paralogisms, antinomies, and the ideal of pure reason. The last (fourth) section of the first chapter discusses the genetic, singular, and ostensive nature of the proofs of the discipline of pure reason. These characteristics demonstrate how the discipline of pure reason at once corrects objectively invalid claims of reason in the transcendental dialectic and grounds objectively valid claims of understanding in the transcendental analytic.

2.4.1 Disciplinary method of metaphysics vs. intuitive method of mathematics

In the first section of the first chapter, titled “The discipline of pure reason in dogmatic use,” Kant argues against the Wolffian imitation of the mathematical method in the dogmatic use of reason and contrasts the critical-disciplinary method of reason in its
metaphysical (dogmatic) cognitions to the intuitive method of reason in its mathematical cognitions.

Mathematical cognitions, Kant writes, give “the most resplendent example of pure reason happily expanding itself without assistance from experience” (KrV A712/B740). Hence, it is “very important for us to know whether the method for obtaining apodictic certainty that one calls mathematical in the latter science is identical with that by means of which one seeks the same certainty in philosophy” (KrV A713/B740). The first Critique’s negative answer to this question is in the making throughout Kant’s precritical years and goes back to Kant’s opposition to the Wolffian identification of mathematical and metaphysical certainty during the 1750s. In particular, the way Kant develops the distinction between mathematics and metaphysics illuminates his genetic conception of methodology in rational cognitions: method is the a priori origin of objective content and thus the apodictic certainty of rational cognitions. All rational cognitions must genetically-methodologically acquire their objective content. The most fundamental difference between mathematics and metaphysics, the two species of rational cognition, lies in how each does so.

The precritical Kant does not start with a fully developed philosophy of mathematics. Even his 1763 Prize Essay, where mathematics is described as a form of synthetic cognition, does not explain how mathematical cognitions are distinct from merely hypothetical or fantastical inventions of imagination. How can mathematics rely on “the arbitrary combination of concepts” (UD 2:276), and yet be apodictically certain and a priori applicable to objects? To be sure, the Prize Essay conceives a role for sensibility as it acknowledges the presence of the universal (mathematical concepts) in concreto (UD
Kant, nevertheless, lacks an elaborate transcendental idealist theory of sensibility. His account of mathematics is vague enough to be found compatible with empiricist-psychological explanations of mathematics or rationalist-metaphysical views on sensibility. The Prize Essay does not explain how mathematical syntheses acquire their objective content a priori in order to be apodictically certain. Only in *Concerning the Ultimate Ground of the Differentiation of Direction in Space* (1768) and more clearly in *Inaugural Dissertation* (1770) can one see the beginning of a new approach that regards the genetic necessity of pure intuition as the apodictic ground of arbitrary combination of concepts, the relational-objective content, of mathematics. Mathematical cognitions are apodictically certain since their possible ends (objective content) are a priori acquired in pure intuition, that is, in the genetic form of mathematical cognitions. A prototype of the transcendental doctrine of intuition – the necessary subjective origin of the relational-objective content of mathematical cognitions – presents pure intuition as the necessary genetic form (ground) of mathematical synthesis. A more complete account of the a priori intuitive acquisition of objective content and apodictic certainty of mathematics appears a decade later in the transcendental aesthetic of the first *Critique*. In the first edition, Kant also hints at the need for a systematic approach: mathematics cannot investigate “from whence the concepts of space and time with which they [mathematicians] busy themselves (as the original *quanta*) might be derived” (KrV A725/B753); the “possibility of mathematics must be shown in transcendental philosophy” (KrV A733/B761). Kant’s transcendental theory of intuition – the genetic necessity of mathematical cognitions – is

---

267 My reading of Kant’s philosophy of mathematics differs from interpretations that discuss the merely logical element of mathematics at the expense of its transcendently intuitive genetic ground. Some of these accounts, e.g., Friedman (1992), overlook the absence of a transcendental theory of sensibility in Kant’s 1763 Prize Essay and overemphasize the continuity between his precritical and critical approaches to mathematics.
further developed in the second edition of the first Critique, where time and space are presented as metaphysical – “given a priori” (KrV B38) – concepts.

Kant’s precritical approach to metaphysics is shaped in distinction from mathematics in methodological terms, i.e., in the way each acquires its object. Kant opposes the Leibnizian-Wolffian identification of methods of metaphysics with mathematics in terms of the principle of contradiction.268 In Nova Dilucidatio (1755), Kant elaborates his opposition to the Leibnizian-Wolffian school, and proposes a genetic approach to the question of metaphysics:

It has been established by the common opinion of all mortals that knowledge of the truth is always based upon an intuition of the ground. However, when we are only concerned with certainty, we very frequently rest satisfied with a consequentially determining ground. But... there is always an antecedently determining ground, or if you prefer, a genetic or at least an identical ground; for, of course, a consequentially determining ground does not bring the truth into being; it only explains it. (PND 1:394)

Kant suggests that metaphysical cognitions should be approached primarily in terms of their antecedent genesis – the a priori source of objects of metaphysics – rather than their consequent explanation.269 The determining ground of a predicate “is not only the criterion

---

268 Despite his criticism of Descartes’ complete abandonment of Aristotle’s teleological notion of substance for a mechanical conception of nature, Leibniz views both mathematics and metaphysics as “truths of reasoning” whose necessity ultimately derives from the principle of contradiction: “when a truth is necessary, its reason can be found by analysis, resolving it into simpler ideas and simpler truth until we reach the primitives” Leibniz [1675-1716] (1989), p. 217. Wolff goes even further and identifies mathematical and metaphysical cognitions in terms of logical certainty: “The identity of philosophical and mathematical method will be a surprise only to him who does not know the common source from which the rules of both mathematics and philosophy are derived. We have deduced the rules of philosophical method from the notion of certitude, which, as we have proven, must be desired in philosophy. And if one searches for the reason for mathematical method, he will find that it is the certitude of knowledge which every mathematician seeks in his own field” Wolff [1736] (1963), p. 77.

269 In the passage, Kant sees the connection between rational cognition and its genetic ground as intuitive. He keeps this position on mathematical cognitions all along. Yet, from 1766 onwards, Kant speaks of any connection to God in terms of intuition/imagination as a hallmark of enthusiasm [Schwärmerei]. In the critical years, he argues for grounding metaphysical cognitions methodologically, through immediate apodictic and purely speculative self-enactment of pure reason.
of truth; it is also its source” (PND 1:392). In Physical Monadology (1756), Kant still tries to reconcile geometry and metaphysics on the issue of infinite divisibility of space. Yet, being disillusioned with traditional metaphysics in the 1760s, Kant contrasts the self-evidence and certainty of mathematics with “obscure abstractions” of metaphysics “which are difficult to test” (NG 2:168). As its title indicates, the essay Attempt to Introduce the Concept of Negative Magnitude in Philosophy (1763) is precisely about the lessons metaphysics has to learn from mathematics. Yet, Kant does not equate a “genuine application of its [mathematical] propositions to the objects of philosophy” with “the imitation of its [mathematical] method” (NG 2:167). In The Only Possible Argument (1763), Kant almost hopelessly warns metaphysicians against “the mania for method and the imitation of the mathematician” (BDG 2:71). Such imitation ignores that, unlike mathematics, metaphysics deals with the existence of actual things. Kant’s elaboration of the transcendental method of pure reason, the necessary subjective (methodological) origin of the objective content of metaphysical cognitions, starts after his genetic grounding of mathematics in pure intuition in Inaugural Dissertation (1770). It takes another decade for Kant to develop a method for metaphysics through which pure reason can generate and test (correct) its concepts of things a priori. As Kant argues in the first Critique, to be apodictically certain, metaphysics must acquire its possible ends or objective content a

270 Kant also discusses this genetic conception of truth in his criticism of Crusius’s argument against the principle of sufficient reason in Nova Dilucidatio (PND 1:397). Later, in his Attempt to Introduce the Concept of Negative Magnitude in Philosophy (1763), Kant develops a genetic notion of truth in terms of the concept of “real opposition” – “relative nothing” or nihil privativum – as distinct from “logical opposition” – “absolute nothing” or nihil negativum (NG 2:171–2). A real qualitative opposition underlies truth. As Kant writes, “every passing-away is a negative coming-to-be. In other words, for something positive which exists to be cancelled, it is just as necessary that there should be a true real ground as it is necessary that a true real ground should exist in order to bring it into existence when it does not already exist” (NG 2:190). In the first Critique, Kant continues to highlight how the question of necessary existence or becoming of physical objects distinguishes metaphysics from mathematics. A critical conception of real qualitative opposition, nihil privativum, is in play in infinite judgements.
priori, independent of the existence or non-existence of actual objects. This is what has elevated mathematics to a self-evident and certain science. Yet, in so doing, metaphysics cannot imitate mathematics. Whereas apodictic certainty in mathematics relies on a purely intuitive ground, metaphysics requires a purely speculative disciplinary ground.

Although Kant does not make it sufficiently explicit, the first section of his chapter on the discipline of pure reason engages mathematics primarily to methodologically ground (correct/prevent) the paralogism of pure reason, which results from the unwarranted imitation of the intuitive method of mathematics in the dogmatic use of reason in metaphysics. In this section, Kant distinguishes the organic oneness of pure reason from the numerical oneness of the soul as an object of inner sense in rational psychology. The organic oneness or unity of metaphysical cognitions cannot be understood in either mathematical or dogmatic terms. Rather, it must be in essence disciplinary in order to negatively unify (form) infinitely changing configurations of sensation (matter of intuition) as things.

Kant distinguishes the transcendental paralogism of pure reason from logical paralogism: “A logical paralogism consists in the falsity of syllogism due to its form, whatever its content may otherwise be. A transcendental paralogism, however, has a transcendental ground for inferring falsely due to its form” (KrV A341/B399). In a passage in his Nachlass, written some time between 1778 and 1783, we find a clearer formulation: “A paralogism is a syllogistic inference that is false as far as its form is concerned, although as far as its matter (the major premise) is concerned it is correct” (Refl 18:218). The transcendental paralogism is the inference of pure reason, which cannot properly satisfy the need of metaphysical cognitions of objects for the unity of thought in general. In
paralogism, pure reason cannot generate the organic systematic oneness necessary for grounding the matter (relational content) of pure reason. The failure to correctly unify the matter of metaphysical cognitions – in terms of the discipline of pure reason –, is due to mistaking “the unity of consciousness in objects” for “a perception of the unity of the subject” (Refl 18:223), that is, “the unity of apperception, which is subjective, is taken for the unity of the subject as a thing” (Refl 18:224). The subreptive conversion of transcendental apperception or ‘I think’ into “an object of inner sense” or “soul” (KrV A342/B400) cannot include “the least bit of anything empirical in my thinking, any particular perception of my inner state” if it is to sustain its unity. And yet such exclusion implies that paralogism conceives the unity of thought in pure intuitive terms, merely as a numerical unity that cannot determine the empirical content of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason organically. The need of metaphysical cognitions for oneness – the unity of sensation in its infinite configurations – cannot be satisfied through self-perception in pure intuition. For Kant, ‘I think’ – “the consciousness of myself” or “original apperception” (KrV A117) – “is the vehicle of all concepts [Begriffe] ... and is thus always comprehended [begriﬀen] among them ... but ... it can have no special title, because it serves only to perform [aufführen] all thinking as belonging to consciousness” (KrV A341/B399-400).

Rather than being a given (relational) pure intuitive condition, the unity or oneness of ‘I think’ is in essence the transcendental discipline or correction of inferred concepts of pure reason. It is due to its negatively self-enacting, modal-transcendental-speculative, nature that ‘I think’ can “accompany all my representations” (KrV B131). The hypostatization of ‘I think’ or unity of apperception into a supersensible object (soul) in the paralogism of pure reason mistakes the negative and organic wholeness, unity, or oneness
— the transcendental-speculative philosophical certainty — of metaphysical cognitions for
the numerical oneness (the intuitive certainty) of pure intuition in mathematical
cognitions.271

As synthetic a priori cognitions, mathematical and metaphysical cognitions can be
apodictically certain only if they form their synthetic a priori object-related ground or unity
and thus a priori acquire their possible objects (relational content). The distinction
between metaphysics and mathematics lies in how they generate their wholes of possible
ends (uses or cognitions). In their a priori acquisition of their objects, both mathematics
and metaphysics must be directed at intuition.272 As Kant remarks in the opening sentence
of the transcendental aesthetic: “[i]n whatever way and through whatever means a
cognition may relate to objects, that through which it relates immediately to them, and at
which all thought as a means is directed as an end, is intuition” (KrV A19/B33). In the first
section of the chapter on the discipline of pure reason, Kant reiterates this point more
precisely, in a manner that indicates the purely speculative ground of intuition in general:
“[a]ll of our cognition is in the end related to possible intuitions: for through these alone is
an object given” (KrV A719/B747, italics added).273 Mathematics and metaphysics are two

271 The transcendental unity of apperception is the disciplinary whole of pure reason which is objectively
valid. The failure to see the epigenetic role of the transcendental-speculative discipline of pure reason in the
formation of the objective-transcendental unity of apperception has led some interpreters to weak versions
of a metaphysically positivistic reading of the first Critique, and to attribution of a rational doctrine of soul to
Kant. E.g., see Ameriks (2000). For Kant, the pursuit of the supersensible is legitimate only in terms of the
apodictic modality or necessity of the discipline of pure reason. Any attempt to make any metaphysical claim
about the supersensible prior to the transcendental doctrine of method is necessarily dialectical.
272 The meaning of “a priori” is different in mathematics and metaphysics. The a priori acquisition of objective
content of mathematics rests on pure sensibility whereas that of metaphysics is in abstraction from
sensibility.
273 The expression “possible intuitions” applies to mathematical objects and physical objects. With regard to
metaphysical cognitions, it particularly hints at that which does not properly belong to intuition and yet
speculatively makes it possible: the necessary methodological-transcendental ground of pure reason to form
itself purely speculatively. More than a mere sum of pure forms and matter of intuition, “possible intuition"
sciences or “two uses of reason” in which reason is directed at intuition differently. They are

very different in procedure, precisely because there are two components to the appearance through which all objects are given to us: the form of intuition (space and time), and the matter (the physical), or the content, which signifies a something that is encountered in space and time, and which thus contains an existence and corresponds to sensation. (KrV A723/B751)

Mathematical and metaphysical methods of reason are ways through which reason directs itself at pure and empirical components of intuition, and forms the a priori whole of cognition and acquires its objects or relational content a priori.274 Kant asserts that “[t]he essential difference between these two kinds of rational cognition ... consists in this form, and does not rest on the difference in their matter, or objects” (KrV A714/B742).275

In mathematics – rational cognition “from the construction of concepts” (KrV A713/B741) –, pure reason abstracts from empirical intuition, and is directed merely at pure intuition. In constructing its concepts in the immediate unity or oneness of pure intuition, mathematics defines its objects into existence. As Kant states in his 1763 Prize

---

274 Here we need to distinguish two conceptions of use in Kant’s critical philosophy: 1) the apodictic methodological use of reason that generates reason as a system or whole of possible ends (uses or cognitions); 2) the object-related use of reason, e.g., dogmatic or mathematical use of reason. In its most basic sense, pure reason is the apodictic methodological use of pure reason. The primary sense of use or application of pure reason is its self-generation as a whole or system of possible uses of pure reason. The object-related use of pure reason presupposes this methodological use. Without the negative use – self-generation – of pure reason, which supplies the purely speculative content of metaphysical cognition, the application of dogmatic principles degenerates into mechanical use of the categories. Hence, it can be misleading to speak of principles first, and of their application second. All principles of pure reason derive from pure reason’s negative use or application to form or generate itself. Critique of pure reason is primarily apodictically speculative-experimental. Ignoring the apodictically speculative-experimental nature, the purely self-formative use, of reason hypostatizes pure reason and turns critical philosophy into positivism.

275 In the first Critique, Kant modifies his precritical identification of “magnitude” as “the object of mathematics” (UD 2:282). He notes: “Those who thought to distinguish philosophy from mathematics by saying of the former that it has merely quality while the latter has quantity as its object have taken the effect for the cause. The form of mathematical cognition is the cause of its pertaining solely to quanta. For only the concept of magnitudes can be constructed, i.e., exhibited a priori in intuition, while qualities cannot be exhibited in anything but empirical intuition” (KrV A714/B742).
Essay, compared to metaphysics, mathematics involves a greater degree of objective certainty (exactness). In mathematics “the concept of what has been defined only comes into existence by means of the definition; the concept has no other significance at all apart from that which is given to it by the definition” (UD 2:291). That is, pure mathematical concept and pure mathematical object are identical. Mathematical cognitions are not “about existence as such at all” and deal with “the properties of the objects in themselves, solely insofar as these are combined with the concept of them” (KrV A719/B747). The identity of mathematical concepts and mathematical objects is possible only as schema (in the sense of number) – ultimately the ‘number’ of all numbers: the oneness of pure intuition – since “we create the objects themselves in space and time through homogenous [gleichformige] synthesis, considering them merely as quanta” (KrV A723/B751). The numerical oneness or unity of pure forms of intuition is the immediate a priori whole of pure reason from which all concepts (objects) of mathematical cognitions can be acquired.276

In metaphysics – “rational cognition from concepts” (KrV A713/B741) –, pure reason is directed at the matter of intuition appearing as a thing in time and space. Unlike mathematics, metaphysics does not create its objects, and has to deal with objects that may

276 As early as 1763 Prize Essay, Kant distinguishes between mathematical and metaphysical certainty: “the grounds for supposing that one could not have erred in philosophical cognition which was certain can never be as strong as those which present themselves in mathematics. But apart from this, the intuition involved in this cognition is, as far as its exactitude is concerned, greater in mathematics than it is in philosophy. And the reason for this is the fact that, in mathematics, the object is considered under sensible signs in concreto, whereas in philosophy the object is only ever considered in universal abstracted concepts; and the clarity of the impression made by such abstracted concepts can never be as great as that made by signs which are sensible in character” (UD 2:292). In other words, “metaphysics is capable of a certainty which is sufficient to produce conviction [Überzeugung]” (UD 2:292) – the immediate certainty of indemonstrable rational principles which “are subsumed under the formal first principles, albeit immediately.” Kant emphasizes that “the feeling of conviction [das Gefühl der Überzeugung] which we have with respect to these cognitions is merely an avowal, not an argument establishing that they are true” (UD 2:295). With articulation of his transcendental theory of sensibility and the transcendental-speculative (disciplinary) method of reason in the first Critique, Kant grounds his precritical distinction between mathematical and metaphysical certainty.
be given in intuition. Concepts of metaphysics are neither identical with their objects nor arbitrarily related to the matter of intuition. In metaphysics, the relation to the matter of pure intuition has to take place indirectly, in terms of pure reason’s objectively valid self-relation. This is necessary not only for metaphysics’ a priority, but also for assuring the possibility of its objects and avoiding enthusiasm [Schwärmerei]. Metaphysics can cognize only those objects that pure reason makes possible in terms of its whole of possible ends. Thus, on the one hand, the object of metaphysical cognitions (sensation or the matter of pure intuition) “can be represented only in perception, thus a posteriori” (KrV A720/B748); on the other hand, we need a non-intuitive grounding to unify sensation as an object. Pure intuition is necessary for the reception of sensation but it cannot organically form sensation as actual objects (qualities). In metaphysics, “the only concept that represents this empirical content of appearance a priori is the concept of thing in general” (KrV A720/B748). This concept takes the form of “indeterminate concepts of the synthesis of possible sensations insofar as they belong to the unity of apperception (in a possible experience)” (KrV A723/B751). The category is the oneness of consciousness in an objectively valid relation to an object in general, the originally internalized form of an object in general. Even though the category is the transcendental possibility of an object in general, we need to “go beyond this concept, and indeed go to the intuition in which it [an object] is given” (KrV A721/B749).277 Transcendental apperception functions as the

277 It is no accident that Kant speaks of “the category” in the transcendental deduction of the categories (KrV B146, italics added). The category is in essence the discipline of reason that is demonstrated to be objectively valid in relation to something in general. In its most original sense, the category is the negative oneness of the unity of apperception, of moral autonomy, and of reflecting unity of the power of judgement. This grounding of all object-related faculties in the epigenetic form of the category, the discipline of pure reason, is the most basic justification for Kant to organize his three Critiques in terms of the categories. Without such grounding, Kant’s use of the categories to structure these texts would be an arbitrary imposition that assumes that which needs to be proved.
ground of this perception. In this heterogeneous synthesis, the category includes “properties that do not lie in this concept but still belong to it” (KrV A718/B746). The category is the oneness of apperception, “the mere rule of the synthesis of that which perception may give a posteriori, but never the intuition of the real object, since this must necessarily be empirical” (KrV A720/B748).278 The oneness of the category or transcendental apperception is in essence an epigenetic unity or negative whole in terms of which infinite combinations of sensation in perception are formed. Rather than a numerical unity, the unity of apperception is “an act [Actus] of spontaneity” of pure reason (KrV B132) whose objective validity in relation to objects is a priori assured in the discipline of pure reason. Natural spontaneity of reason cannot be by itself objectively valid. Nor can it form sensation as an object, if it is not negatively-epigenetically formed. The transcendental unity of apperception is the object-related form of reason’s self-relational disciplinary immediacy. The oneness of the subject in metaphysical cognitions of pure reason can be enacted through the unity of apperception rather than intuitive judgements of mathematical cognitions.

2.4.2 Disciplinary use of reason vs. polemical use of reason

The second section of the chapter on the discipline of pure reason, “The discipline of pure reason with regard to its polemical use,” primarily aims to ground (prevent/correct) the

278 Given the heterogeneous nature of dogmatic synthesis of metaphysics as distinct from homogeneous mathematical synthesis, Kant considers dogmatic synthesis to be more primary in systematic terms: “of the two types of synthetick a priori propositions only those belonging to philosophical cognition carry this name” (KrV A736/B764). In the first section in the chapter on the discipline of pure reason, Kant also argues against the use of dogmatic method of metaphysics if pure reason is not already disciplined. Kant seems to have Wolffian dogmatic rationalism in mind when he writes: “if in the content of the speculative use of pure reason there are no dogmata at all, then any dogmatic method, whether it is borrowed from the mathematicians or is of some special kind, is inappropriate per se. For it merely masks mistakes and errors, and deceives philosophy, the proper aim of which is to allow all of the steps of reason to be seen in the clearest light.” In the same passage, Kant acknowledges that the dogmatic “method can always be systematic” and yet states that dogmatic systematicity is possible since “our reason itself (subjectively) is a system” (KrV A737-8/B765-6).
second class of syllogisms, i.e., the antinomy of pure reason. In its generic sense, the antinomy refers to two putatively opposed, and yet, apparently equally convincing arguments with regard to the world, that is, the “absolute totality in the series of conditions for a given appearance” (KrV A340/B398). The antinomy emerges since from the givenness of appearance, the givenness of the world – the unconditioned condition for a synthetic unity of predicates – is concluded: “from the fact that I always have a self-contradictory concept of the unconditioned synthetic unity in the series on one side, I infer the correctness of the opposite unity, although I also have no concept of it” (KrV A340/B398).

Kant considers the antinomy of pure reason to be the result of the polemical use of reason to attain the systematic completeness of predicates of metaphysical cognitions. Polemical use of reason is “the defense of reason’s propositions against dogmatic denial of them,” the apparent antithetic in which pure reason “comes into conflict with itself” (KrV A740/B768). In the polemical use of reason, no side considers whether its own assertion might be false. The only concern is “that no one can ever assert the opposite with apodictic certainty (or even only with greater plausibility)” (KrV A740/B768). Enacted in assertoric judgements, the polemical use of reason defends a position through asserting the denial of its counter-position.

Kant addresses the inappropriateness of the polemical use of reason in the supersensible, and grounds (corrects/prevents) the antinomy of pure reason through showing that despite its apparently conflictual nature, unbeknownst to itself, the antinomy presupposes and points to pure reason’s more fundamental nature: the disciplinary unity of pure reason. Assuming that “[e]verything that nature itself arranges is good for some aim” (KrV A743/B771), Kant holds that at a certain stage “[r]eason ... very much needs such
a conflict” (KrV A747/B775) as “[t]he conflict cultivates reason by the consideration of its object on both sides, and corrects its judgement by thus limiting it” (KrV A744/B772). Pure reason’s consciousness of such limit is its self-correction in the discipline of pure reason. Kant explains that “the endless controversies of a merely dogmatic reason finally make it necessary to seek peace in some sort of critique of this reason itself, and in a legislation grounded upon it.” He compares the conflict of pure reason with itself in polemical use with Hobbes’s account of the transition from the state of nature to civil government: “one must necessarily leave [the state of nature] ... in order to submit himself to the lawful compulsion [gesetzlichen Zwange] which alone limits our freedom in such a way that it can be consistent with the freedom of everyone else and thereby with the common good” (KrV A752/B780).279 Without this self-formative discipline, reason “cannot make its assertions and claims valid or secure them except through war” (KrV A751/B779). Reason must go “to the origin of controversies themselves” and form (limit) its natural spontaneity that motivates them, if it is to avoid complete destruction and to approximate “a perpetual peace”: “[t]he critique..., which derives all decisions from the ground-rules of its own constitution, whose authority no one can doubt, grants us the peace of a state of law” (KrV A751/B779). Emphasizing the methodological self-formative nature of critique, Kant notes:

the true court of justice for all controversies of pure reason; for the critique is not involved in these disputes, which pertain immediately to objects, but is rather set

279 In their translation of this section of the first Critique, Guyer and Wood use the equivalent “coercion” for Zwang. This translation is misleading. It covers over the internal self-disciplinary (transcendentally compulsive) nature of critique, and assimilates it into a merely juridical (external) interpretation of Kant’s analogy between critique and the rule of law. Guyer and Wood do not even indicate that they are translating the same term Zwang into two different English equivalents: coercion and compulsion. How is the reader supposed to connect these two? Unless Kant’s juridical metaphors are read in terms of his biological or epigenetic metaphors, that is, unless transcendental laws and principles are seen as derived from the epigenetic self-enactment of pure reason, critical philosophy is bound to degenerate into a doctrinal philosophy.
the task to determine and to judging [beurteilen] what is lawful in reason in general in accordance with the principles of its primary institution. (KrV A751/B779)\textsuperscript{280}

The self-limitation or self-institution of pure reason is “the freedom of critique” to which reason must subject itself “in all its undertaking and cannot restrict the freedom of critique through any prohibition without damaging itself and drawing upon itself a disadvantageous suspicion.” This freedom is not simply freedom to be critical of something in its conventional sense. In its epigenetic sense, critique of pure reason is freedom: the “very existence [Existenz] of reason depends upon this freedom which has no dictatorial authority” and “whose claim is never anything more than the agreement of free citizens, each of whom must be able to express his reservations, indeed even his veto, without holding back.” In this sense, reason “can never refuse critique” (KrV A739/B767). Any refusal inevitably presupposes critique. In this sense, critique is “the original right of human reason, which recognizes no other judge than universal human reason itself, in which everyone has a voice, and since all improvement of which our condition is capable must come from this, such a right is holy, and must not be curtailed” (KrV A752/B780). At once the most universal and the most individual, this freedom is presupposed in the polemical use of reason. It forms reason as an organic community of human beings. From the standpoint of this freedom (reason in its critical sense), “there is properly no antithetic of pure reason at all” since we do not need to refute antinomical claims and “always have in reserve the subjective maxims of reason” which the other side lacks, and “under their protection we can regard all his shadow-boxing with tranquility and indifference” (KrV A743/B771).

\textsuperscript{280} In translating this passage, Guyer and Wood also use “judging” for beurteilen without indicating its distinction with urteilen, further obscuring the genetic-methodological nature of pure reason’s negative self-legislation.
Kant distinguishes this disciplinary neutrality or negativity of critique of pure reason from the skeptical principle of “neutrality in all controversies” (KrV A756/B784). Critique is neutral with regard to controversies of pure reason since it views them from the standpoint of its self-formation as a whole. By contrast, the skeptical method supplies weapons to both sides of the dispute, and remains entangled in polemical negation. It ignores that pure reason’s consciousness of its ignorance with regard to the boundaries of its cognitions “can never be made out empirically, from observation, but only critically, by getting to the bottom of [Ergründung] of the primary sources of our cognition.” The difference between skepticism and critique is the one between “perception, about which one cannot say how far the inference from it might reach” and the “science” of boundaries of pure reason (KrV A758/B786), between “a resting-place for human reason” and “a dwelling-place for permanent residence” (KrV A761/B789, italics added). Compared to the dogmatic method, skeptical method is a step forward as it involves “the caution of the power of judgement sharpened by experience” and subjects “the facta of reason to examination.” The conflict and disputation within reason can be “a school for self-improvement,” performing a cultivating function as “the discipline of childhood [Kinderzucht]” (KrV A755/B783). Yet, this
tendency to pretend to be better than one is and to express dispositions that one does not have serves as it were only provisionally to bring the human being out of his crudeness ... [But] later, when the genuine principles have finally been developed and incorporated into his way of thought, that duplicity must gradually be vigorously combated, for otherwise it corrupts the heart. (KrV A748/B776)

Disputation can outlive its provisional cultivating function and turn up as “machinations arise merely from private vanity” (KrV A749/B777). The lingering life of disputation after exhausting its provisional cultivating function constitutes the generic form of skepticism in
distinction from strategic uses of skeptical method. Caught up in a disputation that is not conscious of its methodological grounding, skepticism cannot explain the “augmentation of concepts out of themselves and the parthenogenesis, so to speak, of our understanding (together with reason), without impregnation by experience” (KrV A765/B793).

An account of pure reason’s subjective (apodictic-methodological) generation requires more than the caution of the power of judgement. It needs

the mature and adult power [männlichen] of judgement, which has at its basis firm maxims of proven universality, that, namely, which subjects to evaluation not the facta of reason but reason itself, as concerns its entire capacity and suitability for pure a priori cognitions; this is not the censorship but the critique of pure reason, whereby not merely limits [Schranken] but rather the determinate boundaries [Grenzen] of it. (KrV A761/B789)

In other words, pure reason must distinguish between the objective-relational negativity of skeptical method and the modal (self-relational) negativity of the critical method, between negative assertoric judgements and negative apodictic judgements. Kant describes the contrast between the skeptical method and critical method, the limits [Schranken] and boundaries [Grenzen], of pure reason in a geometrical analogy:

Our reason is not like an indeterminably extended plane, the limits of which one can cognize only in general, but must rather be compared with a sphere, the radius of which can be found out from the curvature of an arc on its surface (from the nature of synthetic a priori propositions), from which its content and its boundaries can also be ascertained with certainty. (KrV A762/B790)

The infinity of reason is in essence a self-relational, self-disciplinary, or purely speculative negation that endlessly forms reason as a living whole, rather than a relational negation in internal disputes of pure reason. At stake in disputes of pure reason “is not the matter [Sache] but the tone [Ton]. For enough remains left to you to speak the language, justified by the sharpest reason, of a firm belief, even though you must surrender that of knowledge” (KrV A744/B772). The tone, mood, or modality of pure reason in its necessary belief
animates the matter. The systematic completeness of predicates in metaphysical cognitions of pure reason can only be pursued in terms of the self-enclosing infinity of the sphere of reason’s faith/belief, rather than in infinite causal series. Kant addresses the distinction between the disciplinary belief and hypothesis (opinion) in the next section of the chapter.

2.4.3 **Disciplinary use of reason vs. hypothetical use of reason**

The third section of the chapter on the discipline of pure reason is primarily concerned with the disciplinary grounding of the use of hypotheses of understanding and reason. That pure reason cannot make assertions in the supersensible does not mean that this field is to be abandoned to hypothetical inventions or opinions. Kant emphasizes that “if the imagination is not simply to enthuse [schwärmen] but is, under the strict oversight of reason, to invent, something must always first be fully certain and not invented, or a mere opinion, and that is the possibility of the object itself” (KrV A770/B798). The use of hypothesis in understanding and reason is justifiable, if it is conditioned by philosophical apodictic certainty in the discipline of pure reason. Problematic judgements must be limited within the boundaries of reason, which is determined by apodictic judgements.

Based on this criterion, Kant argues against the use of physical and hyperphysical hypotheses relying merely on the categories of the understanding and ideas of reason. With regard to the hypotheses of understanding, Kant writes: “we are not allowed to think up any sort of new original forces ... or a new kind of substance.” Similarly, we “cannot conceive of any community of substances that would be different from anything that experience provides” (KrV A770-1/B798-9). The inventions of pure reason must be transcendently necessitated. Kant concludes his criticism of merely hypothetical claims such as Swedenborg’s in this way:
it is only possible for our reason to use the conditions of possible experience as conditions of the possibility of things; but it is by no means possible for it as it were to create new ones, independent of these conditions, for concepts of this sort, although free of contradiction, would nevertheless also be without any object. (KrV A771/B799)

With regard to hypotheses of reason, Kant argues that ideas of reason “have no object in any sort of experience.” These ideas “are merely thought problematically, in order to ground regulative principles of the systematic use of the understanding in the field of experience in relation to them (as heuristic fictions)” (KrV A771/B799). Hypotheses of reason cannot be used for “the explanation of things in nature ... since that which one does not adequately understand on the basis of known empirical principles would be explained by means of something about which one understands nothing at all” (KrV A772/B800). Kant views the hypotheses of reason such as “the appeal to a divine author” to explain things in nature as “lazy reason (ignava ratio)” (KrV A773/B801). We are not allowed to “form opinions outside this field [of experience]” since it “is the same as to play with thoughts” (KrV A775/B803). Kant restricts the use of hypotheses in the field of reason “only as weapons of war, not for grounding a right but only for defending it” (KrV A777/B806).

Although Kant defers elaborating his distinction between reason’s moral faith/belief and opinion until his discussion of the canon of pure reason, the grounding of the hypothetical use (indifferentist method) of reason in the discipline of pure reason contains his remedy for the third class of syllogisms: the ideal of pure reason. After all, the ideal of pure reason is the result of inappropriate pursuit of the hypothetical use of pure reason to address “its urgent need to presuppose something that the understanding could take as the complete ground for the thoroughgoing determination of its concepts” (KrV A583/B611).
The ideal of pure reason is “the concept of an individual object that is thoroughly determined merely through the idea” (KrV A574/B602). Although the ideal of pure reason is “a mere representation” of pure reason’s need for relational systematicity of metaphysical cognitions, it “is first realized, i.e., made into an object, then hypostatized, and finally ... is even personified” (KrV A582/B611). Kant describes the emergence of the ideal of pure reason in this way: “from the totality of conditions for thinking objects in general insofar as they can be given to me I infer the absolute synthetic unity of all conditions of the possibility of thing in general” (KrV A340/B398). The hypostatization of the idea of whole [Inbegriff] of all reality ... comes about because we dialectically transform the distributive unity of the use of the understanding in experience, into the collective unity of a whole of experience; and from this whole of appearance we think up an individual thing containing in itself all empirical reality. (KrV A582/B611)

The epigenetic grounding of the whole [Inbegriff] of reason is mistaken for a hypostatized whole that is invented through illegitimate hypothetical uses of reason in the supersensible. Kant’s argument for grounding inventions of reason in philosophical apodictic certainty implies that reason must ground metaphysical cognitions in its discipline. In this way, critique of pure reason prohibits relational (dogmatic) appeals to God, and permits only his invocation through the modal apodictic reason.

2.4.4 The proofs of discipline: genetic, single, ostensive

In the last (fourth) section of the chapter, “The discipline of pure reason in regard to its proofs,” Kant formulates the three main characteristics in terms of which the discipline of pure reason or pure conviction – the ground of objectively valid claims – can be

---

281 We should not read Kant’s reference to “proofs [Beweise]” in a theoretical sense. The proofs of discipline are not theoretical. Neither can they be transformed into theoretical proofs. They cannot be taught and learned either. These proofs can only be generated individually, through the disciplinary self-enactment of pure reason. As I have discussed, these proofs are the enactment of reason's faith/belief in itself.
distinguished from "[t]he illusion of conviction [Der Schein der Überzeugung]" in objectively invalid claims (KrV A783/B811). These characteristics – the genetic, singular, and ostensive nature of transcendental proofs [Beweise] – indicate where pure reason should, and should not, seek transcendental deduction.282

Kant starts his discussion by distinguishing the proofs of synthetic a priori judgements of mathematics, grounded in pure intuition, from the proofs of synthetic a priori judgements of metaphysics, derived from the discipline of pure reason. Unlike the proofs of mathematical judgements in which concepts are directly applied to the object, the proofs of transcendental synthetic judgements “must first establish the objective validity of the concepts and the possibility of their synthesis a priori” (KrV A782/B810). The ground of mathematical judgements is intuitively available to us whereas the disciplinary ground of metaphysical cognitions – pure conviction or reason’s faith/belief in itself – must be purely speculatively enacted. Kant explains that the establishment of the objective validity of concepts “is not merely a necessary rule of caution, but concerns the essence and the possibility of the proofs themselves” (KrV A782/B810). The grounding of synthetic a priori judgements of metaphysics in the discipline of pure reason is not only a protection against dialectical errors, but also a way to negatively instruct the understanding as it goes beyond concepts to intuition. Without a disciplinary ground between concepts and intuition, the negative transcendental-speculative ground of determination of the object of experience, the application of concepts to intuition cannot be a priori. That is, the a priority of the understanding presupposes the a priority of the discipline of pure reason.

\[282\] These characteristics are presupposed in the transcendental deduction. Without presupposing the universality and necessity of the disciplinary grounding of pure reason, the question of the objective validity – a priori object-relatedness – of the categories is not even intelligible.
After discussing the distinction between mathematical and metaphysical species of synthetic a priori proofs in some detail, Kant outlines three major peculiarities of transcendental proofs of the discipline of pure reason. These proofs are all *genetic, single,* and *ostensive* (purely speculatively immediate).\(^{283}\)

Kant explains the genetic nature of transcendental proofs in this way: there can be “no transcendental proofs without having first considered whence one can justifiably derive the principles on which one intends to build and with what right one can expect success in inferences from them” (KrV A786/B814). The identification of the source of transcendental proofs serves to protect reason against “deceptive conviction [*trüglichen Überzeugung*]” (KrV A786/B814). It supplies the ground by which we can “dispose of the entire heap of these inexhaustible tricks of dialectic at once” without dealing with them one by one (KrV A787/B815).

The second characteristic of transcendental proofs is “that for each transcendental proposition only a *single* proof can be found” (KrV A787/B815). This is not the case for mathematical and empirical proofs drawn from pure and empirical intuition. The uniqueness of the proof here is the singularity of the apodicticity of reason. Every transcendental proposition

proceeds solely from one concept, and states the synthetic condition of the possibility of the object in accordance with this concept. The ground of proof can

---

\(^{283}\) Most writings on “transcendental arguments” in analytic interpretations of Kant avoid engagement with these primary characteristics of disciplinary proofs of pure reason. E.g., see Stern (ed.) (1999). This neglect distorts the negative or disciplinary nature of Kant’s transcendental philosophy. The model of “transcendental arguments” in these interpretations is claimed to come from the transcendental deduction of the categories. In its predominant use, “transcendental argument” is a recent invention of analytic philosophy, and has little to do with Kant’s transcendental philosophy. Kant never used the expression “transcendental argument.” The disciplinary proofs of pure reason only refer to immediate negative-modal-apodictic proofs of methodological reason. These proofs are transcendental-speculative self-enactments of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method, rather than theoretical arguments in the transcendental deduction of the categories.
therefore only be unique, since the outside of this concept there is nothing further by means of which the object can be determined, and the proof can therefore contain nothing more than the determination of an object in general in accordance with this concept, which is also unique. (KrV A787-8/B815-6)

This uniqueness stems from the unteachable negative-modal-apodictic self-enactment of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason. The universality of objectively valid claims emerges from the uniqueness of pure reason's self-acquired discipline:

Where reason would conduct its business through mere concepts, only a single proof is possible if any proof is possible at all. Thus if one sees the dogmatist step forth with ten proofs, one can be sure that he has none at all. For if he had one that proved apodictically (as must be the case in matters of pure reason), for what would he need the rest? (KrV A789/B817)²⁸⁴

The last distinctive feature of transcendental proofs concerns their disciplinary (negative) immediacy. These proofs “must never be apagogic but always ostensive.” Kant defines the “direct or ostensive proof” as “that which is combined with the conviction [Überzeugung] of truth and simultaneously with insight into its source.” This contrasts with apagogic proof, which can produce merely logical certainty “but never comprehensibility [Begreiflichkeit] of the truth in regard to its connection with the grounds of its possibility” (KrV A789/B817). The ostensive (immediate) nature of proofs of discipline protects reason against dialectical illusion, and supplies the ground for transcendental logic as an a priori evidentiary object-related logic. It functions as a negative disciplinary “procedure which satisfies all the aims of reason” even though the clarity of transcendental proofs falls short of apagogic proofs, which “more closely approach the intuitiveness of a demonstration” in mathematics (KrV A790/B818). The contrast between apagogic and ostensive proofs is the

²⁸⁴ Kant’s characterization of the universality of the direct proof of the discipline of pure reason in terms of its uniqueness or singularity implies that, contrary to prevalent conceptions of philosophy, philosophy is not the determination of the universal to be later applied to the particular. The universality of philosophy is the discipline of pure reason, which contains the particular. The methodological universality of philosophy is distinct from the objective universality of the categories in their strict sense. Application of concepts to objects presupposes the universality of the discipline of pure reason.
contrast between the merely logical negativity of the principle of contradiction and the transcendental-speculative – generative – negativity of the discipline of pure reason. The culminating ‘point’ of philosophy, Kant suggests, is logic in its methodological-disciplinary (transcendental-speculative) sense rather than general logic. In Jäsche Logic, Kant characterizes the immediacy of this ‘point’ – the disciplinary whole of pure reason – as indemonstrable: “Even if so much in our cognition is certain only mediately, i.e., through a proof, there must still be something indemonstrable or immediately certain, and the whole of our cognition must proceed from immediately certain propositions” (Log 9:71).

***

As I have elaborated in this chapter, with the self-generation of pure reason as a system or whole of possible ends, the discipline of pure reason prepares the negative or error-free ground for metaphysical cognitions of pure reason. Now it is time to see how pure reason structures its whole into an organic system in order to retrospectively methodologically appropriate and organize the matter, or relational content, of metaphysical cognitions in the transcendental doctrine of elements.
Chapter 3. Self-Organization of the Parts of Pure Reason

After the self-generation of pure reason as a system or whole of possible ends in the discipline of pure reason, Kant devotes the three remaining chapters of the transcendental doctrine of method to systematic organization of the parts (faculties) of pure reason. These chapters outline how pure reason structures its negative-modal-apodictic whole positively, i.e., in terms of relation to possible objects within pure imagination. Pure reason can be transcendentally systematic only if it articulates its disciplinary whole into organic parts, determines the function of each and every faculty of the mind within this whole, and thus prepares systematic conditions of the practical, theoretical, and reflecting use of reason in relation to objects. In other words, Kant's conception of logic involves multiple layers: first, the self-formative self-dividing logic or negative-apodictic method of reason's purification in the discipline of pure reason; second, the universal logic of understanding and reason, i.e., the logic of necessary relation to objects in general in the canon of pure reason; third, the transcendental logic proper, or the logic of necessary object-relatedness of understanding in the architectonic of pure reason. In structuring the whole of pure reason into organic parts or systematic conditions of the use of faculties of pure reason, the

---

285 To be sure, the history of pure reason is part of the transcendental doctrine of method. It presupposes the discipline of pure reason, i.e., the self-formative self-dividing logic of reason's purification. The history of pure reason, however, does not properly belong to the universal logic of the necessary relation of understanding and reason to objects. Kant does not elaborate the chapter on the history of pure reason in the first Critique. He presupposes the history of pure reason in his discussion of the reflecting use of reason in the power of judgement in the third Critique. The history of pure reason is primarily the transcendental structure or systematic whole in which reason is brought before itself in reflecting use, witnessing its own unfolding in pure imagination. This whole is presupposed in the reflecting use of reason, and functions as the systematic condition of its contingent relation to objects. In this sense, the history of pure reason is the systematic whole of pure reason for individuation of objects in the power of judgement. Given the contingent nature of reason's relation to objects in the reflecting power of judgement in the third Critique, Kant does not divide it into a doctrine of elements and a doctrine of method (KU 5:354). Aesthetics and teleology are not sciences in a positive (dogmatic or doctrinal) sense. They are systematic only in a negative (transcendental-disciplinary) sense, and can “occasionally be annexed” to theoretical and practical parts of critique (KU 5:168, italics added).
transcendental doctrine of method forms the relational content or matter of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of elements, determining the whole of possible ends that practical reason, theoretical reason, and the power of judgement can pursue.

In this chapter, I demonstrate how the canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason determine transcendental systematic conditions of practical, theoretical, and reflecting uses of reason, and thus retrospectively appropriate, or transcendentally-systematically form, the relational content or matter of pure reason in the transcendental dialectic, transcendental analytic, and transcendental aesthetic. This self-organization of the faculties redeems reason’s original loss of God – i.e., the objective incompleteness of pure reason in the supersensible – in relational, qualitative, and quantitative terms in pure imagination, as transcendental hope, pure schema, and concrete image. I proceed in three sections. The first section demonstrates how the canon of pure reason determines the whole of possible ends of reason, i.e., reason’s faith/belief in itself or pure conviction, as the ideal of the highest good or the systematic condition of the practical use of reason, i.e., the whole of possible relations or final ends of pure reason. The second section examines how the architectonic of pure reason determines the whole of possible ends of reason as transcendental schema or the systematic condition of the theoretical use of reason, i.e., the whole of possible qualities or essential [wesentlichen] ends of pure reason. The last section addresses how the history of pure reason, which Kant leaves open and undeveloped in the first Critique, functions as the whole of possible quantities or individual ends of pure reason, i.e., the systematic condition of the reflecting use of pure reason. Thus, the canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason transpose the negative-modal-apodictic or disciplinary whole of pure reason into object domains/field, i.e., organic ends of the
faculties of practical reason, theoretical reason, and the power of judgement. This articulation of the whole of pure reason makes metaphysical cognitions (judgements) in the transcendental doctrine of elements relationally, qualitatively, and quantitatively systematic. In other words, the canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason function as analogues of the discipline of pure reason in practical, theoretical, and reflecting uses of reason in pure imagination.

3.1 From reason’s faith/belief in itself to hope or moral faith/belief in God

Kant starts his introduction to the second chapter of the transcendental doctrine of method by acknowledging the necessity of the discipline of pure reason prior to the canon of pure reason. Pure reason can recover from its natural dialectical errors only through the discipline of pure reason: “It is humiliating for human reason that it accomplishes nothing in its pure use,” but “that reason can and must exercise this discipline itself ... elevates it and gives it confidence in itself.” As an experience of ‘nothing,’ which informs all positive claims of pure reason, the humiliation or discipline of pure reason has “the silent merit of guarding against errors” (KrV A795/B823), and forms the apodictic modality – i.e.,

---

286 The shift from the discipline of pure reason to the canon of pure reason, from reason’s faith/belief in itself to reason’s hope or reason’s moral faith/belief in God, involves similarities with a passage in The Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews: “Now faith is the substance [hypostasis] of things hoped for, the evidence [elenchus] of things not seen” (Hebrews 11:1). As self-evidence, faith is the primary evidence of things hoped for but not seen. Here faith is described as elenchus, a testing and testimony [Zeugnis], the term that Plato uses for referring to the negative method of Socrates for self-knowledge (what Kant calls critique). According to Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English Lexicon, the term hypostasis denotes “substance,” “property,” “pillar,” “plan,” “undertaking,” “promise,” and “sustenance.” It also means “confidence, courage, resolution, or steadiness of soldiers,” and is translated as “conviction” [Überzeugung]. Medieval and early modern conceptions of substance [hypostasis] seem to conceal its ‘subjective’ nature. The idealist impulse in Leibniz’s monadological metaphysics starts to remedy this problem. It is the a priori identity of subject and substance that allows monads to be windowless. Leibniz thinks that this identity is part of God’s creation and thus innate in us. Kant’s notion of reason’s faith/belief in itself – a negative or disciplinary self-enactment of pure reason – conceives the subjective nature of substance in methodological terms. In pure conviction or reason’s faith/belief in itself, the subject is the substance. The discipline of pure reason transcendentally-speculatively enacts the modal-apodictic identity of the subject and the substance, prior to any distinction and relation between them. The unity of the subject and the substance cannot be attained step by step, and must be enacted originally, in their formation.
transcendental-speculative boundaries – of pure reason. The self-confidence or self-certainty of pure reason’s discipline – reason’s faith/belief in itself – is the genus of all species of certainty in critical philosophy, including moral certainty with regard to future life and God as well as theoretical certainty of metaphysical cognitions of sensible objects. The disciplinary self-certainty of pure reason, which is Kant’s most basic (negative) remedy to skepticism, functions as the transcendental-systematic or purely speculative ground for the incessant satisfaction of the “unquenchable desire” of pure reason for supersensible objects. As we shall see, the transcendental satisfaction of pure reason can take place only through “a source of positive cognitions that belong in the domain of pure reason” (KrV A795/B823), that is, the “practical use” of reason (KrV A796/B824). The moral domain contains ultimate ends of reason’s metaphysical cognitions or relations to objects.

---

287 The discipline of pure reason, reason’s faith/belief in itself, is the critical antidote to skepticism. It disrupts or denaturalizes the naturalistic projection of sensibility into the supersensible, preparing the ground for the positive remedy to skepticism: reason’s moral faith/belief in God. For Kant, skepticism is the inevitable result of the unlimited theoretical extension of the sensible into the supersensible: the self-destructiveness of theoretical naturalism. In this sense, dogmatism and empiricism are versions of theoretical naturalism as they ignore the gap between the sensible and supersensible, one way or another.

288 The move from the freedom or self-determination of pure reason, i.e., negative-modal-apodictic self-consciousness in the discipline of pure reason, to the systematic condition of the practical use of reason in the canon of pure reason is later echoed in The Oldest Systematic Programme of German Idealism, although this text ignores the negative epigenetic function of the discipline of pure reason and denies the systematicity of Kant’s critical philosophy. This fragment, which is believed to have been written by Hegel around 1796, starts by making a case for the systematic formation of a moral world out of nothing: “An ethics. Since in the future the whole of metaphysics will collapse into morals – of which Kant, with his two practical postulates, has given only an example and exhausted nothing – all ethics will be nothing more than a complete system of all ideas, or, what amounts to the same, of all practical postulates. Naturally, the first idea is the representation of myself as an absolute free being. With the free self-conscious being a whole world comes forth from nothing – the only true and thinkable creation from nothing... The question is this: how must a world be constituted for a moral being?” Beiser (ed.) (1996), p. 3. Indeed, contrary to what this passage claims, Kant directly and systematically addresses this question in the canon of pure reason, where the ideal of a “moral world” (KrV A808/B836) is formed out of pure reason’s infinite self-formative self-division (nothing) in the discipline of pure reason. Reason’s faith/belief in itself or pure reason’s infinite disciplinary self-division becomes the systematic origin of pure reason’s multiplication that forms a moral world. The Oldest Systematic Programme of German Idealism is an early indication of how German Idealist readings of critical philosophy fail to appreciate the free self-conscious being of pure reason in its genetic self-determination in the discipline of pure reason.
The shift from the discipline of pure reason to the canon of pure reason is one from pure reason’s transcendental correction/cultivation [Zucht] to the primary systematic condition of its correct use in relation to objects: “I understand by a canon the quintessential whole [Inbegriff] of the a priori principles of the correct use of certain cognitive faculties in general” (KrV A796/B824). In its canon, pure reason renders its transcendental asceticism, or negative disciplinary whole, positive. Kant explains the simultaneously negative and positive character of critique in the preface to the second edition of the first Critique:

---

289 In its original Greek sense, the term *canon* means “measuring stick” or “standard.” The philosophical sense of *canon* goes back to Epicurus who used it to establish correct rules for judging from a psycho-physiological point of view – in particular, from the standpoint of the good health of sensory organs. According to Diogenes Laertius, Epicurus departs from Aristotle’s division of philosophy into organon (logic), physics and ethics. Epicurus divides philosophy “into three parts: canonic (logic), physics, ethics.” Epicurus understands logic primarily as a canon rather than organon: “Canonic provides procedures for use in the system and it is contained in one work entitled The Canon. Physics comprises the entire study of nature and it is contained in the 37 books of the On Nature and in outline form in the letters. Ethics comprises the discussion of choice and avoidance and it is contained in the book On Ways of Life and in the letters and in On the Goal of Life.” Laertius adds: “in The Canon Epicurus is found saying that sense-perceptions, basic grasps, and feelings are the criteria of truth” Inwood & Gerson (eds.) (1997), p. 40. Kant follows Epicurus in defining the canonic in distinction from the dialectic: “all synthetic cognition of pure reason in its speculative use is entirely impossible. There is thus no canon for its speculative use at all (for this is through and through dialectical)” (KrV A796/B824). The impossibility of synthetic cognitions of pure reason in its theoretical-speculative use, which is internalized in and as the discipline of pure reason, becomes the condition of possibility of synthetic cognitions of pure reason in its practical use in the canon of pure reason. Kant also side with Epicurus’ grounding of truth in a canon against Aristotle’s grounding of truth in an organon. For Kant, an organon is “a directive as to how a certain cognition is to be brought about... an organon presupposes exact acquaintance with the sciences, their objects and sources” (Log 9:13). In short, an organon cannot ground truth completely a priori. Kant, however, differs from Epicurus in understanding the canonic ground of truth in terms of correct rules for judging from a transcendental-speculative, rather than a psycho-physiological, point of view. Kant takes up the canon of pure reason or correct rules of judgement as a transcendental system of reason in pure imagination. For a discussion of the use of the term *canon* in the seventeenth and eighteenth century philosophy, see Tonelli (1994), pp. 178-188.

290 Sometime between 1776 and 1778, Kant writes in his *Nachlass*: “the nomothetic (legislation) of pure reason: 1. Negative part discipline; 2. Positive part canon” (Reß 18:70).

291 The simultaneity of the negative and the positive presupposes the methodological primacy of the negative over the positive. The simultaneity is the presence of an analogue of the discipline of pure reason in the canon of pure reason. The discipline of pure reason can be rendered positive only virtually/analogically. The discipline of pure reason is in the canon of pure reason vicariously. Only in this way can critique be simultaneously negative and positive. The negative determination of pure reason functions as a boundary for its positive determination in pure imagination where pure reason presupposes the possible existence of objects. The discipline of pure reason must remain *un*-objectifiable for reason to generate itself regardless of the existence or non-existence of objects. Despite significant differences with Kant on the use of analogy,
a critique that limits the speculative use of reason is, to be sure, to that extent negative, but because it simultaneously removes an obstacle that limits or even threatens to wipe out the practical use of reason, this critique is also in fact of positive and very important utility, as soon as we have convinced ourselves that there is an absolutely necessary practical use of pure reason (the moral use), in which reason unavoidably extends itself beyond the boundaries of sensibility, without needing any assistance from the speculative reason. (KrV B xxv, italics added)\textsuperscript{292}

In this way, the canon of pure reason moves from the negative measure of purification (self-formation) to the positive (moral) determination of a world. After separating the sensible and the supersensible in real-objective terms and connecting them in negative-modal-apodictic terms in the discipline of pure reason, the canon of pure reason determines the connection between the sensible and the supersensible in positive (moral) terms.\textsuperscript{293} This positivity (practical relation to possible objects in a world) is a form of self-
relational negativity, which a priori contains all moral ends (content) of pure reason. Morality is a species of apodictic modality. The discipline or modal-transcendental self-determination of pure reason is the genus of reason’s self-determination (freedom) in the world. The moral determination of necessary relation to objects accomplishes what the ideal of pure reason in the transcendental dialectic fails to achieve. It forms the whole of possible relations of pure reason and thus makes metaphysical cognitions of pure reason relationally systematic.\(^{294}\) That is to say, the canon of pure reason is the systematic condition (whole) of necessary relation to objects in general, i.e., the “universal logic” or “universal art of reason (canonica Epicuri)” (Log 9:13).\(^{295}\)

Kant’s account of the determination of the transcendental-systematic condition of reason’s necessary relation to objects in general – the enactment of the ideal of the highest

---

\(^{294}\) In the chapter on the ideal of pure reason, Kant discusses the failure of reason in grounding its cognitions in God, and proposes his remedy: moral theology (KrV A632/B660). Moral theology is neither morality proper nor theoretical (doctrinal) theology. It is a practical-speculative theology that exists only in its enactment as reason’s moral faith/belief. This is a theology whose justification comes from the needs of human reason in the world. The elaboration of the connection between the ideal of pure reason and the canon of pure reason requires an independent study, which is beyond the scope of the present discussion.

\(^{295}\) In Jäsche Logic, Kant distinguishes “universal logic” which “deals with all objects in general” from transcendental logic proper “in which the object itself is represented as an object of the mere understanding” (Log 9:15). Kant defines the science of logic in terms of a universal logic or the canon of pure reason: “Logic is a science of reason, not as to mere form but also as to matter; a science a priori of the necessary laws of thought, not in regard to particular objects, however, but to all objects in general; – hence a science of the correct use of the understanding and of reason in general, not subjectively, however, i.e., not according to empirical (psychological) principles for how the understanding does think, but objectively, i.e., according to principles a priori for how it ought to think” (Log 9:16). Kant uses “objectively” as what is universally necessary for the self-preservation of thinking rather than in a theoretical sense. This modal-apodictic “ought” of thinking is distinct from and presupposed in the ought of practical reason. The structure of the transcendental doctrine of method reflects the primacy of universal logic over transcendental logic proper, what Kant also calls the primacy of practical reason over theoretical reason: the canon of pure reason, i.e., “the universal art of reason,” precedes the architectonic of pure reason and history of pure reason, i.e., “the art of systems” (KrV A832/B860) both in the theoretical use of reason and in the art of systems in the reflecting use of reason. The primacy of practical reason over theoretical reason means that theoretical reason – which is concerned with essential ends or universal means of reason – presupposes that practical reason determines the ultimate ends of reason. The primary marker of a relation is the value or end that reason pursues in it rather than the means – whether universal or particular – by which reason pursues such end. In other words, categorical and hypothetical judgements, the categories of substance and causality, presuppose the disjunctive judgement, the category of community. Kant addresses reason’s universal and particular means to its final ends respectively in the architectonic of pure reason and the history of pure reason.
good in reason’s moral faith/belief – takes place in three major steps, set forth in three sections of the canon of pure reason. In the first section, Kant connects the sensible and the supersensible in positive terms, delimiting the distinct domain of morality, i.e., the practical use of reason, as the ultimate end around which all necessary relations of reason and understanding to objects must be transcendentally-systematically organized. The second section defines the ideal of the highest good as the systematic condition of the practical use of reason. The third section demonstrates that the ideal of the highest good is in essence pure reason’s moral self-enactment in moral faith/belief in God.

3.1.1 Demarcation of the moral domain: positive use of reason

As the title of the first section of the Canon of pure reason (“On the ultimate end of the pure use of our reason”) indicates, this section examines the ultimate impulse behind the pure use of reason in the transcendental dialectic. This impulse, Kant maintains, seeks “peace only in the completion of its circle in a self-subsisting systematic whole” (KrV A797/B825).296 To identify the impulse more specifically, Kant concentrates on the function of the three problems of metaphysics which pure reason pursues in the transcendental dialectic, i.e., the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will [Wille] in the world, and the existence of God? What lies in the nature of pure reason, which necessitates it to pursue these perennial metaphysical problems despite the risk of dialectical errors? These questions indicate that Kant presupposes that there is an organic function to all acts emerging from the natural spontaneity of pure reason.

Kant maintains that the determination of the ultimate end of reason according to its nature supplies the end in respect to which “all other ends have merely the value of means”

296 In the first Critique, Kant uses “ultimate end [letzten Zwecke]” and “final aim [Endabsicht]” of reason interchangeably.
and in terms of which all possible ends of pure reason can be internally structured or thoroughly organized (KrV A797/B825). Hence, Kant devotes the first section of the canon of pure reason to assessing the systematic function of the illusory relational content or matter of pure reason in the transcendental dialectic. The goal is to examine the systematic function of the problem of freedom of the will in order to arrive at the quintessential nature of pure reason and determine its ultimate impulse or end. This examination takes the form of delimitation of the practical domain as the locus of the ultimate end of reason, the only form of the positive determination of the supersensible in the sensible.

Kant discusses the functions of the three problems of metaphysics in two steps. First, the immortality of the soul, freedom of the will in the world, and existence of God, Kant argues, "are not at all necessary for our knowing" (KrV A799/B827). Second, these metaphysical problems are necessary for the practical use of reason. In particular, the freedom of the will in the world is the ultimate end of pure reason in its pursuit of supersensible objects.

The immortality of the soul, freedom of the will in the world, and existence of God are of no immanent use in theoretical cognitions. Kant starts with the freedom of the will in the world: “The will may well be free, yet this can concern only the intelligible cause of our willing.” Even if there is free will, it cannot explain the unity of causal series in the world. We still “must explain the phenomena of its [will’s] manifestations, i.e., actions, no differently than all other appearances of nature, namely in accordance with its unalterable laws” (KrV A798/B826). Similarly, assuming we have insight into the spiritual nature of the soul and its immortality, such insight cannot function “either as an explanatory ground of the appearances in this life or for the special constitution of the future state, because our
concept of an incorporeal nature is merely negative” (KrV A798-9/B826-7). Lastly, even if
the existence of God were proved, we “would by no means be authorized to derive from it
any particular arrangement and order”; we still need to account for order in the sensible
field in terms of natural causes (KrV A799/B827).

Contrary to the theoretical use of reason, the practical use of reason needs the
immortality of the soul, freedom of the will in the world, and existence of God, although not
in the same manner. Kant devotes the rest of the first section of the canon of pure reason to
show the necessity of the freedom of the will in the world for establishing morality as an
independent domain containing the ultimate end of pure reason. The transcendental-
 speculative necessity of the two other metaphysical problems for the practical use of
reason is taken up in the second section of the canon of pure reason, in terms of the ideal of
the highest good, i.e., the transcendental-speculative determining ground of the ultimate
end of pure reason.

Pure reason must presuppose the freedom of the will in the world since everything
practical “is possible through freedom” (KrV A800/B828). To demarcate the moral domain
as the domain of freedom of the will in the world, Kant distinguishes the use of free choice
[Willkür] and the free will [Wille]. Free choice is used under empirical conditions, according
to pragmatic laws, and is directed to “the single end of happiness and the harmony of the
means for attaining that end.” Free will is in essence pure practical laws “whose end is
given by reason completely a priori,” “do not command under empirical conditions but
absolutely,” and are “products of pure reason” (KrV A800/B828). Through this distinction,
Kant delimits morality as the positive form that the discipline of pure reason takes in
relation to sensible objects. The demarcation of the moral domain as the ultimate end of
pure reason in its pursuit of supersensible objects is indispensable for the hierarchical organization of possible ends of reason within the whole of pure reason.

The systematic condition of the practical use of reason, however, requires more than the freedom of the will in world. Strictly speaking, this freedom is formative of and belongs to the practical domain of reason, but the pursuit of the ultimate end of pure reason involves more than the practical domain and pure laws of morality. The special task of the canon of pure reason lies precisely in working out this excess (of religion over morality). The canon should focus on the two other metaphysical problems necessary for the practical use of reason: “in a canon of pure reason we are concerned with only two questions that pertain to the practical interest of pure reason, and with regard to which a canon of its use must be possible, namely: Is there a God? Is there a future life?” (KrV A803/B831). In other words, the relational content or matter of reason in the transcendental dialectic cannot be reduced to morality proper. It also negatively points to religion. Kant addresses the metaphysical problems of future life and God, which do not properly belong to morality and yet are at the core of Kant’s conception of a religion of reason, in the second section of the canon of pure reason.297

297 Kant’s treatment of the three metaphysical problems of the soul, world, and God is sometimes discussed in a manner that obliterates their specific functions in the systematic organization of critical philosophy. As we shall see, while the freedom of the will in the world is necessary for morality proper, presupposing future life and God performs necessary systematic functions for the practical use of reason. The lack of distinction between specific functions of these metaphysical problems obscures the distinct steps in Kant’s systematic grounding of the moral use of reason. To be sure, for Kant, morality does not need religion. And yet, without acknowledging the systematic necessity of reason’s moral faith/belief in future life and God for the practical use of reason, we fail to appreciate the indispensible role of the pure religion of reason in the formation of moral sensibility and moral dispositions, in cultivating moral virtue and thereby making “the highest ground of morality ... pleasing in the highest degree” (Br 10:145). Morality cannot be systematically applied and be pleasing without religion. Overlooking the systematic condition (the whole of final ends) of the practical use of reason tends to turn Kant’s moral philosophy into a merely rule-following procedure or formalistic individualistic ethics.
3.1.2 The ideal of the highest good

In the opening paragraph of the second section of the canon of pure reason, Kant recalls the negative lesson of the transcendental dialectic: reason cannot achieve the completeness of its theoretical cognitions through speculative ideas of supersensible objects. Such completeness requires the retrospective discipline (correction) of theoretical reason's transgression into the supersensible. Kant writes:

In its speculative use reason led us through the field of experiences, and since it could never find complete satisfaction for itself there, it led us from there to speculative ideas, which in the end, however, led us back again to experience, and thus fulfilled its aim in a way that is quite useful but not quite in accord without our expectation. (KrV A804/B832)

Given this unanticipated trajectory of reason in its theoretical speculation, Kant asks whether practical reason can attain what theoretical reason fails to accomplish in its speculation with regard to supersensible objects:

Now yet another experiment remains open to us: namely, whether pure reason is also to be found in practical use, whether in that use it leads us to the ideas that attain the highest ends of pure reason which we have just adduced, and thus whether from the point of view of its practical interest reason may not be able to guarantee that which in regard to its speculative interest it entirely refuses to us. (KrV A804/B832)

Can practical reason's speculation with regard to supersensible objects satisfy pure reason's desire for them? This question gives rise to further questions. What is the nature of practical speculation? How does practical speculation relate to theoretical reason and practical reason proper? What is the function of practical speculation in the transcendental system of pure reason?

---

298 As I discuss, the ideal of the highest good is a transcendental ideal of pure reason in pure imagination. By ideal Kant understands "the idea not merely in concreto but in individuo, i.e., as an individual thing which is determinable, or even determined, through the idea alone" (KrV A568/B596). Such individual determination is at once a universal determination. A complete determination of a part is possible only within a completely determined whole (in disjunctive judgements). For Kant, the ideal "exists merely in thought" and "serves as the original image [Urbilde] for the thoroughgoing determination of the copy" (KrV A569/B597) in sense.
To address these questions, Kant identifies all interests or ends of reason in order to determine the systematic function of practical speculation in critical philosophy. He distinguishes three kinds of interests or ends: first, “merely speculative” or theoretical ends (“what can I know?”); second, practical ends (“what should I do?”); third, practical-speculative ends (“what may I hope?”) (KrV A805/B833). This exhaustive classification of positive ends of pure reason aims to determine the interest that motivates pure reason to pursue the two metaphysical problems of future life and God. With this determination, the needs of pure reason with regard to the supersensible can be addressed in a legitimate manner.

Kant holds that his investigation in the transcendental doctrine of elements has “already exhausted all possible replies to it [the first question]”: “this much at least is certain and settled, that we can never partake of knowledge with respect to those two problems [future life and God]” (KrV A805/B833). These problems do not fall under the first – i.e., theoretical-speculative – question. The second question, which is schematically dealt with in the first section of the canon of pure reason, “is not transcendental, but moral.”\(^{299}\) It does not directly concern metaphysical questions of future life and God. The third question “is simultaneously practical and theoretical.” Anticipating his insight on the primacy of practical reason over theoretical reason, Kant characterizes the question of hope as the one in which “the practical leads like a clue to a reply to the theoretical question and, in its highest form, the speculative question” (KrV A805/B833). In the question of hope, which arises after the hopelessness and despair of the transcendental

\(^{299}\) Here Kant uses “transcendental” in its strict sense as “ontological.” It is in this sense that, in the first edition of the first *Critique*, Kant does not include moral philosophy as part of transcendental philosophy.
dialectic and the disciplinary remedy of reason, speculation reappears in an elevated form.\footnote{In the second \textit{Critique}, Kant formulates the simultaneity of the theoretical and the practical in terms of postulates of practical reason. He defines a practical postulate as “a \textit{theoretical} proposition, though one not demonstrable as such, insofar as it is attached inseparably to an a priori unconditionally valid \textit{practical law}” (KpV 5:122). A postulate is a \textit{theoretical} proposition that is \textit{practically-speculatively necessitated}. It prevents practical reason from being entangled in an antinomy, and is enacted through reason’s practical faith/belief in future life and God. In being practically-speculatively necessitated, the theoretical is elevated to what Kant views as the “highest form” of speculation with regard to supersensible objects (KrV A805/B833). This elevation is a re-appropriation of theoretical ends of reason in terms of practical ends of reason, i.e., the re-appropriation and organic incorporation of a lower (theoretical) form of speculation into the highest (practical) form of positive speculation. Practical speculation presupposes pure speculation, i.e., the negative-modal-apodictic use of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason.}

Reason’s hope is the retrospective practical-speculative appropriation of knowledge and morality proper – theoretical ends and practical ends of pure reason – within the practical-speculative unity of reason. The appropriation is necessary for establishing the systematic condition, the whole of possible ends, of practical use of reason. This kind of retrospective speculative appropriation, as discussed in chapter two, is the moral re-enactment of the discipline of pure reason. Critical reason is in essence retrospective speculative re-appropriation of the matter (natural spontaneity) of pure reason.

In a merely theoretical approach, reason asserts the existence of things: “something \textit{is} (which acts as the supreme cause) \textit{because something does happen}” (KrV A806/B834). This approach remains completely indifferent to the moral worth of existence. In short, within a theoretical framework, nature is regarded as mechanical. Similarly, in a merely practical approach, reason is not concerned with natural laws at all. The one and only goal is to follow the moral law. Although the theoretical and moral domains are distinct, Kant appreciates a need to work out their relationship within an organic unity. Practical use of reason lacks any meaning and significance if it does not connect with the theoretical use of reason, the possibility of experience, as part of its systematic condition: since moral
precepts “command that these [moral] actions ought to happen, they must also be able to happen, and there must therefore be possible a special kind of systematic unity” that brings together the theoretical and the practical (KrV A807/B835). This is the transition from morality to religion, which is necessary for the systematicity of the practical use of reason:

without a God and a world that is now not visible to us but is hoped for, the majestic ideas of morality are, to be sure, objects of approbation and admiration but not incentives for resolve and realization, because they do not fulfill the whole end that is natural for every rational being and determined a priori and necessarily through the very same pure reason. (KrV A813/B841, italics added)

In other words, moral laws cannot be “commands ... if they did not connect appropriate consequences with their rules a priori and thus carry with them promises and threats” (KrV A811/B839). How, cheerfully or grudgingly, one respects moral laws cannot be derived from the laws themselves, and yet this affects the nature of our moral disposition.301

The question of reason’s hope accommodates the existential possibility of morality by addressing the gap between knowledge and morality. Hope is a practical speculation that unifies knowledge and morality according to this principle: “something is (which

---

301 As Kant writes in Religion, "morality ... inevitably leads to religion, and through religion it extends itself to the idea of a mighty moral lawgiver outside the human being, in whose will the ultimate end (of the creation of the world) is what can and at same time ought to be the ultimate human end” (RGV 6:6). In other words, human will [Willkür] can be determined only if it is assumed that whatever happens is accounted for. The account-keeping of our moral life, however, cannot be essentially trusted to us, even though it should remain the object of our speculation. That is to say, the complete condition for the moral production of objects in the practical use of reason is not merely practical. In his preface to the first edition of Religion, Kant explains the need for the complete systematic condition of the practical use of reason in more detail: “although on its own behalf morality does not need the representation of an end which would have to precede the determination of the will, it may well be that it has a necessary reference to such an end, not as the ground of its maxims but as a necessary consequence accepted in conformity to them. – For in the absence of all reference to an end no determination of the will [Willkür] can take place in human beings at all, since no such determination can occur without an effect, and its representation” (RGV 6:4). The inclusion of “a necessary reference to .. an end” is indispensable – as part of the systematic condition of the practical use of reason – for the determination of the will [Willkür], even though the moral law does not depend on human ends. Kant acknowledges: “it is the human being’s own fault if such a need is found in him” (RGV 6:3). This fault, which is a form of the objectively unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the supersensible, is structural to human reason. The original fault or fall of the human being goes hand in hand with the original loss of God, and can be remedied only through reason’s moral faith/belief in future life and God.
determines the ultimate final end) because something ought to happen" (KrV A806/B834); reason determines the existence or non-existence of things from a moral standpoint.

The moral orientation of practical speculation – hope – towards possible existence, however, exceeds morality proper since “all hoping concerns happiness” (KrV A805/B833), i.e., “the satisfaction of all of our inclinations (extensively, with regard to their manifoldness, as well as intensively, with regard to degree, and also protensively, with regard to duration).” As a practical speculation, hope appropriates all possible sensation (material intuition or relational ends of pure reason) into a systematic unity of reason. If the appropriation of sensation takes place according to a “pragmatic (rule of prudence)” principle, we have an empirical/psychological notion of hope. If the appropriation is in moral terms, that is, according to the motive of “the worthiness to be happy” (KrV A806/B834), a transcendental notion of hope takes shape. The unity of hope brings together moral principles and theoretical principles into the idea of a “moral world” (KrV A808/B836). In hope, one does not simply follow the moral law in a merely formal sense, i.e., in complete indifference to its influence on the world. Neither does one make worldly consequences of moral action the principle of one’s maxim. Rather, one follows the moral law in a way that also leads to the best possible (moral) world: “Do that through which you will become worthy to be happy” (KrV A808/B836).²

² Kant does not think of incorporation of the best possible consequences as mechanical additions to a maxim that is composed according to the moral law. All possible consequences are always already part of the systematic condition of the practical use of reason. Kant acknowledges and addresses this issue in Religion: “it is one of the inescapable limitations of human beings and their practical faculty of reason … to be concerned in every action with its result, seeking something in it that might serve them as an end and even prove the purity of their intention – which result would indeed come last in practice (nexu effectivo) but first in representation and intention (nexu finali). Now, in this end human beings seek something that they can love, even though it is being proposed to them through mere reason [bloß Vernunft]. Hence the law that only inspires respect in them, though it does not recognize this sought-after something as [its own] need, nonetheless extends itself on its behalf to include the moral final end of reason among its determining
Kant locates reason’s desire for future life (the immortality of soul) in the need or necessity of reason to hope for a moral world, i.e., a world in which happiness is distributed according to virtue or the principle of worthiness to be happy. Through the idea of future life, reason connects the moral law and efficient causes in nature to determine the moral conduct in such a manner to arrive at “an outcome precisely corresponding to our highest ends whether in this or in another life” (KrV A812/B840). Hope brings together and unifies all relational ends of pure reason in terms of a single final end: the moral reshaping of the world which unfolds in history. Hope is a transcendental-speculative system of memory, the representation of practical ends of reason in pure imagination, or an original image [Urbild] through which reason assesses its redemptive movement towards a moral world:

grounds. That is, the proposition, ‘Make the highest possible good in this world your own final end,’ is a synthetic proposition a priori which is introduced by the moral law itself, and yet through it practical reason reaches beyond the law. And this is possible because the moral law is taken with reference to the characteristic, natural to the human being, of having to consider in every action, besides the law, also an end” (RGV 6:7). Kant’s appeal to love – another way of referring to reason’s moral faith/belief – complicates his distinction in Groundwork between morality “in conformity with duty” and morality “from duty” (GMS 4:398). He implies a concept of duty without duty, i.e., a duty that is done with a sense of love and moral pleasure rather than a detached and abstract sense of moral obligation. This concept includes morality “from duty” but transcends – or if you like sublates – it lovingly. This peculiar transgression of moral duty in its strict sense performs an indispensable organic function. Kant explains this function in his essay The end of all things: “love, as a free assumption of the will of another into one’s maxims, is an indispensable complement to the imperfection of human nature (of having to be necessitated to that which reason prescribes through the law). For what one does not do with liking he does in such a niggardly fashion – also probably with sophistical evasions from the command of duty – that the latter as an incentive, without the contribution of the former, is not very much to be counted on” (EnD 8:338). Strictly speaking, the moral law can be pursued for its own sake and enacted purely only through such love. This love is the primary source of moral pleasure. That is how Kant imagines “the highest ground of morality” to “be pleasing in the highest degree” (Br 10:145). Contrary to empirical pleasure, moral pleasure is internal rather than consequent to the organic formation of moral disposition. It does not depend on the external manifestation of moral disposition in action. Far from being a formalistic ethics, love is the content of Kant’s ethics of virtue: “Love God above all, and your neighbor as yourself” (KpV 5:83). The distinction between “in conformity with duty” and “from duty” is valid primarily in regard to the moral “legality of actions,” and does not exactly apply to the “morality of dispositions” (KpV 5:151). That is to say, the distinction arises in approaching moral duty from the standpoint of the objectivity of the moral law rather than in terms of the subjective (disciplinary-methodological) nature of moral dispositions. One does not make moral decisions in an empirical and historical vacuum. Put it differently, one cannot merely suffer from doing one’s moral duty. The complete absence of moral pleasure in a moral decision is a symptom of a rather mechanical application of the moral law, if not the complete absence of moral virtue. Moral cultivation and formation of moral dispositions requires “a revolution in the mode of thought [Denkungsart]” as well as “a gradual reformation in the mode of sense [Sinnesart]” (RGV 6:47). This revolution belongs to the religion of reason rather than morality proper. Moral cultivation also presupposes the a priori correction/cultivation [Zucht] of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason.
Pure reason thus contains – not in its speculative use, to be sure, but yet in a certain practical use, namely the moral use – principles of the possibility of experience, namely those actions in conformity with moral percepts which could be encountered in the history of humankind. (KrV A807/B835)

But how can such hope or a practical-speculative “system of self-rewarding morality” be realized? Kant suggests that the realization of hope is possible only if the moral law and its worldly consequences are coordinated in a manner to secure the proportionality of virtue and happiness for everyone. Such coordination cannot be grounded in either morality or nature; it “cannot be cognized through reason ... but may be hoped for only if it is at the same time grounded on a highest reason, which commands in accordance with moral laws, as at the same time the cause of nature” (KrV A810/B838). Through the question of future life, one is led to the question of God as the highest reason: “I call the idea of such an intelligence, in which the morally most perfect will, combined with the highest blessedness, is the cause of all happiness in the world, in so far as it stands in exact relation with morality (as the worthiness to be happy), the ideal of the highest good” (KrV A810/B838). This ideal is a transcendental-speculative “purposive unity” (KrV A812/B840) or the original image of a moral world—“a world that is future for us” (KrV A811/B839) and in which happiness is proportioned to virtue. In a practical-

303 Hope operates at the level of individual (I) and species (we), enacting the quasi-monomadological nature of the discipline of pure reason in positive terms in pure imagination. Kant’s notion of hope in future life implies the possibility of loss in the past and the present. Time is by nature plagued with loss. Such loss is the temporal/historical form that the original loss of God, or the generative gap of pure reason, takes in pure imagination. Kant’s notion of hope implies that memory/history is the locus of individual/anthropological redemption, indicating an eschatological structure in play in Kant’s critical philosophy. In Religion, Kant discusses hope as the “hope of blessedness” that belongs to “saving faith” but he clearly distinguishes this hope from waiting “quite passively for this moral goodness [virtue], with hands in their lap, as if it were a heavenly gift from above” (RGV 6:116 and 6:161). See my discussion of the role of history for realization of the final ends of pure reason in the third section of this chapter.
speculative sense, the original image, the whole (final end or measure) of possible relations of understanding/reason to objects, is immanent to all images in the human mind. In this sense, reason makes all images of the mind in pure imagination after this original image.\(^{304}\)

### 3.1.3 Reason's moral faith/belief in God

The primary goal of the third section of the canon of pure reason, “On having an opinion, knowing, and believing,” is to demonstrate that the ideal of the highest good is in essence pure reason’s self-enactment in moral faith/belief in God. Moral faith/belief in God is the systematic condition (whole) of practical use of reason. In this section, Kant establishes the critical sense of Glaube as reason’s moral faith/belief in God. Kant implies this sense of

---

\(^{304}\) There are multiple interpretations of the ideal of the highest good. Generally speaking, these interpretations usually differ on the theological character of the ideal of the highest good as well as the motivational role of this ideal for morality. Anti-metaphysical interpretations of Kant approach the ideal of the highest good and the question of moral theology in at least two major ways: first, outright rejection of the systematic significance of the ideal of the highest good; second, reduction of the ideal of the highest good to some form of epistemic or meta-ethical condition with no metaphysical or theological dimension. An example of the first approach can be found in Beck’s commentary on the second Critique: “The truth of the matter is that the concept of the highest good is not a practical concept at all, but a dialectical Ideal of reason. It is not important in Kant’s philosophy for any practical consequences it might have, for it has none except those drawn from the concept of bonum supremum” Beck (1960), p. 245. For another example of anti-metaphysical view that argues for a “secular faith” that “must not fly in the face of inductive evidence” see Baier (1980), p. 133. The second type of anti-metaphysical approach constructs a moral community around the ideal of the highest good but it severs any connection between this ideal and God. E.g. trying to ‘improve’ Kant, Rawls denies the need for reason’s faith/belief in future life and God. Instead, we need “certain beliefs about our nature and the social world…. We can believe that a realm of ends is possible in the world only if the order of nature and social necessities are not unfriendly to that ideal”; that is to say, “we must believe, for example, that the course of human history is progressively improving, and not becoming steadily worse, or that it does not fluctuate to perpetuity from bad to good and from good to bad. For in that case, we will view the spectacle of human history as a farce that arouses loathing of our species” Rawls (2000), pp. 319-320. Rawls explains away the motivational role of reason’s moral faith/belief in future life and God by highlighting Kant’s religious upbringing and the putative limits of his personal psychology. For a similar anti-metaphysical reading of the ideal of the highest good, arguing that “Kant’s theory of freedom of the will” works without “extravagant ontological claims,” see Korsgaard (1996a), p. 183. In essence, all anti-metaphysical accounts of the ideal of the highest good deny the role of religion as the systematic condition of the practical use of reason. On the other hand, metaphysical interpretations of Kant tend to present the ideal of the highest good in terms of some form of metaphysical positivism or ontotheology. E.g., see Ameriks (2000) & (2003). Thus, neither anti-metaphysical nor metaphysical interpretations take the disciplinary ground (modal-apodictic nature) of reason’s moral faith/belief in God seriously. Trying to ‘correct’ or ‘improve’ Kant, anti-metaphysical readings reduce reason’s moral faith/belief in God to naturalistic beliefs or epistemic and meta-ethical conditions. Metaphysical interpretations tend to hypostatize reason’s moral faith/belief in God in terms of existence of an objective supersensible reality. For more literature on the dispute in interpreting the ideal of the highest good see also Silber (1959), Reath (1988), and Engstrom (1992).
Glaube in his discussion of moral theology in the chapter on the ideal of pure reason in the transcendental dialectic. Neither a theological morality nor a set of problematic/assertoric judgements about the existence of God, “moral theology is ... a conviction [Überzeugung] of the existence of a highest being which grounds itself on moral laws” (KrV A632/B660). Kant does not elaborate his notion of moral theology in the transcendental dialectic. Moral theology presupposes the discipline of pure reason, which is yet to be introduced in the transcendental doctrine of method. Without the discipline or determination of the boundaries of pure reason, faith/belief in God lacks a purely rational origin, remains under the influence of sensibility, and cannot be essentially distinguished from enthusiasm [Schwärmerei]. Moral faith/belief in God is a species of pure reason’s discipline or reason’s faith/belief in itself—a transcendental-speculative form of mourning the original loss or absence of God in the world. Moral faith/belief in God is human reason’s remedy for this loss or absence, that is, an attempt to redress the loss in positive terms.305

305 I discuss Kant’s conception of reason’s moral faith/belief exclusively from the standpoint of its function in the canon of pure reason. Kant’s use of the term Glaube (faith/belief) is not consistent in different works. He sometimes uses Glaube in its conventional sense as in “Christian faith” and “pragmatic belief.” Different meanings of Glaube in English (faith/belief) add to the confusion. Starting from the canon of pure reason in the first Critique, Kant increasingly uses Glaube in its critical sense as reason’s moral faith/belief in God. Although Kant is not always terminologically consistent, at several points he distinguishes this critical sense of faith/belief from historical, theoretical, and pragmatic beliefs. E.g., he writes: “the word ‘belief’ does not occur at all in a theoretical sense” (VT 8:396); “so-called historical belief cannot really be called belief ... and cannot be opposed as such to knowledge, since it can itself be knowledge” (Log 9:68). That said, even in the canon of pure reason, Kant does not present his discussion of moral theology, reason’s practical faith/belief in God, effectively. He does not clearly demonstrate how reason’s practical faith/belief in God is the systematic condition of the practical use of reason. This issue is addressed more explicitly in his 1786 essay on the pantheism controversy, where Kant points to a sense of reason that is neither theoretical proper nor practical proper. Written in 1786-7, Reinhold's Letters on the Kantian Philosophy explains Kant’s argument on this issue in a manner more accessible than Kant’s. Reinhold states that reason’s practical faith/belief goes beyond the simple opposition between reason and faith. See Reinhold [1790] (2005), p. 20. In the second Critique, Kant discusses postulates of practical reason in terms of “reason’s pure practical faith/belief [praktischen Vernunftglaubens]” (KpV 5:144). Later in Religion, Kant develops his conception of moral faith/belief further, in particular in relation to the historical character of Christianity. Comprehensive examination of Kant’s conception of reason’s moral faith/belief, its development throughout Kant’s intellectual life, and its significance for critical philosophy is beyond the scope of this chapter and requires a separate study.
In the third section of the canon of pure reason, Kant elaborates his notion of moral theology – reason’s moral faith/belief in God – by making a number of distinctions.

At the most basic level, Kant distinguishes between the objective validity – truth \([Wahrheit]\) – of judgements and the subjective validity of judgements, i.e., the holding-to-be-true \([Das Fürwahrhalten]\). The objective validity of judgements concerns their a priori object-relatedness (relational act) whereas the subjective validity of judgements is about their modality (self-relational act). Kant writes: “Holding-to-be-true is an occurrence in our understanding that may rest on objective grounds, but that also requires subjective causes in the mind of him who judges” (KrV A820/B848). Although the modality of judgements is presupposed in the transcendental logic, it is not directly addressed there. But now, after establishing the apodictic modality of pure reason through negative judgements of discipline, the foundational role of “subjective causes” (holding-to-be-true) in metaphysical judgements can be made explicit.306

Kant distinguishes two kinds of holding-to-be-true depending on the nature of the subjective cause that forms a judgement: the transcendental-logical modality of judgements and the psychological modality of judgements. If the subjective ground of holding-to-be-true is “valid for everyone merely as long as he has reason, then its ground is objectively sufficient” and this is called “conviction” (KrV A820/B848). If the subjective ground of holding-to-be-true is based only “in the particular constitution of the subject,” it cannot be objectively sufficient.307 In this case, the subjective ground is persuasion

\[306\] Kant does not make the question of modality explicit in the canon of pure reason. This question is among the most neglected in Kant’s own exposition as well as in secondary literature. Chapter four discusses the modal-apodictic foundation of the table of judgements.

\[307\] Kant does not mean that all judgements that are “valid for everyone merely as long as he has reason” are necessarily objectively sufficient. The point is that all objectively sufficient judgements must be subjectively universally – i.e., transcendentally-methodologically – valid in the first place.
Given that both conviction and persuasion rest on some form of subjective ground, they cannot be distinguished internally: “the touchstone of whether holding-to-be-true is conviction or mere persuasion, is therefore, externally, the possibility of communicating it and finding it to be valid for the reason of every human being to take it to be true.” Conviction is universally valid because its grounds are communicable and can lead to universal assent whereas persuasion “has only private validity” since its grounds “cannot be communicated” (KrV A820/B848).

After distinguishing persuasion and conviction, Kant introduces three modes of justification of holding-to-be-true: “Taking something to be true, or the subjective validity of judgement, has the following three stages in relation to conviction (which at the same time is valid objectively): having an opinion, believing, and knowing.” Having an opinion is a mode of holding-to-be-true that is “subjectively as well as objectively insufficient.” Believing is a mode of holding-to-be-true that is “only subjectively sufficient” and remains objectively insufficient. Knowing is a mode of holding-to-be-true that is “both subjectively and objectively sufficient.” The first mode of holding-to-be-true – subjective insufficiency and objective insufficiency – only produces a merely logical possibility of connection to truth. Opinions are merely logically possible. The second mode – subjective sufficiency and objective insufficiency – “is called conviction (for myself).” The third mode – subjective

---

308 In Dohna-Wundlacken Logic, transcribed in 1792, Kant defines persuasion more broadly: “Persuasion is actually holding-to-be-true based on grounds, without investigating whether they are objective or subjective” (V-Lo Dohna 24:747).

309 In reading the third section of the canon of pure reason, a potential confusion about Kant’s terminology should be avoided. For Kant, objective validity and objective sufficiency are synonyms. But “subjective validity” and “subjective sufficiency” are not. Holding-to-be-true is subjectively valid but it is not necessarily subjectively sufficient. This is the case in persuasion, which can be subjectively valid but not subjectively sufficient. Subjective sufficiency depends on the mode of justification in holding-something-to-be-true. Subjective validity may be private or public whereas subjective sufficiency must be public in the sense of being common to human species. Subjective sufficiency requires grounding in modal-apodictic reason.

310 Modally speaking, having an opinion, knowing, and believing are enacted respectively in problematic, assertoric, and apodictic judgements.
sufficiency and objective sufficiency – generates “certainty (for everyone)” (KrV A822/B850).

Kant’s classification of three modes of holding-to-be-true isolates reason’s moral faith/belief in terms of its unique characteristics. On the one hand, having an opinion is not acceptable on issues of knowledge and morality: “it is absurd to have an opinion in pure mathematics: one must know, or else refrain from all judgement. It is just the same with the principles of morality, since one must not venture an action on the mere opinion that something is allowed, but must know this” (KrV A823/B851). On the other hand, “[i]n the transcendental use of reason,” i.e., in the practical-speculative use of reason with regard to future life and God, “to have an opinion is of course too little, but to know is also too much.” In a “practical relation [Beziehung],” Kant argues, it is justifiable to believe, i.e., to be merely subjectively sufficient. One can be subjectively sufficient in two ways: in terms of “skill” (the hypothetical necessity of what Kant calls pragmatic faith/beliefs) or “morality” (the absolute necessity of moral faith/beliefs); “the former for arbitrary and contingent ends, the latter ... for absolutely necessary ends” (KrV A823/B851).

Kant complicates his distinction between pragmatic faith/belief and moral faith/belief by introducing “doctrinal faith/beliefs”: “pragmatic faith/beliefs” are “contingent beliefs, which however ground the actual use of the means to certain actions” and doctrinal faith/beliefs are an “analogue” of belief in practical judgements through which “we would suppose to have sufficient grounds if there were a means for arriving at certainty about the matter” (KrV A824/B852 & A825/B853). Kant considers theoretical judgements or theses about the existence of God, e.g., physico-theology, as a form of doctrinal faith/belief. Although the shift from the language of knowledge to belief in such
cases is “an expression of modesty from an objective point of view” and “the firmness of confidence in a subjective sense,” Kant thinks that a doctrinal faith/belief cannot address the need of reason in relation to metaphysical problems of future life and God. He writes: “there is something unstable about merely doctrinal faith/belief; one is often put off from it by difficulties that come up in speculation” (KrV A827/B856). Kant encapsulates the problem with doctrinal faith/belief:

If here too I would call merely theoretically taking something to be true only an hypothesis that I would be justified in assuming, I would thereby make myself liable for more of a concept of the constitution of a world-cause and of another world than I can really boast of; for of that which I even only assume as an hypothesis I must know at least enough of its properties so that I need invent not its concept but only its existence. (KrV A827/B855)

In short, a theoretical hypothesis cannot stem the infinite regress of theoretical speculation, and reproduces the very problem that it aims to address.

Satisfaction of the needs of pure reason with regard to supersensible objects requires moral faith/belief. Unlike doctrinal faith/belief, moral faith/belief does not extend the theoretical reach of pure reason. Rather, it orients reason in its practical speculation with regard to future life and God. Explaining such orientation, Kant writes: “The word ‘belief’ ... concerns only the direction [Leitung] that an idea gives me and the subjective influence on the advancement of my actions of reason that holds me fast to it, even though I am not in a position to give an account of it from a speculative [theoretical] point of view” (KrV A827/B855).\(^{311}\) Moral faith/belief in God is the practical satisfaction of reason after its “frustration of all the ambitious aims” in the transcendental dialectic (KrV A829/B857).

---

\(^{311}\) Kant develops his point on the orienting character of moral faith/belief in his 1786 essay on the pantheism controversy What does it mean to orient oneself in thinking? This essay makes the grounding of moral faith/belief in the discipline of pure reason more explicit. Kant separates the moral nature of faith/belief from the theoretical character of opinion and knowledge, and states that moral faith/belief cannot be transformed into knowledge. This objective incompleteness of moral faith/belief is vital for sustaining its subjective sufficiency and its firmness independent of the physical world. Also see (Log 9:67).
Kant calls this satisfaction a moral conviction or “moral certainty” and distinguishes it from theoretical certainty. That is why we can only say “I am morally certain” rather than “It is morally certain that there is a God.” Avoiding anti-metaphysical and metaphysical positivism, Kant builds his metaphysics on the moral faith/belief in God, what Kant refers to as “reason's faith/belief [Vernunftglaube]” (KrV A829/B857). To ignore the systematic need of reason for moral faith/belief or to hypostatize its object violates the disciplinary boundaries of reason, and turns a practical relation [Beziehung] to supersensible objects into a theoretical one. Moral faith/belief in God, i.e., moral theology, is “only of immanent use, namely for fulfilling our vocation here in the world by fitting into the system of all ends” (KrV A819/B847), enacting the ideal of the highest good as a “systematic unity of ends,” or “the most perfect purposiveness” (KrV A814/B842). This purposiveness functions as the ground of a moral world.\(^{313}\)

\(^{312}\)This seems to be the only time that Kant uses Vernunftglaube in the first Critique. This term plays a central role in Kant’s 1786 essay on the pantheism controversy. Also, in the third Critique, Kant defines practical faith/belief as “habitus, not as actus,” i.e., as a disposition, not as an individual act. Reason's practical faith/belief is “reason’s moral way of thinking in the affirmation of that which is inaccessible for theoretical cognition” (KU 5:471). In other words, practical faith/belief (the canon of pure reason) is the positive form of reason’s faith/belief in itself (the discipline of pure reason). To distinguish reason’s faith/belief in itself from its practical or positive analogue in the canon of pure reason, I use reason's faith/belief in itself exclusively for the negative (disciplinary) self-enactment of pure reason. The terminological distinction between reason's faith/belief in itself and reason’s moral faith/belief [moralische Vernunftglaube] is necessary for demonstrating two distinct levels of transcendental-methodological grounding of morality in the discipline of pure reason and the canon of pure reason. Appreciation of this distinctness is also essential for avoiding reduction of the disciplinary (negative) unity of pure reason to its practical (positive) unity.

\(^{313}\)In my interpretation, Kant’s use of the term thing in itself does not require any ontological commitment. As Kant states, the concept of noumenon belongs to neither the problematic nor the assertoric use of reason. Rather, it is an apodictic use of reason: “The concept of noumenon is therefore merely a boundary concept [Grenzbegriff], in order to limit the pretension of sensibility, and therefore only of negative use” (KrV A255/B310, bold is added). Kant’s suggestion applies to all supersensible objects, and clearly distinguishes critical philosophy from any form of ontotheology. Moral theology is a necessary moral faith/belief in God, in essence a modal-apodictic use of reason, not an ontological commitment to God’s existence. Any form of ontological commitment renders faith/belief irrelevant. Moral faith/belief in God can be enacted only through modal-apodictic negativity of pure reason. Contrary to merely metaphysical interpretations of critical philosophy, the modal-apodictic interpretation of Kant’s reference to the supersensible, which I have presented above, does not contain any ontological commitment to supersensible objects. My interpretation is also different from epistemological or anti-metaphysical interpretations of critical philosophy. Both merely
Kant traces the motivation behind moral faith/belief in God to reason’s “natural interest in morality”: “Strengthen and magnify this interest, and you will find reason very tractable and even enlightened for uniting the speculative with the practical interest” (KrV A830/B858). No human being is free from this natural interest in morality since it is rooted in the common nature of human reason.\textsuperscript{314} As a result, even in the absence of good dispositions, Kant states, we “fear a divine existence and a future.” This natural interest at least prevents us from claiming certainty that there is no future life and no God. Kant calls this “a negative faith/belief, which, to be sure, would not produce morality and good dispositions, but would still produce the analogue of them, namely it could powerfully restrain the outbreak of evil dispositions” (KrV A830/B858).

Having determined the final ends of pure reason – the enactment of the ideal of the highest good in reason’s moral faith/belief – in the canon of pure reason, Kant turns to the issue of universal means to pursue the final ends of pure reason in the world. What are the universal means by which pure reason can approximate its final ends, organize its relation to the world, and thus recast it in light of reason’s faith/belief in God? Kant addresses this question in the third chapter of the transcendental doctrine of method.

\textsuperscript{314} Kant’s point that every rational being has a “natural interest in morality” indicates his positive remedy to skepticism: reason’s moral faith/belief in God. Arguing that, due to its theoretical nature, a doctrinal belief in God cannot overcome skepticism, Kant writes: “The only reservation that is to be found here is that this reason’s faith/belief is grounded on the presupposition of moral dispositions. If we depart from that, and assume someone who would be entirely indifferent in regard to moral questions, then the question that is propounded by reason becomes merely a problem for [theoretical] speculation, and in that case it can be supported with strong grounds from analogy but not with grounds to which even the most obstinate skepticism must yield” (KrV A829/B857). Kant develops the point on human reason’s “natural interest in morality” in his criticism of Jacobi’s naturalistic notion of faith/belief; a naturalistic faith/belief opens the gate of enthusiasm. The denaturalizing (disciplinary) ground of reason’s moral faith/belief is Kant’s remedy to enthusiasm and nihilism, which are entangled in positive or negative forms of naturalism.
3.2 From the hope of a moral world to the schema of a sensible world

Kant devotes the third chapter of the transcendental doctrine of method to the architectonic of pure reason. After the canon of pure reason discusses the enactment of the ideal of the highest good in moral faith/belief, as the systematic condition (the whole of final ends) of the practical use of reason, the architectonic of pure reason deals with the systematic condition (the whole of essential ends) of the theoretical use of pure reason in relation to objects in the world. If morality is to be of real significance for human beings, there must be a systematic way – some universal means – to advance morality in the world and render the sensible world moral. Kant calls this systematic pursuit, or theoretical cognition of objects in the world, metaphysics or philosophy in its strict sense. Although Kant’s chapter on the architectonic of pure reason lacks any formal structure and even at points may seem disparate and oblique, its overarching goal is to determine the systematic condition of the theoretical use of reason, the proper domain of metaphysics or philosophy. Metaphysics becomes science only if the whole of its possible ends – the systematic condition of the theoretical use of reason – is a priori determined. In their strict sense, the categories of the understanding presuppose this systematic condition. Kant’s delimitation of philosophy (metaphysics proper) in terms of its systematic condition – the systematic determination of the world as the object domain of understanding – can be discussed in terms of three major steps in the chapter on the architectonic of pure reason: first, defining the architectonic of pure reason as the systematic condition or whole of the theoretical use of the understanding in the world; second, distinguishing the worldly

---

315 Generally speaking, Kant uses philosophy in two senses, the first the more original: critique as a methodological propaedeutic to metaphysics. The second sense is derivative: metaphysics proper.
concept \([\text{Weltbegriff}]\) of philosophy from its scholastic concept \([\text{Schulbegriff}]\); third, outlining metaphysics in terms of its divisions.\(^{316}\)

3.2.1 The systematic ground of the rational cognition of the world

Kant starts the architectonic of pure reason by introducing it in terms of its primary function to make our ordinary cognition of the world systematic:

> By an architectonic I understand the art of systems. Since systematic unity is that which first makes ordinary cognition into science, i.e., makes a system out of a mere aggregate of it, architectonic is the doctrine of that which is scientific in our cognition in general, and therefore necessarily belongs to the doctrine of method. (KrV A832/B860)

In a general sense, an architectonic refers to a plan or design – a unity of organized ends (parts) – that serves to structure the whole of an edifice. In the transcendental doctrine of method, Kant uses the term architectonic in a more specific sense: the art of reason that systematizes a mere aggregate of ordinary cognition or mere use of understanding in pure imagination. This specific sense of architectonic is implied in the very structure of the

\(^{316}\) Most interpretations of the first \textit{Critique} ignore the architectonic of pure reason. E.g., Kemp Smith claims that the architectonic is Kant's “favourite hobby” and “of slight scientific importance, and is chiefly of interest for the light which it casts upon Kant's personality” Kemp Smith (1962), p. 579. Even those who take the architectonic seriously do not discuss it in terms of Kant's plan for a system of cognitions of pure reason in the introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method. Many accounts of the architectonic also overlook that it presupposes the discipline and canon of pure reason and thus cannot be taken as the most basic ground of critical philosophy. E.g., disregarding the foundational role of the discipline of pure reason in the doctrine of method, Tonelli views the architectonic as “the climax of the Theory of Method” Tonelli (1994), p. 250. Yovel makes a similar claim about the canon of pure reason: “the ideas of highest good and history, far from being marginal, become the systematic apex of Kant's whole critical endeavor” Yovel (1980), p. 31. Contrary to Tonelli and Yovel, the highest point of the doctrine of method and indeed critique is the transcendental-speculative negativity of the discipline of pure reason. As discussed in chapter two, the highest point of critique, the moment of its epigenetic formation (birth) is at once its vanishing point (death). More recently, König distinguishes two major approaches to Kant's notion of architectonic: the first connects the architectonic with the table of the categories; the second discusses the architectonic in relation to the transcendental doctrine of method; for two examples representing these approaches see Baum's and König's papers in Fulda and Stolzenberg (eds.) (2001). Yet, neither Baum nor König follows Kant's plan for a system of philosophy in the transcendental doctrine of method. Similarly, Manchester presents the architectonic as that which “merely provides a schema for investigating human reason as it pursues its speculative interests” Manchester (2008), p. 133. This reading too fails to appreciate the organic function of the architectonic within Kant's overall critical-methodological plan for the system of philosophy. Also, despite Kant's explicit reference to the role of schema for applying the idea of metaphysics as a possible science, the systematic connection between the architectonic and transcendental schematism in the analytic of principles is missed in secondary scholarship.
transcendental doctrine of method. The architectonic of pure reason presupposes two wholes or “formal conditions of a complete system of pure reason” (KrV A707/B735), that is, the discipline of pure reason – which determines the whole of possible ends or boundaries of pure reason in general – and the canon of pure reason – which determines the whole of practical use or final ends of pure reason. The architectonic of pure reason is the third layer of systematic grounding of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method. Systematically speaking, this order indicates the primacy of disciplinary reason over practical reason as well as the primacy of practical reason over theoretical reason. Only after formation of the negative-modal-apodictic whole of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason and transposition of this whole into a relational (positive or moral) whole in the canon of pure reason can the qualitative whole of pure reason – the whole of understanding in its predications – be determined. That is to say, the architectonic of pure reason is specifically concerned with the transcendental systematicity of the understanding proper in the power of judgement – the systematicity of the transcendental analytic – rather than the critical system as such. This systematicity is enacted primarily in the analytic of principles in the transcendental analytic. In its specific sense, the architectonic of pure reason is the art of making understanding or ordinary cognitions in pure imagination systematic. Kant’s response to Hume’s epistemology lies primarily in the architectonic of pure reason, where the transcendental-speculative systematic unity of the use of the concepts of understanding in imagination and sense is established.317

317 This means that, contrary to many interpretations of Kant, the systematicity of critical philosophy cannot be explained primarily in terms of the architectonic of pure reason. Kant’s use of the term **architectonic** in the transcendental doctrine of method is particularly tied to the systematicity of understanding proper in the
Kant is explicit about the systematic function of the architectonic in subordinating understanding to reason: “Under the government of reason our cognitions cannot at all constitute a rhapsody but must constitute a system, in which alone they can support and advance its essential ends.” The unity of understanding is its subordination to the essential transcendental analytic. Confusion of a general sense of architectonic and specific sense of architectonic in chapter three of the transcendental doctrine of method sometimes takes place through invoking part of the following statement from the transcendental dialectic: “Human reason is by nature architectonic, i.e., it considers all cognitions as belonging to a possible system, and hence it permits only such principles as at least do not render an intended cognition incapable of standing together with others in some system or other” (KrV A474/B502). Most interpreters of Kant quote only the first few words of this statement and ignore that in the passage Kant uses architectonic in a general sense, only to show the impossibility of a system of rational inferences in the antinomies of pure reason whereas the specific sense of architectonic in the transcendental doctrine of method concerns the methodological necessity of a system of understanding. Generally speaking, Kant’s use of the term architectonic in the doctrine of method follows Lambert’s Anlage zur Architektonik, which was written between February to September 1765 but published in 1771. The subject matter of Lambert’s work is an ontology that is discussed from a methodological perspective. Lambert discusses his work with Kant, soon after completing his draft. In a November 13, 1765 letter to Kant, Lambert explains his use of architectonic: “I take ’architectonic’ to include all that is simple and primary in every part of human cognition, not only the principia which are grounds derived from the form, but also the axiomata which must be derived from the matter of knowledge and actually only appear in simple concepts, thinkable in themselves and without self-contradiction, also the postulata which state the universal and necessary possibility of composition and connection of simple concepts. We do not get any material knowledge from form alone, and we shall remain in the realm of the ideal, stuck in mere nomenclature, if we do not look out for that which is primary and thinkable in itself in the matter or objective material of cognition” (Br 10:52). Adopting key elements of Lambert’s use of architectonic, in the second half of 1760s, Kant takes a step further and starts to argue for the necessity of a simple and primary negative grounding of the architectonic itself in order to avoid what later he calls the dialectical inferences of pure reason. From Kant’s perspective, this negative grounding is propaedeutic to the use of the architectonic in Lambert’s project. In his September 2, 1770 letter to Lambert, Kant writes: “The most universal laws of sensibility play a deceptively large role in metaphysics, where, after all, it is merely concepts and principles of pure reason that are at issue. A quite special, though purely negative science, general phenomenology (phaenomologia [sic] generalis), seems to me to be presupposed by metaphysics” (Br 10:98). Kant speaks of the need for a negative science prior to an architectonic account of the physiology of concepts in metaphysics (ontology) as it is done by Lambert. This letter is composed ten days after Kant defends his Inaugural Dissertation where he briefly discusses the question of the method of metaphysics. In the Inaugural Dissertation, we read: “since the method of this science may not be well known at the present time, apart, that is, from the kind of which logic teaches generally to all sciences, and since the method which is suited to the particular character of metaphysics may be wholly unknown, it is no wonder that those who have devoted themselves to this inquiry, seem, hitherto, to have accomplished scarcely anything at all with their endless rolling of their Sisyphean stones. However, although I have neither the intention nor the opportunity of discoursing here on such a distinguished and extensive theme, I shall, nonetheless, briefly outline the things which constitute no despicable part of this method, namely the infection of sensitive cognition by cognition deriving from the understanding, not only in so far as it misleads the unwary in the application of principles, but also in so far as it invents spurious principles themselves in the guise of axioms” (MSI 2:411). In the letter to Lambert, Kant repeats his point on the need for limitations of pure reason’s natural spontaneity in Dreams of a Spirit-seer (1766), and moves from his diagnosis of the illness of metaphysics in the Inaugural Dissertation towards his critical prescription. As it turns out, the “purely negative science” takes the form of a discipline of pure reason in the first Critique. Kant builds the logic of presupposition of this purely negative science into the ordering of chapters in the transcendental doctrine of method.
ends of pure reason. The system of understanding cannot emerge out of haphazard use and generalization of its rules. This system does not properly belong to understanding. Understanding is an object-related faculty, and cannot form the condition of its use as an a priori whole independent of its relation to objects. This whole can be supplied a priori only as an idea of reason: “I understand by a system ... the unity of the manifold of cognitions under one idea” (KrV A832/B861). Pure concepts of understanding can be used – applied to appearances – systematically only if they presuppose a whole of their possible ends. The unity or purpose of the concept (Begriff) ultimately lies in the quintessential whole of pure reason (Inbegriff), i.e., the inner conception of concepts which is presupposed and yet remains concealed in concepts.\(^{318}\)

Even though in an oblique manner, Kant makes this point as early as the opening paragraph of the transcendental analytic:

> Now this completeness of a science cannot reliably be assumed from a rough calculation of an aggregate put together by mere estimates; hence it is possible only by means of an idea of the whole of the a priori cognition of the understanding, and through the division of concepts that such an idea determines and that constitute it, thus only through their connection in a system.... Hence the quintessential whole [Inbegriff] of its cognition will constitute a system that is to be grasped and determined under one idea. (KrV A64-65/B89-90)\(^{319}\)

\(^{318}\) Kant speaks of the intricate or hidden character of this conception or Inbegriff: “Nobody attempts to establish a science without grounding it on an idea. But in its elaboration the schema, indeed even the definition of the science which is given right at the outset, seldom corresponds to the idea; for this lies in reason like a seed, all of whose parts still lie very involuted and are hardly recognizable even under microscopic observation” (KrV A834/B862). This passage proceeds with an advice that guides us as readers of Kant (the founder of the science of critique of pure reason and metaphysics as science): “For this reason, sciences, since they have all been thought out from the viewpoint of a certain general interest, must not be explained and determined in accordance with the description given by their founder, but rather in accordance with the idea, grounded in reason itself, of the natural unity of the parts that have been brought together. For the founder and even his most recent successors often fumble around with an idea that they have not even made distinct to themselves and that therefore cannot determine the special content, the articulation (systematic unity) and boundaries of the science” (KrV A834/B862). Kant’s acknowledgement of the historical limitations of his articulation of critique (the science of pure reason) encourages us to reformulate critical philosophy in a ‘more complete’ form, even though any account of critique inevitably bears the mark of its historical time.

\(^{319}\) Similarly, in Jäsche Logic, Kant writes: “An idea contains the archetype for the use of the understanding, e.g., the idea of the world whole, which idea must necessarily be, not as constitutive principle of the empirical use of the understanding, but as regulative principle for the sake of the thoroughgoing connection of our empirical use of the understanding. Thus it is to be regarded as a necessary basic concept, either for
This idea is

the reason’s concept [Vernunftbegriff] of the form of a whole, insofar as through this the domain of the manifold as well as the position of the parts with respect to each other is determined a priori. The scientific reason’s concept thus contains the end and the form of the whole that is congruent with it. (KrV A832/B861)

Hence, this whole must a priori be built into the understanding as the condition of its use.

The determination of the whole establishes an end immanent to every part, in turn determining internal relation among parts. Rather than an objective unity, the whole is in essence an internal drive for unity that organically orders our cognitions in a system:

The whole is therefore articulated (articulatio) and not heaped together (coacervatio), it can, to be sure, grow internally (per intus susceptionem) but not externally (per appositionem), like an animal body, whose growth does not add a limb but rather makes each limb stronger and fitter for its end without any alteration of proportion. (KrV A833/B861)

Objectively completing the understanding’s actions of subordination or for regarding them as unlimited. — The idea cannot be attained by composition, either, for the whole is prior to the part” (Log 9:92).

The a priority of the whole [Inbegriff] of understanding with regard to its parts, i.e., the architectonic of pure reason, is at the heart of Kant’s theory of concept [Begriff] formation. This is particularly evident in Kant’s conception of abstraction as it is discussed in Jäsche Logic. He writes: “In all sciences, above all in those of reason, the idea of the science is its universal abstract or outline [Abriß oder Umriß], hence the extension of all cognitions that belong to it. Such an idea of the whole – the first thing one has to look to in a science, and which one has to seek – is architectonic” (Log 9:93). Kant follows this discussion with his account of “the form of a concept, as that of a discursive representation” that “is always made” rather than given. He identifies three “logical Actus of the understanding, through which concepts are generated as to their form”: 1. comparison [die Vergleichung] of representations among one another in relation to the unity of consciousness; 2. reflection [die Überlegung] as to how various representations can be conceived in one consciousness; and finally 3. abstraction [die Absonderung] of everything else in which the given representations differ; “To make concepts out of representations one must thus be able to compare, to reflect, and to abstract, for these three logical operations of the understanding are the essential and universal conditions for generation of every concept whatsoever” (Log 9:94). In comparison, we focus on difference among representations. In reflection, we focus on what representations have in common amongst themselves. In abstraction, we separate or tear these common marks from everything else in other representations. Abstraction is a separation or tear [Riß] necessary for the formation of the concept as a whole. There is no formation without such separation, negation, or life-giving violence. In this sense, “abstraction is only the negative condition under which universal representations can be generated, the positive condition is comparison and reflection. For no concept comes to be through abstraction; abstraction only perfects it and encloses it in its determinate limits” (Log 9:95). In other words, the systematic idea of a whole – the idea of a systematic form – belongs in essence to the abstracting (negative) nature of methodological reason. In concept formation, understanding reenacts the negativity of the discipline of pure reason in relation to objects. Every concept, a mark of human finitude, owes itself to an original negation, a primordial loss of the thing, which necessitates the genetic conception of a concept. Contrary to most interpretations of Kant’s account of concept formation, the negative origin of the abstracting operation is reason rather than the power of judgement or understanding proper. The exclusion of the negative contribution of reason in concept formation reduces critical philosophy to a philosophy of reflection in the power of judgement, and fails to appreciate the negative-speculative ground of
After a brief explanation of the transcendental methodological origin of the systematicity of understanding, Kant discusses how the architectonic unity of reason, the idea of the qualitative whole (of essential ends) of pure reason operates in understanding: “For its execution the idea needs a schema, i.e., an essential manifoldness and order of the parts determined a priori from the principle of the end” (KrV A833/B861).\(^{321}\) Given that pure reason does not directly relate to objects, the transcendental schema functions as the medium through which the idea of reason (the architectonic unity of reason) is enacted in the world. Kant distinguishes two kinds of schema – the technical and the architectonic – in terms of their respective – empirical and rational – origins.\(^{322}\) The technical schema takes shape in order to deal with empirical needs, i.e., “arbitrary external ends.” The architectonic schema “arises only in consequence of an idea (where reason provides the ends a priori and does not await them empirically).” It derives from “a single supreme and inner end, which first makes possible the whole,” i.e., the transcendental methodological ground of philosophy or metaphysics proper as science of understanding (KrV A833/B861).\(^{323}\)

---

\(^{321}\) The idea of the qualitative whole (of essential ends) of reason is the idea of world as the whole of predicates of our theoretical judgements in cognizing things. Kant speaks of this whole in terms of essential ends of reason since these ends are universal means and "necessarily interest everyone" (KrV A839/B867).

\(^{322}\) As their common etymology indicates, the technical and the architectonic are two forms of tekhné. They are both means of protection, one empirical (particular) and the other transcendental (universal). The categories are universal means of reason. They are necessary for protection but similar to any other means they can be projected too far, beyond their proper use, and thus undermine pure reason’s self-preservation.

\(^{323}\) For an example of an interpretation of the first Critique which misses the central role of the architectonic of pure reason as the systematic condition of the operation of the understanding in the transcendental analytic, see Goldman (2012). Goldman promises to “investigate the underlying methodology of Kantian critique” (p. 1), but neglects the primary place where Kant discusses the critical method: the transcendental doctrine of method. Goldman’s last chapter, “Transcendental method: the orientation of critique,” contains almost no discussion of the transcendental doctrine of method. He looks for the method of critique primarily in the “account of transcendental reflection in the appendix to the Transcendental Analytic of the first Critique” where Kant supposedly “announces the regulative foundation of the entire critical project” (p. 185).
architectonic schema rationally enfold what can be potentially empirically unfolded in cognitions of understanding; the “schema contains the outline (monogramma) and the division of the whole into members in conformity with the idea, i.e., a priori” (KrV A833/B862).

Kant acknowledges that, despite the transcendental-systematic priority of the architectonic unity of reason, we discover it only retrospectively. We should not, however, confuse the natural (empirical) order of the discovery of the architectonic of pure reason with the denaturalized (transcendental) order of grounding (rational origination). The

Contrary to what Goldman argues, the key to the analysis of cognitive faculties lies in the transcendental doctrine of method, where the whole of pure reason is generated in the discipline of pure reason and the systematic conditions of the use of faculties of reason are established in the canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason. Ignoring Kant’s crucial methodological insights in the transcendental doctrine of method, this interpretation reduces the critical method of pure reason to a putative “regulative role of the psychological idea.” The organic formative function of the discipline of pure reason is prior to any, including regulative, uses of reason. Strictly speaking, regulative functions in critical philosophy presuppose the possibility of relation to objects whereas the critical method is primarily concerned with pure reason’s modal-aposi-
ductive self-relation or self-positing. Moreover, at no point, does Kant speak of a regulative function of the psychological idea. Kant outlines the systematic function of metaphysical ideas in the canon of pure reason.

Although Kant does not make it explicit, the architectonic schema determines the systematic ground of the analytic of principles. In the chapter on schematism, Kant discusses the transcendental schema as “a third thing,” “mediating representation” (KrV A138/B177), or “monogram of pure a priori imagination” (KrV A142/B181) in terms of which the categories can be applied to sensible intuition. The transcendental schema contains all possible ends that such application might pursue. Kant writes: “The schema is in itself always only a product of the imagination; but since the synthesis of the latter has as its aim no individual intuition but rather only the unity in the determination of sensibility, the schema is to be distinguished from an image” (KrV A140/B179). The transcendental schema of categories is one and the same since it originates from the architectonic (idea) of pure reason, although in being applied to appearance it takes twelve distinct forms. While we can know the rational origin of the schema, Kant maintains, it remains inexplicable why the schema takes twelve forms. For Kant, the transcendental schematism of understanding in pure imagination is “a hidden art in the depths of the human soul, whose true operations we can divine from nature and lay unveiled before our eyes only with difficulty” (KrV A141/B180-1). In his discussion of transcendental schematism, Kant outlines how the architectonic schema functions as the pure image of the categories. The worldliness of human reason is determined in terms of its temporal (worldly) analogues in pure imagination, as schematized categories of the understanding. Kant writes: “The schemata are therefore nothing but a priori time-determinations in accordance with rules ... the time-series, the content of time, and order of time, and finally, the whole of time [Zeitbegriff] in regard to all possible objects.” In a sentence, Kant explains the “schema of necessity”: “the existence of an object at all times” (KrV A145-6/B184-5). The whole of time in regard to possible objects is a temporal analogue of the absolute positing of the possible existence of object in the discipline of pure reason. Heidegger [1973] (1997a) tries to locate the original unity of critique in his own account of Zeitbegriff, emphasizing its generative (temporalizing) nature. He, nevertheless, does not appreciate that Zeitbegriff is the correlate or analogue of the whole (Inbegriff, discipline, or apodictic modality) of pure reason in sensibility (pure imagination). For Kant, the apodictic modality of pure reason, the origin of critique, is neither ontical nor ontological.
transcendental retrospection of pure reason, Kant argues, arises from the nature of pure reason:

It is too bad that it is first possible for us to glimpse the idea in a clearer light and to outline a whole architectonically, in accordance with the ends of reason, only after we have long collected relevant cognitions haphazardly like building materials and worked through them technically with only a hint from an idea lying hidden within us. The systems seem to have been formed, like maggots, by a *generatio aequivoca* from the mere confluence of aggregated concepts, garbled at first but complete in time, although they all had their schema, as the original seed, in the mere self-development of reason, and on that account are not merely each articulated for themselves in accordance with an idea but are rather all in turn purposively united with each other as members of a whole in a system of human cognition, and allow an architectonic to all human knowledge. (KrV A834-5/B862-3)\(^{325}\)

Kant also suggests that the self-development of reason, which unfolds in history, should not lead us to mistake “the *architectonic* of all cognition from *pure reason,*” the rational origin of the science of metaphysics, with a historical origin. Historical cognition is “*cognitio ex datis,* rational cognition, however, *cognitio ex principiis.*” Historical learning does not amount to a cognition that originates from pure reason since “the faculty of imitation is not that of generation” (KrV A836/B864). Rational cognition from principles requires generating the schematic systematic ground (whole) of cognition.

After isolating the rational origin of cognition in the architectonic of pure reason from empirical and historical ones, Kant makes a further distinction to demarcate the architectonic as the idea of science of philosophy or metaphysics proper.\(^{326}\) Not all rational

---

325 Despite the significance of this passage for an account of the architectonic of human knowledge, it is crucial to notice that the architectonic of pure reason alone cannot account for the systematicity of the first *Critique* or critical philosophy as such. The reduction of the the transcendental doctrine of method to the canon of pure reason or the architectonic of pure reason, which takes place in many interpretations of the second or first *Critique,* ignores the crucial role of the discipline of pure reason, which is presupposed by the canon and the architectonic of pure reason. The essence of critique is the transcendental negativity that also takes the positive form in the canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason. Without this disciplinary negativity, critique becomes a doctrine.

326 Kant’s distinction between the rational and the empirical as well as that between the rational and the historical are discussed in more detail in *Jäsche Logic* where he divides cognitions in terms of “their *objective*...
cognitions are philosophical. Unlike mathematics, philosophy cannot be immediately verified in intuition. In other words, “only mathematics can be learned, never philosophy (except historically); rather, as far as reason is concerned, we can at best only learn to philosophize” (KrV A837/B865). Philosophy is “the archetype for the assessment [Beurteilung] of all attempts to philosophize,” that is,

> a mere idea of a possible science, which is nowhere given in concreto, but which one seeks to approach in various ways until the only footpath, much overgrown by sensibility, and the hitherto unsuccessful ectype, so far as it has been granted to humans, is made equal to the archetype. (KrV A838/B866)

The architectonic is the idea or whole of philosophy – the theoretical use of reason – as a possible science. Given the impossibility of the complete correspondence of the ectype to the archetype, a historical version of philosophy to the ideal of philosophy, one can only learn to philosophize, i.e., to exercise the talent of reason in prosecuting its general principles in certain experiments that come to hand, but always with the reservation of the right of reason to investigate the sources of these principles themselves and to confirm or reject them. (KrV A838/B866)

Philosophy or metaphysics is concerned with the logic of truth. But since judgements of metaphysics are not immediately certain, their ground always needs to be attended to, and assessed in terms of the idea of philosophy as a science or the architectonic of pure reason.

### 3.2.2 Worldly concept of philosophy vs. scholastic concept of philosophy

Having outlined the idea of philosophy or metaphysics proper as a science, Kant is now in a position to distinguish his transcendental conception of philosophy from a merely logical one that has been dominant in the philosophical tradition:
Until now, however, the concept of philosophy has been only a scholastic concept [Schulbegriff], namely that of a system of cognition that is sought only as a science without having as its end anything more than the systematic unity of this knowledge, thus the logical perfection of cognition. But there is also a worldly concept (conceptus cosmicus) [Weltbegriff] that has always grounded this term, especially when it is, as it were, personified and represented as an archetype in the ideal of the philosopher. From this point of view philosophy is the science of the relation of all cognition to essential ends of human reason (teleogia rationis humanae), and the philosopher is not an artist of reason but the legislator of human reason. It would be very boastful to call oneself a philosopher in this sense and to pretend to have equalled the archetype, which lies only in the idea. (A838-9/B866-7)\textsuperscript{327}

Kant’s distinction between scholastic and worldly concepts of philosophy opposes two kinds of perfection of cognition: merely logical and transcendental. In contrast to the scholastic concept of philosophy, which is substantively empty, the worldly concept of philosophy operates on the teleology of human reason, that is, the movement of human reason to pursue its ends in relation to sensible objects in the world.

To clarify this distinction further, Kant contrasts the archetype of the philosopher with archetypes of the logician, mathematician, and naturalist. These “artists of reason” focus on a particular use of reason – merely logical, pure intuitive, or empirical – without insight into the systematic condition of such use. But the philosopher – the legislator of reason – is “a teacher in the ideal, who controls all of these and uses them as tools to advance the essential ends of human reason.” The philosopher is not confined to a particular activity of human reason but is concerned with human reason as such: “the idea of his legislation is found in every human reason” (KrV A839/B867). Mathematics, natural sciences and empirical knowledge “have a high value as means, for the most part to

\footnote{327 Unlike English translations of the first Critique, I do not use cosmopolitan concept as an equivalent for Weltbegriff. Worldly concept more effectively communicates the object-relatedness and temporal nature of the worldliness of reason (through understanding). The worldly concept of philosophy is the systematic ground of natural sciences that are self-explanatory, with no other-worldly dependence. In other words, the worldliness of reason through understanding is the publicness or universality of the categories as means of reason.}
contingent” ends. But they can contribute to “necessary and essential ends of humanity ... only through the mediation of rational cognition from mere concepts, which, call it what you will, is really nothing but metaphysics” (KrV A850/B878). In this way, metaphysics is “the culmination of all culture of human reason” as it grounds “even the possibility of some sciences and the use of all of them” (KrV A850-1/B878-9). Metaphysics, Kant argues, must be a science in order to prevent “the devastations that a lawless speculative reason would otherwise inevitably perpetuate in both morality and religion”; in this way, metaphysics “must always remain the bulwark of religion” (KrV A849/B877), a universal means to defend morality and religion and pursue final ends of pure reason in the world.

The significance of metaphysics or worldly concept of philosophy as a science of universal means of human reason is due to its power to “prescribe for systematic unity from the standpoint of ends” (KrV A839/B867). Kant explains this point further in a footnote: “A worldly concept here means one that concerns that which necessarily interests everyone; hence I determine the aim of a science in accordance with scholastic concepts if it is regarded only as one of the skills for certain arbitrary ends” (KrV A839/B867). In contrast to the arbitrary multiplicity of techniques in scholastic philosophies, the oneness of a worldly concept of philosophy lies in the architectonic nature of human reason as systematic in relation to the world. The technical emerges from the empirical dimension of human life whereas the architectonic arises from the systematic need of human reason to pursue its final ends in the world. In this way, the systematicity of reason in relation to the world is of general concern to human reason as such and thus to all human beings.

The systematicity of reason in relation to the world can be enacted in pursuit of what Kant calls “essential ends [Wesentliche Zwecke]” of pure reason, i.e., ends that are
fundamental to the working of human reason in the world. These ends “are on this account not yet the highest, of which (in the complete systematic unity of reason) there can be only a single one. Hence they are either the final end, or sub-alternate ends, which necessarily belong to the former as means” (KrV A840/B868). Essential ends of pure reason are ends that are organic to the categories, that is, universal means for the systematic cognition of the world and thus advancing morality and religion. As Kant puts it in Jäsche Logic, the worldly concept of philosophy, which contains all essential ends of reason, has to do with “a science of the highest maxim for the use of our reason” in the world (Log 9:24).

Now that Kant has defined philosophy as the universal legislation of human reason, Kant distinguishes two objects of this legislation: nature and freedom. Hence, metaphysics is divided into metaphysics of nature and metaphysics of morals. Although Kant acknowledges that “this name [metaphysics] can also be given to all of pure philosophy including the critique” (KrV A841/B869), he keeps the term metaphysics for metaphysics of nature: “The metaphysics of speculative reason is that which has customarily been called metaphysics in the narrower sense” (KrV A842/B870). This is the sense of metaphysics that the architectonic of pure reason grounds.

3.2.3 Metaphysics and its divisions

Kant’s last step in grounding or systematic determination of metaphysics as science is to determine its internal divisions. This internal determination, Kant argues, has not been done properly since hitherto attempts have not been based on a clear view of the whole (origin) of metaphysics. Kant writes: “It is of the utmost importance to isolate cognitions that differ from one another in their species and origin, and carefully to avoid mixing them together with others with which they are usually connected in their use.” The method of
isolation is particularly necessary for philosophy as “a special kind of cognition” that has advantage “over the aimless use of the understanding” (KrV A841/B870).

Kant points to two major approaches that have failed to determine metaphysics and its bounds: the first defines metaphysics only in terms of the level of generality; the second obliterates the distinction between metaphysical and mathematical species of rational cognition. Even though Kant is not explicit, these two approaches seem to refer respectively to Aristotle and Wolff. Kant argues that in the first approach metaphysics “could not be clearly differentiated from empirical cognition: for even among empirical principles some are more general and therefore higher than others.” Therefore, “the mere degree of subordination (the particular under the universal) cannot determine any boundaries for a science.” To view metaphysics only in terms of “a rank in regard to generality” inevitably includes empirical principles in metaphysics, and undermines its unity and internal divisions. The second approach identifies metaphysics with mathematics since they both have a priori origin in reason. But this approach, Kant maintains, ignores that metaphysics is a necessary cognition from concepts rather than an arbitrary construction of concepts in intuition (KrV A843/B871). Using mathematical cognitions as a model for all rational cognitions overlooks the necessary character of relation to sensible objects in metaphysical cognitions.

After his brief discussion of the failure of two major attempts in the history of philosophy to determine metaphysics and its bounds, Kant outlines the internal division of metaphysics. This division is done in a manner to include and ground most components of Wolff’s systematic philosophy, which Kant considers to be the most developed form of a scholastic concept of philosophy. The components are those stemming from the idea of
metaphysics and enjoy a merely logical systematicity. Kant starts to outline the internal division of metaphysics in this way:

Metaphysics in this narrower sense consists of *transcendental philosophy* and the *physiology* of pure reason. The former considers only the *understanding* and reason itself in a system of all concepts and principles that are related to objects in general, without assuming objects that would be given (*Ontologia*); the latter considers *nature*, i.e., the quintessential whole [*Inbegriff*] of given objects (whether they are given by the senses or, if one will, by another kind of intuition), and is therefore *physiology* (though only *rationalis*). (KrV A845/B873)

According to Kant, metaphysics consists of a transcendental-methodological part and an object-related part. The transcendental-methodological part of metaphysics is in the original idea of metaphysics, although Kant views his transcendental philosophy as the most decisive step to articulate it. From Kant’s perspective, the history of philosophy has largely concerned itself with the second component of metaphysics, i.e., the physiology of pure reason which “considers nature, i.e., the quintessential whole of given objects.” The idea of nature as the whole of given objects, however, can be understood in two major ways, and hence the two uses of reason in relation to nature. If nature is understood in terms of sensible intuition, we will have “*immanent*” physiology that deals with “nature so far as its cognition can be applied in experience (*in concreto*)” (KrV A845/B873). If nature is taken in terms of “another kind of intuition” (intellectual intuition), there will be a “*transcendent*” physiology that pertains to “the connection of the objects of experience which surpasses all experience” (KrV A845/B873).

Kant outlines how, in the absence of an elaborate methodological grounding of uses of reason, the three dialectical sciences of reason – rational psychology, rational cosmology, and rational theology – emerge out of immanent (physical) and transcendent (hyperphysical) physiologies of reason in the idea of metaphysics. Immanent physiology,
which considers the whole of objects of the sense “as it is given to us” and “in accordance with a priori conditions” is the source of rational psychology: nature as the whole of objects of the sense can be the object of outer sense or the object of inner sense (the soul), that is “corporeal nature” and “thinking nature.” The metaphysics of corporeal nature is “rational physics” and that the metaphysics of thinking nature is called rational psychology (KrV A846/B874). Rational cosmology and rational theology also arise from the division of transcendental physiology in terms of its inner and outer connection to its object. Rational cosmology is the (inner transcendent) “physiology of nature in its entirety, i.e., the transcendental cognition of the world.” Rational theology, Kant remarks, is the (outer transcendent) physiology of nature: physiology of “the connection of nature in its entirety to a being beyond nature, i.e., the transcendental cognition of God” (KrV A846/B874).

Kant sums up his outline of the internal division of metaphysics in this way:

Accordingly, the entire system of metaphysics consists of four main parts. 1. Ontology. 2. Rational Physiology. 3. Rational Cosmology. 4. Rational Theology. The second part, namely the doctrine of nature of pure reason, contains two divisions, *physica rationalis* and *psychologia rationalis* (KrV A847/B875).328

---

328 Here Kant includes Baumgarten’s classification in his own. Baumgarten distinguishes between general metaphysics – the science of being as being – and special metaphysics – which is directed at supersensible beings: psychology, cosmology, and theology. Baumgarten’s *Metaphysics* consists of four parts: Ontology, cosmology, psychology, and theology. See Baumgarten [1739] (2009), pp. 87-8. In his Nachlass, Kant defines transcendental philosophy (in its strict sense) or ontology in this way: "A science of things in general actually abstracts from all differences and determinations of things as objects, and thus deals merely with pure reason: *transcendental philosophy*" (Refl 18:100). It is essential to appreciate that Kant does not suggest that all parts of the division can be realized in a non-dialectical way. Ontology and rational physics can be science. But, despite their merely logical systematicity, rational psychology, rational cosmology, and rational theology – as Kant has already shown in the transcendental logic – cannot be science. For Kant, a complete determination of metaphysics in its bounds should account for the systematic errors arising from the idea of metaphysics. The inclusion of the systematic grounds of these errors, however, does not mean that they have the same status as error-free parts of the system. This point is not appreciated in many readings of Kant’s internal division of metaphysics in the above passage. E.g., In their editorial footnote to this passage, Guyer and Wood write: “Here Kant is subsuming rational physics and rational psychology under the general title of rational physiology, suggesting that there are constructive doctrines of rational physics and psychology, expounding the a priori conditions of empirical judgements in physics and psychology, that can replace the merely dialectical transcendent doctrines of rational cosmology and rational psychology (as well as rational theology) which he has already rejected in the ‘Dialectic.’ However, although Kant was to go on to produce his ‘rational physics’ in the *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science* of 1786, there he would deny that any
This internal division, Kant maintains, is prescribed by "the original idea of a philosophy of pure reason itself"; it is "architectonic, in conformity with its [reason's] essential ends." Kant concludes his discussion of the architectonic of pure reason by referring to two challenges in the history of philosophy that might "weaken the conviction of its [the division's] lawfulness" (KrV A847/B875). Although Kant is not explicit, he rejects these two challenges, i.e., the argument for the impossibility of a rational physiology and the argument for including empirical psychology as part of metaphysics. For Kant, rational physiology is possible in its immanent sense and empirical psychology has no ground in the idea of metaphysics and therefore should be excluded from it.

As it stands, Kant’s chapter on the architectonic of pure reason maps out the systematic condition (whole) of the theoretical use of reason, or metaphysics of nature as science. Despite this crucial step to make metaphysics science, critical philosophy is not yet completely transcendentally systematic. The pursuit of the final ends of pure reason through its essential ends or universal means can be systematic only if it takes a concrete form in individual ends of pure reason. The realization of final ends of pure reason in sensible terms requires an organic structure or idea of reason that functions as the whole of individual ends of pure reason. The history of pure reason is the formal or

---

rational psychology (Seelenwissenschaft) at all is possible, on the ground that inner sense, unlike outer sense, does not yield to mathematization, and thus there can be no genuine science of inner sense (see 4:471)” see p. 756, fn. 47 in the Cambridge edition of Critique of Pure Reason. This reading ignores that at no point does Kant entertain the possibility of rational psychology as a legitimate science. Neither does he intend to replace rational psychology, rational cosmology, and rational theology. Kant only incorporates the systematic division of a scholastic concept of philosophy into his systematic division of a worldly concept of philosophy. This inclusion only reveals the crucial significance of the discipline of pure reason prior to the architectonic of pure reason. From Kant's standpoint, Wolff's system of metaphysics already contains many systematic (architectonic) elements, as it is built according to the categories. And yet it is incapable of making metaphysics a science. Metaphysics becomes science only if critique (discipline) precedes the architectonic. It is only through this discipline that the whole of pure reason is formed and the place of each part – including internal dialectical elements – can be organically determined. For Kant's view on the inadequacy of “the discipline of the scholastic method” and the need for the discipline of the critical method of pure reason see (WDO 8:138).
transcendental-systematic condition of the embodiment of final ends of pure reason in time and space.

3.3 From the schema to the concrete image of a sensible world

The last chapter of the transcendental doctrine of method, “the history of pure reason,” is the shortest in the first Critique. Kant begins the chapter by acknowledging that “[t]his title stands here only to designate a place that is left open in the system and must be filled in the future” (KrV A852/B880).329 Although Kant does not even minimally work out the history of pure reason as a formal condition of a complete system of pure reason, we should not lose sight of the fact that he finds it systematically necessary not to exclude the chapter from the transcendental doctrine of method. The history of pure reason concludes not only the transcendental doctrine of method but also the first Critique as a whole. The reader, however, remains in the dark about what systematically necessitates the inclusion of the history of pure reason in the doctrine of method, and how this open place is supposed to be filled in the future. Does Kant leave this place open in the system merely because he rushes to finish the first Critique, or is there an underlying systematic reason that necessitates the open ending of the system? Is it simply haphazard that Critique of Pure Reason culminates in the history of pure reason, or does such ending enact reason’s self-consciousness and reveal the retrospective structure of critique as reason’s never-ending endeavour to catch

---

329 Most readings of the first Critique ignore the chapter on the history of pure reason. Even the few that engage with it overlook Kant’s crucial opening sentence. They do not ask how, as Kant unequivocally states in the introduction to the doctrine of method, the history of pure reason is a formal condition of a complete system of pure reason. Thus, the chapter on the history of pure reason is taken to be mainly, if not only, a brief empirical history of the development of major philosophical schools. E.g., see Heimsoeth (1971), pp. 821-828. Yovel’s book is among the few devoted to Kant’s philosophy of history. Yet, Yovel discusses the history of pure reason mainly through the canon of pure reason. He blurs the distinction between the canon of pure reason and the history of pure reason as special systematic functions of pure reason. See Yovel (1980). Contrary to Yovel’s account, the history of pure reason does not belong to the universal logic of reason in the canon of pure reason.
up with its own natural spontaneity and, as Kant writes in the last sentence of the book, attain “full satisfaction” (KrV A855/B883)? Is the history of pure reason the structure by which reason becomes consciousness of its natural history (from a de-naturalized standpoint)?

The evidence available in Kant’s correspondence and Nachlass suggests that the history of pure reason is incorporated into the structure of Critique of Pure Reason several years after Kant develops the first versions of its plan. Kant’s correspondence in 1774 indicates his intention to publish a work titled Critique of Pure Reason (Br 10:165 & 10:213). Prior to 1774, Kant uses other titles to refer to his future book. From a good number of notes, written between 1774 and 1776, we can infer that, in this period, Kant divides Critique of Pure Reason into two parts: analytic and dialectic. There is no evidence that at this point Kant gives a place to the transcendental aesthetic and the doctrine of method in the structure of Critique. Kant seems to start developing his thoughts about the doctrine of method and its internal divisions after this period, between 1776 and 1778 (Refl 18:52). In his November 24, 1776 letter to Herz, Kant writes:

What we need in order to indicate the divisions, limits, and the whole content of that field [of pure reason], according to secure principles, and to lay the road marks so that in the future one can know for sure whether one stands on the floor of true reason or on that of sophistry – for this we need a critique, a discipline, a canon, and an architectonic of pure reason, a formal science, therefore, that can require nothing of those sciences already at hand and that needs for its foundations an entirely unique technical vocabulary. (Br 10:199)

As this passage and notes in Kant’s Nachlass indicate, the history of pure reason is not part of Kant’s plan for the doctrine of method even in the last few years of the 1770s.

---

330 Many notes in this period contain Kant’s division of Critique into analytic and dialectic, without indicating an aesthetic or a doctrine of method. E.g., see (Refl 18:22, 18:31, 18:32, 18:33, 18:39, 18:57, 18:82, 18:83).

331 See also the following notes that do not include the history of pure reason (Refl 18:11 and 18:70).
Despite the absence of the history of pure reason in Kant’s original versions of the plan for the transcendental doctrine of method, its late inclusion should not be treated as a haphazard addition of a merely empirical history of philosophical schools. While conceding the difficulty and inaccessibility of his text, Kant insists on the organic systematicity of *Critique of Pure Reason* and the need to appreciate its organic necessity in each and every part:

But pure reason is such an isolated domain, within itself so thoroughly connected, that no part of it can be encroached upon without disturbing all the rest, nor adjusted without having previously determined for each part its place and its influence on the others; for, since there is nothing outside of it that could correct our judgement within it, the validity and use of each part depends on the relation in which it stands to the others within reason itself, and, as with the structure of an organized body, the purpose of any member can be derived only from the complete concept of the whole. That is why it can be said of such a critique, that it is never trustworthy unless it is *entirely complete* down to the least elements of pure reason, and that in the domain of this faculty one must determine and settle either *all or nothing.* (Prol 4:263)

It is in this spirit that we should approach the history of pure reason in the doctrine of method. Even if one takes Kant’s strong statement on the organic systematicity of *Critique* to be an exaggeration, we need to take such exaggeration seriously in order to appreciate what Kant considers to be at stake in the organic systematicity of critical philosophy. What philosophical need motivates such exaggeration? Analysis of the systematic function of the history of pure reason should take its lead from Kant’s plan in the introduction to the doctrine of method, where he presents the history of pure reason as one of “the formal conditions of a complete system of pure reason” (KrV A708/B736). We should ask: in what sense does Kant view the history of pure reason as a formal condition of a complete system of reason? How can the transcendental-speculative closure of the system of reason in the history of pure reason be simultaneously an open ending that must be filled in the future?
To be sure, Kant writes the transcendental doctrine of method hastily. This is particularly true of the chapter on the history of pure reason, which might partly explain the brevity of Kant’s discussion of the history of pure reason.\footnote{It is not possible to be certain about why Kant does not develop the chapter on the history of pure reason in detail. At least three major reasons seem to contribute to its brevity: 1) Kant writes the first \textit{Critique} hastily, in part due to the lateness of critique in his philosophical life. 2) The focus of the first \textit{Critique} on the object-related character of understanding seems to overshadow the transcendental doctrine of method in general and the history of pure reason in particular. After all, the history of pure reason does not properly belong to either universal logic or the transcendental logic of reason. 3) Despite Kant’s emphasis on the significance of the history of pure reason as a formal condition of a complete system of metaphysical cognitions, he does not seem to have a worked-out view of this title. The first \textit{Critique} attempts an account of the individuation or specification of objects without introducing the reflecting power of judgement.} However, there is a sense in which deferral is structural to the history of pure reason. The transcendental systematicity of pure reason requires the history of pure reason to remain an open place in the system and to be constantly filled in the future. The openness or deferral to the future is indispensable for the systematicity of pure reason as the retrospective appropriation of the past. The deferral, which is a form of the generative gap in the structure of critical reason, is the necessary opening for constant critical-methodological self-enactment of pure reason in concrete terms. There can be no history without such deferral, which is the gap between natural givenness and its critical self-givenness. In other words, the original loss of supersensible objects for pure reason necessitates the history of pure reason as the redemptive structure through which pure reason can mourn or remember its original loss and redeem itself \textit{infinitely temporarily}. Memory/history arises as an awareness of, and as a temporal way of coping with, the original loss of supersensible objects. In its most general sense, mourning or remembering involves accepting the incomprehension of the loss and leaving a place for it in one’s life in order for one to return to it recurrently. It is primarily in this sense that Kant designates the history of pure reason as “a place that is left open in the system” and which “must be filled in the future.” It is as the interiorization of a place of
infinite mourning or constant retrospective appropriation that the history of pure reason can function as a formal condition of a system of pure reason. The interiorization of infinite mourning is the transcendental-speculative temporalization of the apodictic modality of pure reason in pure imagination, and provides the systematic ground for organizing what may be given in sense. The temporalization enables the unfolding of reason’s transcendental-speculative purposiveness in empirical forms, as specific purposes. In other words, determinations of reason can be embodied and take concrete forms only as parts of a whole that delimits all possible sensible content of reason within pure imagination. The concrete embodiment of sensation as things is the analogous re-enactment of concrete images (ideal embodiments) in sense. The history of pure reason is the transcendental-speculative whole that grounds such re-enactment in relation to the possible content that can be given in time. There is a quasi-monadic structure at work between the history of pure reason as the transcendental-speculative harmony of determinate things and the concrete determination of things within this harmony. The givenness of objects in the transcendental aesthetic presupposes the imaginative self-givenness or transcendental-speculative self-enactment of reason in the history of pure reason.

---

333 This characterization indicates the relation between Heidegger’s phenomenological interpretation of the first Critique and Kant’s methodological grounding of temporality. For Heidegger, care is the being of Dasein and the primordial meaning of care is temporality. Heidegger grounds temporality through what he calls “a still more primordial temporalization of temporality.” Hence the repetition of the fundamental analysis of Dasein in the second division of Being and Time so as to arrive at an existential mode of temporality distinct from its “vulgar” mode. Although Heidegger does not make the question of modality in critical philosophy thematic, his attempt to develop an existential notion of temporality aims to appropriate key elements of Kant’s conception of the apodictic modality of pure reason. See Heidegger [1927] (1996), p. 217 and p. 371. By contrast, Kant grounds the object-related time of the transcendental aesthetic in the history of pure reason, which is the temporal analogue of pure reason’s apodictic modality. Transcendental historicity is the temporal form of the apodictic modality of pure reason. Systematically speaking, temporality derives from the apodictic modality of pure reason. Chapter four discusses the apodictic modality of pure reason as the apodictic modality or absolute positing of possible existence. Heidegger unsuccessfully attempts to appropriate Kant’s conception of absolute positing as primordial temporalization, ignoring the modal-apodictic nature of the absolute positing or transcendental necessitation of possible existence.
As discussed so far, the discipline of pure reason forms the modal-apodictic whole of pure reason, determining the boundaries of pure reason. The canon and architectonic of pure reason determine the systematic conditions of reason's practical and theoretical use (the whole of possible relations and the whole of possible qualities), respectively grounding the transcendental dialectic and transcendental analytic. With the systematic grounding of practical and theoretical uses of reason in the canon and architectonic of pure reason, the only other object-related use of reason that needs to be systematically grounded is that in empirical intuition, i.e., the use of reason for specification or individuation of objects and formation of empirical concepts. Although at the time of the publication of the first Critique Kant has not developed an account of the reflecting use of reason in the power of judgement, he appreciates the systematic need for an open place to render metaphysics proper in empirical terms, that is, to make metaphysical cognitions of objects completely systematic. At several points, Kant unequivocally argues against inclusion of empirical, psychological, or anthropological elements in metaphysics, and yet he appreciates that metaphysics proper – “a system of a priori cognitions from concepts alone” (MS 6:216) or the logic of necessary relation to objects – can be completely systematic only if it is transcendentally-systematically attachable to the empirical content of objects.\footnote{For Kant’s case against Wolffian inclusion of psychology and anthropology in metaphysics, see (KrV B viii).} In other words, at the end of the architectonic of pure reason, metaphysics proper – as a system of pure concepts – is schematically systematic and yet it needs a supplementation to connect to and make empirical intuitions systematic. Without this systematic supplementation, metaphysics cannot take an embodied form and as a result the systematic condition for realization of the final ends of pure reason cannot be
completely established. This supplementation, however, cannot be a part of metaphysics proper. Such inclusion corrupts the purity of metaphysics. As a systematic condition, the history of pure reason enables the supplementation and grounds its contingent relation to objects, without violating the purity of metaphysics proper. It functions as the systematic condition or the a priori structure of attachability in terms of which theoretical and practical reason can be unified in a completely determinate manner, i.e., attached in embodied form in empirical intuition. This thoroughgoing determination of pure reason in empirical intuition requires a subjective or methodological ground that belongs to pure reason, i.e., a whole or structure that belongs to the method of pure reason and enables the spontaneous formation of contingent empirical material in an organic manner. The history of pure reason or the transcendental historicity is that whole or structure by which reason can infinitely reshape its empirical content in time and space, and realize the final ends of pure reason.

The history of pure reason is the systematic supplementation, a temporalized analogue of the discipline of pure reason in pure imagination, that systematically grounds and completely determines the material content of reason, i.e., the past or what is naturally

---

335 Kant explains the systematic necessity of this moment in his preface to the third Critique: “A critique of pure reason, i.e., of our faculty of judging in accordance with a priori principles, would be incomplete if the power of judgement, which also claims to be a faculty of cognition, were not dealt with as a special part of it, even though its principles may not constitute a special part of a system of pure philosophy, between the theoretical and the practical part, but can occasionally be annexed to either of them in case of need. For if such a system, under the general name of metaphysics, is ever to come into being (the complete production of which is entirely possible and highly important for the use of reason in all respects), then the critique must previously have probed the ground for this structure down to the depth of the first foundations of the faculty of principles independent of experience, so that it should not sink in any part, which would inevitably lead to the collapse of the whole” (KU 5:168).

336 In Jäsche Logic, Kant shows that cognitions of pure reason can be divided in terms of their objective and subjective origins. In objective terms, cognitions are “either rational or empirical.” In subjective terms, cognitions are “either rational or historical” (Log 9:22). In the first case, the term rational refers to the understanding proper. In the second case, the term rational refers to reason in its methodological sense.
given.\textsuperscript{337} From a methodological standpoint, the material content can be taken in two senses: reason's natural spontaneity and empirical intuition. The history of pure reason is the systematic condition that grounds the material content in both senses: first, the history of pure reason is the structure of reason's historical self-consciousness; second, the history of pure reason is the whole of individual ends of reason, i.e., the systematic condition for the reflecting use of reason, i.e., the quantification of judgements of metaphysics.

3.3.1 The history of pure reason: the transcendental condition of pure reason's historical self-consciousness

Leaving an account of the history of pure reason as a formal (transcendental) condition of a complete system of pure reason for later, Kant devotes his three-page chapter to “casting a cursory glance from a merely transcendental point of view, namely that of the nature of pure reason, on the whole of its labours hitherto, which presents to my view edifices, to be sure, but only in ruins” (KrV A852/B880). Although Kant does not directly discuss the history of pure reason as a formal condition of a complete system of reason, this passage implies such conception. Kant’s characterization of previous philosophy as ruins does not mean to be a dismissive and disparaging remark about previous philosophers. From a critical standpoint, the ruination of previous philosophy is a condition of philosophizing. The constant play of ruination and formation is how philosophy lives. Philosophizing is the

\textsuperscript{337} As the transcendental-speculative retrospection of pure reason, the discipline of pure reason contains an immanent sense of temporality which Kant formulates as the history of pure reason. In other words, the discipline of pure reason is a determination of the rhythm or pulse of pure reason which serves its self-preservation. The canon of pure reason determines the final end of pure reason. The architectonic of pure reason introduces the universal means (essential ends) of pure reason. The history of pure reason expresses the rhythm of the discipline of pure reason in terms of contingent relation to objects in the world. It functions as the ground for empirical means (skills). Skills and techniques are objectified empirical forms of the rhythm of the discipline of pure reason. They tend to conceal their temporality and modality. The history of pure reason is the universal path to realize final ends of pure reason. This does not necessarily mean a progressive or teleological sense of history. The universal path is first and foremost the historicity of pure reason as a retrospective structure of appropriation, as critique. A progressive or teleological sense of history naturalizes and conceals the denaturalizing retrospective structure of historicity that makes it originally possible.
recollection and retrieval of the ideal of philosophy. History of philosophy is inevitably a philosophical history.\textsuperscript{338} In \textit{Jäsche Logic}, Kant explains his point more clearly: “Every philosophical thinker builds his own work, so to speak, on someone else’s ruin, but no work has ever come to be that was to be lasting in all its parts.” This deficiency derives primarily from the inevitably “historical” nature of our grasp of a complete (ideal) philosophy, even if one assumes that there is such “\textit{a philosophy actually at hand}” (Log 9:25). Philosophizing is in essence reason’s retrospective consideration of “all systems of philosophy only as \textit{history of the use of reason}” (Log 9:26). In this consideration, previous philosophy becomes philosophical ruins or material for philosophizing.\textsuperscript{339} Using this material, philosophical thinking is supposed to redeem the ideal of philosophy. The uniqueness of critical philosophy lies in understanding itself as the transcendental purposive structure for such ongoing redemption. The systematic-philosophical incorporation of the history of the use of reason as an immanent function of reason is the most distinctive historical characteristic of Kant’s critical philosophy. Critique invents the transcendental structure of historicity. As a modern discipline, history is the \textit{belated} child of the enlightenment. No empirical history can be shaped and narrated without reason’s purposive whole – the whole of its possible ends or matter – being transcendentally formed in pure imagination. Hence, from a critical

\textsuperscript{338} The merely argumentative form of philosophy is only a derivative form of such ruination and formation. Philosophy is not reducible to any set of arguments. To be sure, philosophy cannot do without arguments. The reduction of the enacting nature and life of philosophy to mere arguments, however, can only reify philosophy and its arguments, and conceal the inevitably autobiographical nature of the use of reason. A note from Wittgenstein’s \textit{On Certainty} describes the organic systematic groundedness of arguments succinctly: “105. All testing, all confirmation and disconfirmation of a hypothesis takes place already within a system. And this system is not a more or less arbitrary and doubtful point of departure for all our arguments: no, it belongs to the essence of what we call an argument. The system is not so much the point of departure, as the element in which arguments have their life” Wittgenstein (1969), p. 16e.

\textsuperscript{339} In his December 31, 1765 letter to Lambert, Kant expresses the same point in a slightly different way: “Before true philosophy can come to life, the old one must destroy itself; and just as putrefaction signifies the total dissolution that always precedes the start of a new creation, so the current crisis in learning magnifies my hopes that the great, long-awaited revolution in the sciences is not too far off” (Br 10:57).
standpoint, the history of pure reason is not an objective sequence of philosophical systems in time. It is the purposive structure or formal systematic condition (whole) of a transcendental speculation that incorporates and recasts previous philosophy, making empirical history possible. Through this transcendental structure, reason ‘feels’ itself and redeems its past. The need for constant recovery and redemption in and through the history of pure reason arises from reason’s most formative condition: the original loss of supersensible objects.340

The transcendental history of pure reason is a purposive structure immanent to the common concept of reason. Reason detects such immanence only in retrospect, in its adult maturity: “It is remarkable enough, although it could not naturally have been otherwise, that in the infancy of philosophy human beings began where we should now rather end, namely, by studying the first cognition of God and the hope or indeed even the constitution of another world” (KrV A852/B880). In short, the final ends of reason are its unconscious beginning. This is possible due to the purposive structure of the history of pure reason. Kant explains: “theology and morality were the two incentives, or better, the points of reference for all the abstract inquiries of reason to which we have always been devoted” (KrV A857/B881). The history of pure reason is the structure through which reason assesses its movement toward its final ends and redeems itself historically. It is an

340 I use the verb feel in the sense that Kant uses in his 1786 essay on the pantheism controversy. Referring to his metaphorical use of ‘feeling’ for reason, in a footnote, Kant explains: “[r]eason does not feel; it has insight into its lack and through the drive for cognition [Erkenntnistrieb] it effects the feeling of a need” (WDO 8:140). The transcendental history of pure reason is where Kant’s aesthetic/teleological theory and philosophy of religion intersect. This is one of the most neglected areas in Kant’s critical philosophy, and it is of particular significance for articulating his account of transcendental embodiment.
immanent unfolding of reason and the embodiment of its epigenetic whole in concrete terms.\textsuperscript{341}

Although Kant does not develop his reference to the transcendental nature of the history of pure reason in clear systematic terms, his outline of “the chief revolutions” in metaphysics (KrV A853/B881) presupposes the redemptive structure of the history of pure reason. Taking a critical standpoint, he presents the outline of this history in terms of the object, origin, and method of metaphysical cognitions.

With regard to the object of metaphysical cognitions, Kant divides the philosophical tradition into “merely sensual philosophers” such as Epicurus and “merely intellectual philosophers” such as Plato (KrV A853/B881). The sensual philosophers find reality in the objects of senses alone, although they do not dismiss the significance of concepts in the logical realm. The intellectual philosophers view reality in merely intelligible terms, and take senses to be a mere semblance. With regard to the origin of metaphysical cognitions, Kant contrasts “empiricists” such as Aristotle and Locke and “noologists” such as Plato and Leibniz. Empiricists locate the source of metaphysical cognitions in experience. Noologists finds this source to be independent of experience (KrV A854/B882). Lastly, with regard to the method of metaphysical cognitions, Kant distinguishes between “naturalistic” and “scientific” methods. Kant views naturalistic method as “mere misology brought to principles.” As far as “the observers of a scientific method are concerned,” Kant distinguishes between dogmatic and skeptical methods. He suggests that, one way or another, these methods are occupied with human reason’s lust for knowledge, and

\textsuperscript{341} In a different way, Hegel later develops Kant’s point on the immanence of the history of pure reason. Hegel’s “the beginning is the purpose” encapsulates the organic structural dynamic of the historical embodiment of reason. Hegel [1807] (1977), p. 12.
therefore cannot satisfy the metaphysical impulse of human reason. There can be no systematic satisfaction of reason without the apodictic systematic limitation of its lust for knowledge. Hence, “[t]he critical path alone is still open.” The critical method is the only remaining way to satisfy transcendental-systematic needs of reason. The transcendental history of reason enacts the transcendental structure of retrospection through which pure reason can recast and incorporate its internal conflicts between sensual philosophers and intellectual philosophers, empiricists and noologists, dogmatists and skeptics in systematic terms, redeem its past efforts, and bring itself to “full satisfaction” (KrV A855/B883).

In the first *Critique*, Kant does not develop the history of pure reason as the transcendental systematic ground or structure necessary for the unfolding of reason’s full satisfaction in concrete historical forms. But the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of human reason in pursuing its final ends (in the canon of pure reason) by universal means or essential ends of pure reason (in the architectonic of pure reason) should ultimately take concrete historical form and unfold in history. In the third *Critique*, Kant provides a comprehensive systematic account of how human reason determines its contingent relation to objects of sense and the individual ends of pure reason. The history of pure reason is the subjective (methodological) condition necessary for the reflecting use of reason in the power of judgement.342

---

342 Kant’s long appendix to the second part of the third *Critique* – Methodology of the Teleological Power of Judgement – engages in discussions around the question of final ends of pure reason in nature, containing an account of embodiment distinct from previous conceptions of theology and teleology as well as anti-teleology. Kant’s teleology is not grounded either in intrinsic essences/substances or in a progressive development in linear time. The teleology is based on the disciplinary grounding of contingent affinities in the history of pure reason. A full appreciation of Kant’s teleology and its connection to theology requires thematizing the concept of *embodiment* in critical philosophy. In her *Ideal Embodiment*, Nuzzo writes: “The concept of ‘transcendental embodiment’ brings together two terms that are generally considered to be almost oxymoronic: the transcendental method and the problem of the body” Nuzzo (2008), p. 317. Yet, Nuzzo does not engage with the history of pure reason as the primary transcendental-methodological condition of embodiment.
3.3.2 The history of pure reason: the transcendental condition or systematic whole of the reflecting use of reason

The history of pure reason is not merely a transcendental purposive ground or structure to assess the movement of philosophical thinking. In his introduction to the transcendental doctrine of method, Kant characterizes this transcendental structure as a formal condition of a complete system of pure reason. The history of pure reason is the transcendental condition or systematic whole of the reflecting use of reason or judging [Beurteilung] in the empirical field, even though Kant develops a comprehensive account of such use only later in the third Critique. The history of pure reason is particularly necessary after the canon of pure reason and the architectonic of pure reason determine formal conditions of the use of reason in practical and theoretical domains. The need to ground the reflecting use of reason within a systematic whole is implicit in the first Critique, particularly in the transcendental aesthetic.343 Pure forms of intuition receive the manifold of intuition but they cannot systematically ground it as individual things. The merely transcendental-logical determination of cognitions cannot do so either. The transcendental systematicity of cognitions of objects requires a transcendental condition in terms of which we can individuate them.344

343 This systematic connection between the transcendental aesthetic and the history of pure reason seems to go hand in hand with their simultaneously late addition to the doctrine of element and doctrine of method, although Kant does not make this connection explicit. While the transcendental aesthetic concerns the objective character of possible intuitions, the history of pure reason deals with the subjective formation of empirical intuitions as things.

344 The need for the determination of empirical laws of nature – i.e., the individuation or specification of natural objects – is also implicit in the transcendental ideal of the highest good (the whole of final ends of pure reason). As already indicated, for Kant, the ideal of the highest good is a determination of an idea of reason in individuo. In the canon of pure reason, Kant states that the realization of the ideal of the highest good “could be encountered in the history of humankind” (KrV A807/B835). The empirical history of humankind presupposes the transcendental history of pure reason.
Kant attempts to address this issue in the appendix to the transcendental dialectic through a regulative use of reason for specification of objects and formation of empirical concepts. He even intimates articulating a special faculty for such specification: “The idea of a fundamental power [Grundkraft] – though logic does not at all ascertain whether there is such a thing – is at least the problem set by a systematic representation of the manifold of powers” (KrV A649/B677). Later in the third Critique, Kant develops this fundamental power as the reflecting power of judgement. As Kant states, “To reflect (to consider) ... is to compare and to hold together given representations either with others or with one’s faculty of cognition, in relation to a concept thereby made possible. The reflecting power of judgement is that which is also called the faculty of judging (facultas diiudicandi)” (EEKU 20:210). Unlike the schematism of the determining power of judgement, the reflecting power of judgement is the structure that enables the organic formation of contingent content in terms of their elective affinities. This specification requires the subjective principle of purposiveness without purpose, a whole whose empirical parts are self-organizing, “a lawfulness of the contingent as such” (EEKU 20:217). The lawfulness or logic of contingent relation to objects is that of affinity in a whole. The reflecting use of reason in the power of judgement, however, must presuppose a transcendental-systematic whole within which empirical laws of nature and individuation of natural objects can be organized. This whole is the purposiveness without purpose, or the history of pure reason as the transcendental structure of historicity. In the appendix to the transcendental dialectic in the first Critique and the third Critique, Kant discusses the need to presuppose a whole or unity of reason in which the reflecting use of reason can operate in order to determine empirical laws of nature and connect them to each other (KrV A651/B679 &
Yet, he does not locate this presupposition – the systematic whole or formal condition of the reflecting use of reason – in the doctrine of method. This systematic whole or formal condition is the history of pure reason, in terms of which pure reason reflects to establish a spontaneous organic connection among its matter—be it the content of its natural history or empirical nature.

The relation between the transcendental history of pure reason, or the reflecting power of judgement, and the empirical field of nature, what the third Critique characterizes in terms of the transcendental principle of purposiveness without purpose, can also be understood in terms of the relation between what in Jäsche Logic Kant calls the highest genus and the lowest species. The highest genus is the genus “which is not a species” and the lowest species is the species “which is not a genus.” Kant formulates a “universal law” that governs the determination of species concepts: “There is a genus that cannot in turn be a species, but there is no species that should not be able in turn to be a genus.” Kant explains this point:

in the series of species and genera there is no lowest concept (conceptus infimus) or lowest species, under which no other would be contained, because such a one cannot possibly be determined. For even if we have a concept that we apply immediately to individuals, there can still be specific differences in regard to it, which we either do not note, or which we disregard. Only comparatively for use are there lowest concepts, which have attained this significance, as it were, through convention, insofar as one has agreed not to go deeper here. (Log 9:97)

The history of pure reason is the necessary absolute ground or systematic whole of pure reason in terms of which the infinity of lowest species or lowest concepts unfolds. This infinity, which Kant discusses in the appendix to the transcendental dialectic (KrV A656/B684) and the First Introduction to third Critique (EEKU 20:203), is the unfolding of the immanent absoluteness of apodictic modality of reason through the history of pure
reason in pure imagination. Nature is (in) history as it can be specified only through the transcendental history or historicity of reason. Without the absolute, or transcendental-systematic, grounding of infinite specification of objects in the history of pure reason, the complete transcendental-systematic condition for the realization of final ends of reason will be missing.\footnote{Purposiveness without purpose is the genus of purposiveness with purpose, i.e., moral feeling and empirical feeling (sensation) are species of feeling.}

As the absolute ground of contingent relations to objects, the history of pure reason is the whole of possible quantities or individual ends of pure reason, the systematic condition of the reflecting use of reason, in which objects of metaphysical cognitions can be specifically determined. Unlike mathematical quantification as numbers, metaphysical quantification is the individuation of matter as things. Metaphysical oneness cannot be arbitrary to empirical content of things and remains irreducible to mathematical oneness.\footnote{This does not mean that metaphysical quantification is against mathematical quantification. In the transcendental analytic, Kant discusses quantification mainly in mathematical terms since the primary mode of relation to nature is the schema of understanding proper (the determining power of judgement). Kant proceeds differently in the third \textit{Critique} in which he deals with the complete determination of objects (as an individual object) in the reflecting power of judgement. In a footnote to “First Moment of the judgement of taste,” Kant writes: “In seeking the moments to which this power of judgement attends in its reflection, I have been guided by the logical functions of judging (for a relation to the understanding is always contained even in the judgement of taste). I have considered the moment of quality first, since the aesthetic judgement on the beautiful takes notice of this first” (KU 5:203). The reflecting use of the power of judgement in judgements of taste, necessary for the complete determination of objects as individual ends, requires privileging the moment of quality over the moment of quantity. The order of the titles of categories in the first \textit{Critique} does not correspond to the order of the title of categories when they are used in the empirical field.}

Kant presents a different model of quantification for metaphysical cognitions. In metaphysical cognitions, oneness is the totality of a thing in which all phenomenal content are systematically organized into a concrete image. In mathematical cognitions, oneness consists in mechanical schematization of empirical content. Metaphysical oneness is an organic enactment that is immanent to the matter of a thing rather than an extrinsic
activity contingent to it. Totality is in essence an aesthetic whole within pure imagination
that includes phenomenal content and is irreducible to numerical unity. 347

Kant contrasts the two distinct approaches to quantification in his account of
mathematical and aesthetic estimation of magnitude in the analytic of the sublime:

Now for the mathematical estimation of magnitude there is, to be sure, no greatest
(for the power of numbers goes on to infinity); but for the aesthetic estimation of
magnitude there certainly is a greatest; and about this I say that if it is judged
[beurteilt] as an absolute measure, beyond which no greater is subjectively (for the
judging [beurteilenden] subject) possible, it brings with it the idea of the sublime,
and produces that emotion which no mathematical estimation of magnitudes by
means of numbers can produce (except insofar as that aesthetic basic measure is
vividly preserved in the imagination), since the latter always presents only relative
magnitude through comparison with others of the same species, but the former
presents magnitude absolutely, so far as the mind can grasp it in one intuition. (KU 5:251)

Kant characterizes the contrast between mathematical estimation and aesthetic estimation
of a given magnitude primarily in terms of their capacity to generate an absolute or
maximum. The mathematical estimation can never have a determinate concept of a given
magnitude since it lacks an absolute ground, a maximum, for limiting and shaping the
phenomenal content of the magnitude. Mathematical measurement by means of numbers
can be infinitely large or infinitely small, but it is devoid of phenomenal content. That is
why, in quantitative terms, the sublime is not mere number. On the contrary, the aesthetic

347 For Kant, this is precisely what the tradition of logic, particularly the Leibnizian-Wolffian school, ignores. Chapter four discusses how Kant argues against the identification of the singular judgements with universal judgements, or totality with unity. In his chapter on the transcendental schematism, Kant discusses quantity in mathematical terms and defines number as unity not totality: “number is nothing other than the unity of the synthesis of the manifold of a homogeneous intuition in general” (KrV A143/B182). It is notable that Kant skips defining the categories of plurality, totality, and infinity in the transcendental schematism. Neither the transcendental aesthetic nor the transcendental schematism contains an organic conception of unity, i.e., totality as infinity. Despite these deficiencies, Kant is unequivocal about the systematic primacy of metaphysical oneness over mathematical oneness. The purpose of metaphysical cognition is a thing whereas the purpose of a mathematical cognition is magnitude. Kant discusses the systematic priority of quality over quantity in detail in the first chapter of the discipline of pure reason. See (KrV A714-727/B742-755). This priority is manifest in Kant’s decision to preserve the strict sense of the expression *synthetic a priori judgement* for judgements of metaphysics.
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estimation of a given magnitude rests on a subjective absolute that enables the quantitative
determination of phenomenal content of the magnitude as ends of human reason. Unlike
the mathematical notion of infinity that operates in comparative terms, the aesthetic notion
of infinity rests on enacting a totality, that is, the formation of an aesthetic whole through a
retrospective structure of pure reason in pure imagination: “the imagination reaches its
maximum and, in the effort to extend it, sinks back into itself, but is thereby transported
into an emotionally moving satisfaction” (KU 5:251, italics added). This retrospective
structure of pure reason in pure imagination, as a result of which a totality is formed, is the
essence of the reflecting use or history of pure reason, in terms of which individual ends of
reason are determined. Although a totality that is formed is always unique, its formation
stems from the methodological nature of critical reason, particularly the history of pure
reason. Kant’s account of aesthetic quantification in the sublime illuminates what is
necessary for the individuation of sensible objects in metaphysical cognitions: the
transcendental-speculative formation of the totality of empirical content through
purposiveness without purpose or the history of pure reason.

As the formal condition of a complete system of pure reason, reason’s temporal self-
enactment in the history of pure reason is necessary for its historical self-consciousness as
well as for its self-formation as a completely individuated system. On the one hand, the
previous attempts in philosophy are ruins, insofar as the professed ends of the
philosophers were not achieved. On the other hand, only from the perspective of the
completed (individuated) system outlined in the first Critique can one say in what exact
sense they are ruins or what whole they are fragments of. Only the completed system

---

348 Kant’s case for enacting infinity through totality indicates the quasi-monadic nature of things in the world. The whole world is in a unique manner expressed in a thing.
would be a genuine totality, hence a genuine individual. So it is only with this individuated whole or totality in view that we can understand what are the proper ends of pure reason – as opposed to the professed ends of previous philosophers. And it is only with these ends in mind that we can assess the previous attempts, classify them according to their successes and failures, and make new attempts to redeem reason.

With the determination of the systematic condition of pure reason's historical self-consciousness or the reflecting use of reason to form the whole of quantities or individual ends of metaphysical cognitions (judgements) in the history of pure reason, the negative-modal-apodictic whole of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason is rendered completely positive or transcendentally determinate.

***

As discussed in this chapter, the determination of the whole of possible ends of pure reason in terms of the final end (practical use), essential ends (theoretical use), and individual ends (reflecting use) of reason completes the systematic self-organization of parts of pure reason, and makes metaphysical cognitions relationally, qualitatively, and quantitatively systematic. The next chapter discusses how the transcendental systematicity of metaphysical cognitions in the doctrine of method makes the table of judgements transcendentally systematic.
Chapter 4. The Systematicity of the Table of Judgements

Having discussed the determination of the formal conditions of an organic system of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method, we are now at a position to appreciate Kant’s pivotal claim on the transcendental completeness or systematicity of the table of judgements. In Kant’s account, the table of judgements contains all possible cognitions (judgements) of metaphysics, functions as the birthplace of the table of categories, and thus supplies the schema for the completeness of the theoretical, practical, and reflecting parts of the critical system. The transcendental systematicity or organic unity of the table of judgements, as discussed below, consists in the methodological determination – negative-modal-apodictic formation – of judgements of metaphysics prior to relation to objects. Only the transcendental doctrine of method contains an organic sense of pure reason, i.e., an absolute unity or whole of possible ends, from which the table of judgements and thereby the table of categories can be systematically derived. The last two chapters have shown how pure reason generates and organizes its modal-apodictic whole in the doctrine of method. The present chapter works out how the methodological self-generation and self-organization of pure reason make the table of judgements transcendentally systematic. Making the table of judgements transcendentally systematic is one and the same as grounding the logic of predication in transcendental ontology and thereby in pure reason’s disciplinary self-enactment, absolute positing, or the negative-modal apodicticity of possible existence in critical methodology. Discussion of the systematicity of the table of judgements proceeds in two sections. Focusing on Kant’s precritical treatment of modality, the first section explores how the apodictic modality of pure reason comes to play a crucial
role, as a critical version of Kant’s precritical conception of the absolutely necessary existence, in grounding metaphysical cognitions of physical objects. The second section discusses the metaphysical deduction of the categories, demonstrating how the formal conditions of the complete system of pure reason in the transcendental doctrine of method – i.e., the discipline, canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason – correspond to the whole of possible ends of reason in its judgements of modality, relation, quality, and quantity. Kant’s plan to ground the logic of predication in the critical method, to make the merely logical table of judgements transcendentally systematic, hinges on determining the whole of possible ends of pure reason in modal, relational, qualitative, and quantitative terms.

4.1 Modality: from precritical philosophy to critical philosophy

The systematic grounding of the table of judgements in Kant’s critical philosophy takes place primarily in modal-apodictic terms. The systematic function of the apodictic modality of pure reason in critical philosophy can be fully appreciated only if we trace how Kant’s precritical conception of modality develops into a critical conception of modality in the first Critique. Despite remaining unthematized in Kant’s corpus and the secondary scholarship, as examined in the discussion of the discipline of pure reason in chapter two, the critical conception of modality is the centerpiece of critical philosophy. In its most fundamental sense, critique is the apodictic modality of pure reason, that is, the absolute positing of possible existence of objects or the transcendental-speculative ground of the object-relatedness of the categories. This section begins with an examination of Kant’s precritical treatment of modality in Nova Dilucidatio. It then moves to discuss how Kant develops this early view on modality in The Only Possible Argument. The section concludes with an
outline of how Kant's critical account of apodictic modality, as the absolute positing of possible existence of objects, replaces his precritical argument for the absolutely necessary existence of God as the ground for the possible existence of things.

The question of modality appears in precritical texts primarily in a theological context, particularly in Kant's examination of the ontological proof for the existence of God and his alternative to or perhaps own version of this proof. It is not accidental that Kant's engagement with modality takes place in a theological context: it is only in light of a metaphysics of creation that Kant can use modality to separate existence from the predicative logic of substance and formulate it in genetic terms. This separation is central to Kant's articulation of the foundation of an argument for the existence of God, which is distinct from different versions of the ontological argument, including the Leibnizian-Wolffian ones. Kant considers God as the absolutely necessary ground of all beings, and approaches the existence of created beings primarily in terms of the existence of God, the creator. As I discuss below, Kant's precritical approach to modality lies in conceiving...

---

349 This separation is a key move that drives Kant's precritical thought towards critical philosophy, overlooked in most interpretations of Kant's critical philosophy. These interpretations fail to view the object-relatedness of understanding in terms of the genetic modal-apodictic method of pure reason in the first Critique, ignoring Kant's move to understand existence primarily in modal-genetic rather than substantive-static terms. In this regard, most interpretations of Kant's critical philosophy do not read the first Critique even in a precritical way. As becomes clear below, the question of existence for Kant is primarily that of methodological generation or absolute positing rather than that of sensation, reality, or relative positing. Systematically speaking, the givenness of manifolds of intuition in a relation presupposes pure reason's disciplinary self-positing or the absolute positing of a thing in general. This absolute positing, which takes place in the discipline of pure reason, is presupposed in the transcendental unity of apperception.

350 This is a major philosophical legacy of medieval scholasticism that Kant inherits. In this tradition, ontology is directed toward the idea or concept of God. Ontology is ultimately grounded in God as the most perfect form or necessary ground of existence. Kant coins two key expressions the ontological proof and ontotheology to refer to this tradition. This sense of ontotheology, which is intimately associated with a general sense of Christian theology, is distinct from the recourse to the unmoved mover in Aristotle. In ontotheology, the question of the existence of God is acknowledged as an issue and is made thematic. Ontotheology has its historical roots in the declining influence of ancient Greek culture and the rising influence and ultimately the dominance of Christianity in the Roman world. Anselm's ontological proof for the existence of God exemplifies the thematization of the question of existence in a theological context. Descartes presents another version of this proof. The ontological proof infers the existence of God from his concept. Medieval
modality in separation from the real ontological content and its predicative logic. This separation later becomes the methodological kernel of critical philosophy. In its critical sense, the apodictic modality of pure reason, discussed in chapters two and three, is simultaneously separate from and the methodological ground of (attachable to) object-related content, i.e., negative and also positive. The methodological self-negation of pure reason generates the relational positivity of existing objects. In this sense, separation is not primarily a theoretical distinction. The self-preservation or life of pure reason rests on the critical sense of separation. Pure reason lives on this separation. And separation is in essence pure reason's self-separation, self-negation, or self-formative self-division. It is the constant genetic formation of an organic economy, a whole, or a home—the only

scholasticism radically transforms the ancient Greek philosophy. As Heidegger has shown, the ancient Greek philosophy does not thematize the question of existence, understanding existence primarily in terms of reality or the logic of predication. See Heidegger [1975] (1988), pp. 27-121. The thematization of existence as distinct from reality or the logic of predication takes place primarily as a result of the increasing influence of the Biblical account of genesis and creation from nothing. As Kahn remarks: “existence in the modern sense becomes a central concept in philosophy only in the period when Greek ontology is radically revised in light of a metaphysics of creation: that is to say, under the influence of Biblical religion” Kahn (1976), p. 323. The essence-existence distinction goes back to Aristotle. But the thematization of this distinction seems to start from Ibn Sina’s commentary on Aristotle’s distinction. Written under the influence of Neo-Platonists, the Quran’s version of the Biblical story of creation, and Farabi, this commentary transposes the essence-existence distinction as a real distinction into a metaphysics of creation. According to this commentary, which is taken up by Aquinas, God’s essence is the same as his existence whereas the essence of the created beings differs from their existence. Aquinas views the distinction between the essence and existence of created beings as a real distinction. Kant considers this distinction to be a modal one. Kant is not the first to characterize this distinction as modal. At least in some respects, Kant’s notion of modality can be traced back to Suarez’s differentiation between modal distinctions and real and mental ones. For Suarez, a real distinction is “a distinction between thing and thing. It consists in the fact that one thing is not another, and vice versa.” A mental distinction “does not formally and actually intervene between the things designated as distinct, as they exist in themselves, but only as they exist in our ideas, from which they receive some denomination.” A modal distinction “is not a predicamental relation or ordination... Accordingly there are in created entities certain modes affecting these entities, and their nature seems to consists in this, that they do not of themselves suffice to constitute being or entity in the real order of things, but are intrinsically directed to the actual modification of some entity without which they are quite incapable of existing” Suarez [1597] (1947), p. 16, p. 18, and pp. 29-30. Through his notion of modal distinction, Suarez highlights the irreducible significance of modes of being. Kant’s distinction between the critical method of metaphysical cognition and metaphysical cognition proper, transcendental methodology and transcendental ontology, apodictic modality and object-relatedness in critical philosophy can be understood as a critical interpretation of the distinction between the modal and the real in Suarez. For Suarez’s extensive discussion of the essence-existence distinction in created or finite beings, see Suarez [1597] (1983). For an interpretation that takes Kant’s thesis on the non-predicative nature of existence to be somewhat similar and yet unanticipated by Suarez see Seigfried (1972).
systematic antidote to natural dialectical errors, modality in its apodictic sense, or critique
par excellence. A critical sense of separation, or apodictic modality, is the incessant self-
enactment of pure reason to form itself as a genetic whole, human reason’s finitude as
infinite movement from and to home, or pure reason’s organic re-naturalization (re-
habituation) and de-naturalization (de-habituation).

Kant’s precritical engagements with the question of modality take place for the most
part in Nova Dilucidatio, Kant’s first major metaphysical work, and The Only Possible
Argument, Kant’s most comprehensive precritical examination of major proofs for God’s
existence.

---

351 In this way, Kant’s critical philosophy establishes infinity as an infinite organicism of finite human reason. This organicist view of the infinite enables pure reason’s self-preservation.

352 To be sure, Kant’s critical philosophy does not discuss habit in its empirical-psychological sense, but this does not mean that Kant simply excludes the question of habit from pure reason’s self-formation. Kant engages with the question of habit primarily in terms of the natural life of reason in speculation. Dialectical habits of pure reason are at once necessary and pathological. As I discussed in chapter two, humiliation is a form of de-habituation or de-naturalization of pure reason to a priori correct its dialectical habits. In this sense, habit plays a part in the transcendental self-affection of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason. Critical reason inhabits in the repetitive movement of re-habituation and de-habituation. See (Refl 18:71). Later Hegel takes up this retrospective transcendental movement of re-naturalization and de-naturalization – the modal-apodictic or transcendental-speculative self-enactment or organic self-formation of reason – in his speculative philosophy. E.g., discussing education in The Elements of the Philosophy of Right, Hegel writes: “Education is the art of making human beings ethical: it considers them as natural beings and shows them how they can be reborn, and how their original nature can be transformed into a second, spiritual nature so that this spirituality becomes habitual to them” Hegel [1821] (1991), p. 195. In his essay Of Habit, Ravaisson writes: “In descending gradually from the clearest regions of consciousness, habit carries with it light from those regions into the depths and dark night of nature. Habit is an acquired nature, a second nature that has its ultimate ground in primitive nature, but which alone explains the latter to the understanding. It is, finally, a natured nature, the productive and successive revelation of naturing nature” Ravaisson [1838] (2008), p. 59. The movement of re-appropriation of the original nature (natural spontaneity) or the incorporation (formation) of the non-organic into the organic unity of pure reason, which is at the heart of Kant’s use of the metaphor of epigenesis for a transcendentental system of pure reason, is formulated even by thinkers who seem to be fundamentally at odds with critical philosophy. E.g., in his arguably most important philosophical work, Difference and Repetition, Deleuze describes this organic movement of re-naturalization and de-naturalization in terms of a movement of contraction and contemplation: “When we say that habit is a contraction we are speaking not of an instantaneous action which combines with another to form an element of repetition, but rather of the fusion of that repetition in the contemplating mind. A soul must be attributed to the heart, to the muscles, nerves and cells, but a contemplative soul whose entire function is to contract a habit. This is no mystical or barbarous hypothesis. On the contrary, habit here manifests its full generality: it concerns not only the sensory-motor habits that we are; the thousands of passive syntheses of which we are organically composed. It is simultaneously through contraction that we are habits, but through contemplation that we contract” Deleuze [1968] (1994), p. 74.
4.1.1 Kant’s precritical treatment of modality in *Nova Dilucidatio*

In the section two of *Nova Dilucidatio*, Kant discusses modality in the context of his interpretation of the principle of sufficient reason, or what, after Crusius, he calls the principle of determining ground. Kant defines a ground as “that which determines a subject in respect of any of its predicates.” But not all determining grounds are the same. Kant distinguishes two kinds of determining ground. First, “[a] consequentially determining ground is one which would not be posited unless the concept which is determined by it had not already been posited from some other source”; it is “the ground *that*, or the ground of knowing” (PND 1:392). Despite its essential role for knowing the truth, a consequentially determining ground “does not bring the truth into being; it only explains it” (PND 1:394). Kant considers truth to be an actual determination of a predicate in a subject, that is, a positing “in such a way that every opposite is excluded” (PND 1:393). This points to the second kind of determining ground that a consequentially determining ground must presuppose: “an antecedently determining ground, or if you prefer, a genetic or at least an identical ground” (PND 1:394). This ground is one “the concept of which precedes that which is determined”; it is “the reason *why*, or the ground of being or becoming” (PND 1:392). The ground of being or existence is a ground that relates the subject to a predicate. This *why* is an *actual or determinate relation* between the subject and a predicate, which, contrary to the claims of the Leibnizian-Wolffian school, cannot be understood in merely logical or indeterminately possible terms. The exclusion of the opposite predicates from the same subject cannot determine why the included predicates relate to the subject or how these predicates form a unity in the subject. The *why* of antecedently determining ground concerns the whole of predicates in relation to each other whereas the *that* of consequently
determining ground deals with avoiding the inclusion of the two opposite predicates in the subject.\textsuperscript{353}

Even though Kant does not thematize modality in \textit{Nova Dilucidatio}, it is difficult to miss the connection between antecedently determining and consequentially determining grounds on the one hand, and the modal distinction between actuality (existence) and merely logical possibility on the other hand. Kant introduces this modal distinction as a remedy to the Leibnizian-Wolffian reduction of the principle of sufficient reason to the principle of contradiction. In Kant’s reading, Wolff defines a ground primarily in terms of the possibility of understanding why something should rather be than not be. But this conception of ground focuses primarily on our understanding rather than on how something comes into being. It “conflates the thing defined with its own definition” (PND 1:393), and thereby collapses the antecedently determining ground of things into the consequently determining ground of our knowledge of them. For Kant, merely logical possibility of things is grounded in, i.e., presupposes, their givenness or actuality.

Kant’s implicit treatment of the question of modality in \textit{Nova Dilucidatio} does not stop at grounding the merely logical possibility of our knowledge of things in their ontological determinateness or actuality. Kant takes a further step to argue for grounding the actuality or existence of things in an absolutely necessary existence. This step is indispensable since the actuality or existence of things cannot be completely self-standing and remains in need of an absolute grounding. That is to say, things cannot exist completely on their own. Incompleteness is an inseparable characteristic of things. Being absolutely

\textsuperscript{353} See below for discussion of how Kant considers the why of the antecedently determining ground to be a \textit{relative or relational positing} that excludes every opposite predicate even though it is not reducible to the principle of contradiction. Even though Kant does not discuss it explicitly in \textit{The Only Possible Argument}, he grounds the principle of sufficient reason – relative positing – in the absolutely necessary existence of God.
conditioned is essential to the thingness of things. Without absolute conditioning or necessitation, even the contingent character of existence cannot be intelligible. Kant explains:

For suppose that these realities, which are, so to speak, the material of all possible concepts, were to be found distributed among a number of existent things; it would follow that each of these things would have its existence limited in a certain way. In other words, the existence of each of these things would be combined with certain deprivations.... Deprivations ... belong to the complete determination of a thing, and without this complete determination a thing could not exist. This being the case, it follows that the realities, which are limited in this way, will exist contingently. (PND 1:395)

In other words, the actuality of things is relational, and therefore requires an absolutely necessary grounding. In this way, existence of things indicates the need for an absolutely necessary determination. Actuality cannot sustain itself without an absolutely necessary ground conditioning its contingent material. With this step, Kant establishes the order of grounding of things in modal terms: an absolutely necessary existence is the ground of the actuality of things, and this actuality is in turn the ground of merely logical possibility of things. The general structure of this precritical account of relations among the three categories of modality survives in critical works, even though Kant interprets the absolutely necessary existence primarily in terms of the discipline of pure reason rather than God. As it is built into the structure of the transcendental doctrine of method, any reference to God must be necessitated by and takes place through the discipline of pure reason.

Based on his account of the intrinsic incompleteness of things and the need for their grounding in an absolutely necessary existence, Kant formulates his criticism of the claim

---

354 Chapter two treated this issue mainly from a genetic perspective. Below it will be examined in terms of Kant’s precritical and critical conceptions of modality.
that the ground of existence of things lies within themselves. To say that something has the
ground of its existence within itself, Kant argues, is absurd since, as the cause and the
caused, the same thing cannot “be simultaneously both earlier and later than itself” (PND
1:394). Things or created beings need to presuppose an absolutely necessary existence.
This presupposition, however, differs from both consequentially determining ground and
antecedently determining ground. The absolute condition of existence cannot be itself
conditioned. An absolutely necessary existence “does not exist because of some ground.” In
such existence, even “an antecedently determining ground is completely absent”; an
absolutely necessary existence “exists because the opposite cannot be thought at all…. *It
exists*” (PND 1:394). Such being is absolutely self-positing.\footnote{In *Nova Dilucidatio*, Kant implies but does not present his conception of existence as the absolute positing of a thing. This formulation, as discussed below, occurs in *The Only Possible Argument.*} The impossibility of the
opposite of an absolutely necessary existence is distinct from the impossibility of the
opposite predicate in the merely logical principle of contradiction. Rather than a
predicative opposite, the opposite of an absolutely necessary existence is non-existence or
the impossibility of existence as such. And non-existence is not the negation of a predicate.
In this way, *Nova Dilucidatio* implies the non-predicative nature of existence, what eight
years later Kant formulates as the key component of his criticism of the ontological proof
for the existence of God. Without an absolutely necessary existence, neither an
antecedently determining ground nor a consequentially determining ground, neither
actuality nor possibility of things can function: “you instantly abolish not only the entire
existence of things but even their inner possibility itself” (PND 1:395).

Although Kant does not elaborate his argument for the existence of God in *Nova
Dilucidatio*, he uses the argument for an absolutely necessary existence to criticize
Descartes' ontological proof for the existence of God and to show the direction for an alternative proof arrived at through the essence or the possibility of existence of things. As Kant implies, existence is not a predicate that can be included in and derived from the concept of God. The existence of God, Kant argues, can be proved only in terms of the absolute necessity or modal grounding of things. We arrive at the creator through the created beings. Kant encapsulates his notion of absolutely necessary grounding in a passage, where he explains why logical possibility must be grounded in actuality, and why actuality of things or contingent existence must be grounded in an absolutely necessary givenness or the existence of God:

Possibility is only definable in terms of there not being a conflict between certain combined concepts; thus the concept of possibility is the product of a comparison. But in every comparison the things which are to be compared must be available for comparison, and where nothing at all is given there is no room for either comparison or, corresponding to it, for the concept of possibility. This being the case, it follows that nothing can be conceived as possible unless whatever is real in every possible concept exists and indeed exists absolutely necessarily.... Furthermore, it is necessary that this entire reality should be united together in a single being. (PND 1:395)

Kant emphasizes the modal character of his grounding of existence of things in God, that is, the separation of the absolute necessity of existence from the contingent existence or relational actuality of things, by suggesting an adverbial formulation of the relation between the absolutely necessary existence and things: “although essences (which consist in inner possibility) are ordinarily called absolutely necessary, nonetheless, it would be more correct to say that they belong to things absolutely necessarily” (PND 1:395). That is to say, neither possibility nor actuality are absolute necessity, even though absolute necessity modally underlies them. To be, things need to be absolutely necessitated. In this way, Kant

---

356 Kant's point here should not be mistaken with a physico-theological argument for the existence of God. Kant conceives of the move from the finite to the infinite in modal terms.
separates the creator, whose essence and existence are the same, from creatures, whose existence relies on an essence that is finite and must be infinitely absolutely necessitated: “Of all beings, God is the only one in which existence is prior to, or, if you prefer, identical with possibility” (PND 1:396). The separation of God from other beings, the whole or “entire reality” from real beings, the absolute from the relative, the absolutely necessary existence from the predicative logic of actual contingency, aims to protect the absolutely necessary ground of existence from the contingent reality of things, and also ground such contingency. The separation of an absolutely necessary existence from reality is required for preventing an infinite regress of contingent existence as, “[a]bsolute necessity is not compatible with deprivations as it is with realities” (PND 1:395). Predicative determination by nature is a type of positing that involves comparison and exclusion, whereas absolute necessity is bereft of either. Kant develops his conception of existence as absolute necessity in presenting his argument or proof-ground [Beweisgrund] in support of a demonstration of the existence of God.

4.1.2 Kant’s precritical treatment of modality in The Only Possible Argument

Kant’s more explicitly thematic account of existence and modality in general takes place in his 1763 The Only Possible Argument. In particular, Kant’s first three reflections in section one of this work deals with three categories of modality: existence, possibility, and necessity. Kant’s elaboration of these categories and their relationship to each other are discussed below, together with his formation of his conception of modality (the how of

357 In his critical philosophy, discussed in chapter two, above, Kant uses this separation as a way to limit the extension of the sensible content into the supersensible realm, forming sensibility or the relational content of pure reason while a priori preventing its influence over reason. The logic of sensibility is the logic of infinite regress, which can be stemmed by such separation. Unlike skepticist restlessness, this separation does not belong to the sensible series, and arises immanently from pure reason.
positing) in separation from the real ontological content (what is posited). Kant maintains this account of modality in his critical philosophy, even though his methodological revolution ultimately locates necessity in the discipline of pure reason rather than God.

In his first reflection, “Of existence in general,” Kant articulates his conception of existence by introducing negative and positive theses about existence. Kant does not start his discussion of existence with a definition of existence, and warns against the imitation of the method of mathematics in metaphysics.

Kant’s first step in developing an account of existence is the negative thesis that “Existence is not a predicate or a determination of a thing” (BDG 2:72). Both consequentially determining ground and antecedently determining ground involve real predicative determination of things. But existence or actuality is not real. The identification of existence as reality reifies existence. Kant acknowledges that this thesis “seems strange and absurd” and yet he emphasizes that “it is indubitably certain.” In this thesis lies Kant’s ground-breaking move to separate modality from ontological content or real predicates. To support his negative thesis, Kant argues that the complete determination of predicates in a thing does not mean that it exists. A thing can be completely determined, yet not exist. Existence requires God’s creation. Kant explains this crucial point by an example: “The Being who gave existence to the world and to our hero [Julius Caesar] within that world

---

358 The discussion of the first section of The Only Possible Argument does not include an exposition or evaluation of Kant’s argument for or against different proofs for the existence of God. The main focus is on Kant’s treatment of the categories of modality, particularly their significance from the standpoint of critical philosophy. Of course, there is a close connection between Kant’s account of modal categories and his central argument against the ontological proof for the existence of God. For Kant, existence is not a real predicate and must be understood in modal terms. The ontological proof mistakes the absolute necessity of the existence of God with a merely logical necessity because it reduces existence to a predicate that is taken to be intrinsic to the logical concept, whether of God or the thing. Kant develops his alternative proof for the existence of God in terms of the absolute necessary ground for the internal possibility of things.
could know every single one of these predicates without exception, and yet still be able to regard him as a merely possible thing which, in the absence of that Being's decision to create him, would not exist.” A non-existing thing can be possible in its complete determination, without any “predicate at all ... be missing” (BDG 2:72). The key to the existence of things or created beings is the creator.

Kant explains that, in the identification of existence as a predicate in common speech, existence “is a predicate not so much of the thing itself as of the thought which one has of the thing” (BDG 2:72). Common speech mistakes the way or modality in which something is posited in thought as predicates of the thing itself. Kant attributes this phenomenon to “certain ineradicable defects” of “all human languages,” “which arise from the contingent circumstances surrounding their origins” (BDG 2:73). Yet, he recommends philosophical caution to avoid misunderstanding rather than the “pedantic and futile” attempt “to over-refine language and impose limits upon it in those cases where, in ordinary usage, no misunderstanding could arise” (BDG 2:73). Common speech only exemplifies a more basic philosophical failure to appreciate the absolute grounding of the thing.

Kant’s negative thesis about the non-predicative nature of existence, as well as his diagnosis on the use of existence as a predicate in common speech, implies that existence should not be approached in terms of real ontological predication or content. Being involved with the contingent, logical predication and common speech lack absolute necessity by themselves. Existence should not be understood in terms of “what is posited” (the real content or predicates) but “how it is posited” (the modality in which the content is formed) (BDG 2:75). In this way, Kant characterizes existence as a modal concept,
separating it from real content. Existence should be understood primarily in terms of creation, i.e., as how matter is formed. It does not add any predicate to the already given content or predicative determination of a thing. Kant’s negative thesis, the separation of what is posited from how it is posited, prepares the way for the positive thesis where Kant defines the most important sense of how with regard to existence.

Kant formulates his positive thesis in this way: "Existence is the absolute positing of a thing. Existence is thereby also distinguished from any predicate; the latter is, as such, always posited only relative to some other thing" (BDG 2:73). In this thesis, Kant discusses the absolute positing as divine creation. The “predicates are posited relative to the subject” but “the thing itself, together with all its predicates, is posited absolutely” (BDG 2:74). This thesis implies that one of the sources of mistaking existence with a predicate is to confuse two kinds of positing, or two distinct hows: the relational or relative positing and absolute positing. The relative positing, which is implicated with predicates, takes place according to the antecedently determining ground or the principle of sufficient reason. The absolute positing, however, is separate from any predication.

Kant starts the detailed discussion of his positive thesis with a definition of existence in general as positing: “The concept of positing or setting [Position oder Setzung] is perfectly simple: it is identical with the concept of being in general.” Existence or positing can be either relative or absolute. In relative positing, “something can be thought as posited merely relatively, or, to express the matter better, it can be thought merely as the relation (respectus logicus) of something as a characteristic mark [Merkmal] of a thing” (BDG 2:73). In other words, relative positing concerns a relational how, that is, a relational distribution of real predicates within the whole of reality. Kant’s definition of a characteristic “mark” in
Jäsche Logic shows the predicative and partial character of relative positing: "A mark is that in a thing which constitutes a part of the cognition of it, or – what is the same – a partial representation, insofar as it is considered as ground of cognition of the whole representation" (Log 9:58). A mark concerns logical predicates of the concept of thing, which are necessary for our cognition of a thing, rather than its existence proper. Kant explains that relative positing is that of a relation between the subject and a predicate: “being, that is to say, the positing of this relation, is nothing other than the copula [Verbindungsbegriff] in a judgement.” In contrast to relative positing, Kant describes the absolute positing as that in which “the thing [is] posited in and for itself”; “this being is the same as existence.” This positing of the thing is prior to its predicates. Thus, the key issue in appreciating existence is to avoid "confusing it with the relations which things have to their characteristic marks" (BDG 2:73). Kant defines existence as the how or modal ground, in terms of which the subject relates to a predicate. The absolute positing or being in general concerns the whole of our cognition, which in turn is directed at the whole of a thing. Yet, the whole of the thing is not part of the thing as a set of predicates. It is the absolute positing of the thing, and thus absolutely necessarily belongs to it. Strictly speaking, this whole or existence is separate from the predicates of the thing and cannot be understood by being broken into predicative parts. Kant explains: “Once it is appreciated that the whole of our cognition ultimately resolves itself into unanalyzable concepts, it will also be understood that there will be some concepts which are almost unanalyzable” (BDG 2:73). This “is the case with our definition of existence.... the nature of the object in relation to the faculty of our understanding does not admit of a higher degree of distinctness” (BDG 2:74). Kant contrasts human cognition, in which there is a gap between our view of predicates and their wholeness or existence,
with divine cognition, in which God posits predicates “only relatively to this whole” (BDG 2:74).

Kant concludes his first reflection by addressing the question whether it can properly be said that there is more in existence than there is in mere possibility. In responding to this question, Kant tries to distinguish existence (actuality) from possibility. His answer to this question is yes and no. As far as what is posited is concerned, “no more is posited in a real thing than is posited in a merely possible thing, for all the determinations and predicates of the real thing are also to be found in the mere possibility of that same thing” (BDG 2:75). In terms of their content or predicates, existence and possibility are not different. That said, as far as how something is posited, “more is posited through actuality.” Actuality exceeds possibility since “positing through an existent thing involves the absolute positing of the thing itself as well.” In other words, “in mere possibility it is not the thing itself which is posited; it is merely the relations of something to something which are posited in accordance with the law of contradiction” (BDG 2:75). That is how, in addressing the question of the excess of actuality over possibility, Kant differentiates his account of existence from Wolff’s conception of existence (as a completion of possibility), Baumgarten’s conception of existence (as thoroughgoing internal determination), and Crusius’s inclusion of time and place as intrinsic to existence.

Kant’s second reflection, “Of internal possibility, in so far as it presupposes existence,” introduces a basic distinction in the concept of possibility. Possibility consists of a material or ontological element and the formal or merely logical element.359 This

---

359 Chignell (2009) claims that there is a third requirement for Kant’s concept of possibility in The Only Possible Argument: the absence of real repugnance or conflict between different predicates of the concept. In
distinction is valid only “in so far as it [possibility] presupposes existence.” In speaking of the possibility of a thing, we must presuppose its existence or givenness. Kant concludes his conception of possibility stating that “all possibility is given in something actual as a determination existing within it or as a consequence arising from it” (BDG 2:79). Possibility is grounded in actuality, and this grounding takes place through the material element of possibility representing actuality. Kant’s distinction between the material and formal elements of possibility is primarily directed at Leibnizian-Wolffian school in which possibility and existence are defined in a manner that the material element of possibility, or the presupposition of existence in possibility is ignored.

Kant’s third reflection, “Of absolutely necessary existence,” deals with the concept of necessity as necessary existence, which is distinct from other forms of necessity. In other words, Kant does not define necessity primarily nominally and looks for “a real definition” of absolute necessity (BDG 2:81). To distinguish such approach, he writes:

All our concepts of internal necessity in the properties of possible things of whatever kind they may be amount to this: the opposite is self-contradictory. If, however, it is absolutely necessary existence which is at issue, one would not have much success if one tried to arrive at some understanding of it by means of the above characterization. Existence is not a predicate at all nor is the cancellation of existence the negation of a predicate, by means of which something in a thing is cancelled and through which an internal contradiction could arise. The cancellation of an existent thing is a complete negation of all that is posited unconditionally or absolutely by its existence…. what is cancelled by non-being is not the same as what is posited in the thing but something else; as a result there is never a contradiction here. (BDG 2:81-2)

Thus, Kant distinguishes between “logical necessity,” i.e., “the necessity in the predicates of merely possible concepts,” and “absolute real necessity,” “the ultimate foundation, namely, the necessity of existence” (BDG 2:82). Referring to his earlier distinction between formal
and material elements of “possibility in so far as it presupposes existence,” Kant identifies two kinds of cancellation or negation. The first one is negation of the formal element that leads to contradiction. The second one is negation of the material element or “the negation of the data of all can be thought” (BDG 2:82). The first conception of negation is predicative whereas the second is modal. In other words, we need to distinguish between logical impossibility, as the opposite of logical possibility, and ontological impossibility, as the opposite of absolutely necessary existence. In the latter, necessity is the only way to salvage existence from impossibility. As discussed in chapter two, the first Critique incorporates this ontological impossibility (of God) as the absolute internal necessity of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason (negative-modal-apodictic judgements of discipline). Kant also develops his notion of infinite judgement as the ground for the transcendental possibility of predicates in a thing.

After distinguishing absolute real necessity from logical necessity, Kant explains the foundational role of absolute real necessity in a way that brings together all three categories of modality: possibility, actuality, and necessity. Kant writes, “All possibility presuppose something actual in and through which all that can be thought is given” (BDG 2:83). Actuality or existence also must presuppose “a certain reality, the cancellation of which would itself cancel all internal possibility whatever.”\(^{360}\) This reality, through which the thing is posited prior to its predicates, is “absolutely necessary” (BDG 2:83). It functions

\(^{360}\) Even though Kant usually uses "real" and "reality" in a predicative sense, there are places like this sentence where he uses real or reality to mean the entirety of predicates in God as the absolutely necessary existence or what he also calls “the most real of all possible beings” (BDG 2:85). Kant’s use of “the most real being” is symptomatic of a problem that ultimately leads Kant to abandon his alternative proof for the existence of God. By Kant’s own critical standards, the maximization of the predicates of real objects in God extends the logic of the sensible into the supersensible. After all, Kant formulates his project in The Only Possible Argument as “the method of using natural science to attain cognition of God” (BDG 2:68). This is briefly discussed in the next section. A detailed examination of the relation between Kant’s argument in The Only Possible Argument and the ideal of pure reason in the first Critique requires another study.
as the foundation in terms of which the contingent – i.e., “that of which the opposite is possible” (BDG 2:83) – is ordered.

Kant argues that the absolutely necessary existence is single, simple, immutable, and eternal. (BDG 2:83-4). It “contains supreme reality” in the sense that all the data of possibility can be found in it (BDG 2:85). Kant’s description of the absolutely necessary existence in terms of reality does not reduce existence to the logic of predication. The absolutely necessary being is “the ultimate ground of possible reality.” It contains “the highest degree of real properties which could ever inhere in a thing.” That is why this being is “the most real of all possible beings, for all other beings are only possible through it alone” (BDG 2:85). Despite his use of the language of real and reality to refer to an absolutely necessary being, Kant clearly distinguishes between real predicates and their entirety. The entirety or wholeness of real predicates in a thing does not belong to these predicates. Kant emphasizes that the reference to God as “the most real of all possible beings” “is not to be understood to mean that all possible reality is included among its determinations” (BDG 2:85). Not all predicates can coexist as determinations in a single subject. The absolutely necessary being is not the locus of an aggregate of predicates. It supplies the whole in which predicates come together to make up a thing. In other words, the absolutely necessary being is the ultimate ground of the absolute positing of a thing in itself, prior to any relative positing of predicates.

Kant’s precritical account of the three categories of modality in *The Only Possible Argument* can be summed up in this way: the possibility of things presupposes their actuality, and the latter is in turn grounded in the absolutely necessary existence of God. Roughly speaking, as discussed in the second section of this chapter, the general structure
of the precritical account of possibility, actuality, and necessity forms the backbone of Kant’s critical conception of modality. The most important shift in Kant’s critical conception of modality occurs with regard to his account of the absolutely necessary existence: instead of God, the discipline of pure reason enacts a finite version of creation from nothing in its methodological self-enactment, and thus absolutely posits the possible existence of objects. The interpretation of the absolutely necessary existence in terms of the self-preservation of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason marks the transition from a precritical ontotheological conception of absolute necessity to a critical conception of absolute necessity.361

4.1.3 The modal-apodictic nature of absolute positing in the transcendental dialectic

In the first *Critique*, Kant does not clearly elaborate that his conception of being, or absolute positing or necessitation of possible existence of objects, is the apodictic modality of pure reason. Such a view is, nevertheless, implied in Kant’s discussion of the impossibility of the ontological proof of God’s existence in the transcendental dialectic. Indeed, transcendental logic (ontology) should be understood in terms of this conception of being, which after Kant’s critical turn belongs to critical methodology rather than his precritical ontotheology. Kant’s refutation of the ontological proof bears the mark of his critical conception of apodictic modality and in that way is distinct from his own precritical argument against the ontological proof.362

---

361 For sporadic formulation of Kant’s conception of modality in the ‘silent decade’ (1770s) see the following notes in his *Nachlass* (Refl 17:497, 18:125, and 18:232).

362 The ontological proof for the existence of God is of particular significance among the proofs that Kant dismisses. For Kant, the physico-theological (teleological) and cosmological proofs for the existence of God ultimately depend on the ontological proof. The rejection of the ontological proof, therefore, means the refutation of other proofs for the existence of God. In this way, Kant’s critique of the ontological proof is a critique of rationalist theology as such.
Kant starts his refutation of the ontological proof with a discussion of the concept of absolutely necessary existence. He distinguishes the objective reality of an absolutely necessary being and pure reason’s need for such an idea: “the concept of an absolutely necessary being is a pure concept of reason, i.e., a mere idea, the objective reality of which is far from being proved by the fact that reason needs it, since this only points to a certain though unattainable completeness, and properly serves more to set boundaries to the understanding than to extend it toward new objects” (KrV A592-3/B620). For Kant, the concept of absolutely necessary existence is the culmination of the natural development of human reason:

This ... is how the natural course of human reason is constituted. First it convinces itself of the existence of some necessary being. In this it recognizes an unconditioned existence. Now it seeks for the concept of something independent of all conditions, and finds it in that which is the sufficient condition for everything else, i.e., in that which contains all reality. The All without limits, however, is absolute unity, and carries with it the concept of one single being, namely the highest being; and thus reason infers that the highest being, as the original ground of all things, exists in an absolutely necessary way. (KrV A586-7/B614-5)\textsuperscript{363}

Kant describes the natural course of human reason in order to show that reason’s natural pursuit of the highest reality and absolute necessity in God inevitably leads to natural illusion. The natural course of reason must be limited (de-naturalized), if reason is not to be entangled in dialectical self-destruction. The in-itself of things should be conceived or posited in terms of human reason’s self-preservation rather than divine cognition. Being, absolute positing, or the original ground of things must be understood as the determination of the boundaries of pure reason.

\textsuperscript{363} Kant presents a version of the ontological proof that contains both conceptions of God as the supreme reality and as the absolutely necessary being. As I discuss below, Kant formulates a critical version of “absolute unity” as the a priori transcendental-speculative origin of the table of judgements.
In this spirit, Kant recasts his precritical distinction between absolute positing and relative positing in a critical framework, reiterating his negative and positive theses about being in terms of the critical method of pure reason:

*Being* is obviously not a real predicate, i.e., a concept of something that could add to the concept of a thing. It is merely the positing *[Position]* of a thing or of certain determinations in themselves. In the logical use it is merely the copula of a judgement.... the little word ‘*is*’ is not a predicate ... but only that which posits the predicate *in relation* to the subject. (KrV A598-9/B626-7)

This passage distinguishes the “merely” positing of the thing independent of its predicates and the positing of the predicates of things, or to use Kant’s language in *The Only Possible Argument*, the absolute positing and relative positing. The key difference, however, is that the absolute positing of things is not attributed to the absolutely necessary existence of God but to the absolutely positing act of pure reason or what Kant characterizes as the determination of the boundaries of pure reason. In the transcendental dialectic, Kant does not develop the critical version of his notion of absolute or merely positing. As chapter two discussed, this absolute positing or modal-apodictic necessitation belongs to the transcendental doctrine of method, and takes place in the discipline of pure reason. Hence, the existence of things consists of two kinds of positing: the absolute positing of the thing in general, which is one and the same as the self-positing of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason; and the relative positing of relational content of the thing, in which the predicate is related to the subject. The relative positing needs the absolute positing since “whatever and however much our concept of an object may contain, we have to go out

---

364 In the second edition of the first *Critique*, Kant formulates his distinction between predication and existence (as relative or absolute positing) in terms of two kinds of categories: “*mathematical*” and “*dynamical*.” The mathematical categories are those of quantity and quality, which are “concerned with objects of intuition (pure as well as empirical).” The dynamical categories are those of relation and modality, which are “directed at the existence of these objects (either in relation to each other or to the understanding)” (KrV B110). Kant seems to use the categories of relation in correspondence with relative positing and the categories of modality with absolute positing.
beyond it in order to provide it with existence” (KrV A601/B629). This movement of transcendence or going beyond the concept is the absolute positing of the thing or the absolute ground in terms of which the relation to the object and predication become possible.\textsuperscript{365} In a note in his Nachlass, written some time between 1785 and 1788, Kant makes explicit the correspondence between absolute positing and relative positing on the one hand and the modal apodicticity of pure reason and the relational objectivity of the understanding on the other hand:

By means of the predicate existence I do not add anything to the thing, rather I add the thing itself to the concept. In an existential proposition I therefore go beyond the concept, not to a predicate other than what was thought in the concept, but to the thing itself with precisely those predicates that were thought in the concept, neither more nor less, only in this case absolute positing is thought in addition to relative positing (complementum possibilitas). (Refl 18: 543)

A detailed discussion of how the critical version of absolute positing or modal necessitation makes the table of judgements systematic reveals the foundational role of apodictic modality as the absolute grounding of judgements of metaphysics and indeed the entire critical project.

4.2 The modal-apodictic or absolute grounding of the table of judgements

One cannot exaggerate the crucial significance of the table of judgements for the first Critique. According to Kant, the table of judgements is the source of the table of the categories and thus supplies the plan for the completeness of the first Critique and indeed the entire critical project. Yet, despite Kant’s claim that the systematic enumeration of judgements and thus categories “can readily be accomplished” (KrV A69/B94), it remains unclear how the table of judgements is systematic. In what does the completeness or

---

\textsuperscript{365} As discussed below, contrary to Heidegger’s ontological-phenomenological interpretation, this absolute positing is not primarily located in pure imagination. The unity of pure imagination rests on the methodological negativity of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason.
systematicity of the table of judgements consist? Where should we locate the systematic grounding of the table of judgements? Or to put it differently, how does pure reason absolutely posit possible existence in its judgements of metaphysics?\textsuperscript{366}

As discussed below, the transcendental systematicity of the table of judgements, or the absolute positing of possible existence in judgements of metaphysics, is enacted primarily in the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of pure reason. This judgement also functions as the absolute or negative-modal-apodictic ground of disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements in pure imagination. These judgements contain the modal-apodictic whole or unity of matter and form in relational, qualitative, and quantitative terms, which also systematically grounds the traditional pairing of judgements of relation, quality, and quantity.\textsuperscript{367}

\textsuperscript{366} The question of the systematicity or completeness of the table of judgements is a neglected topic in scholarship on Kant’s critical philosophy. Most interpreters overlook the question of the systematicity of the table of judgements. Among the few who engage with this question, there are two major types of approach: the first takes Kant to have gathered the table in an unsystematic empirical manner; the second discusses the a priori origin or systematicity of the table primarily in object-related – epistemological, phenomenological, etc. – terms. An example of the first type is Hegel who criticizes Kant for finding judgements rather than deducing them in their philosophical necessity: “We are all well aware that Kant’s philosophy took the easy way in its finding of the categories. ‘I,’ the unity of self-consciousness, is totally abstract and completely undetermined. So how are we to arrive at the determinations of the I, or at the categories? Fortunately, we can find the various kinds of judgement already specified empirically in the traditional logic. To judge, however, is to think a determinate ob-ject” Hegel [1830] (1991). Hegel does not appreciate that the table of judgements can be deduced transcendentally-methodologically, from the retrospective standpoint of the doctrine of method, even though Kant did not himself present a worked-out account of such deduction. Given the dominance of merely epistemological interpretations of critical philosophy, the second type of interpretation is dominant in twentieth century philosophy. A few major books that are exclusively devoted to the question of completeness of the table of judgements argue for some version of epistemological grounding of the table. Reich presents the first study of the completeness of the table of judgements. Ignoring most of Kant’s text on the completeness of the table of judgements in the first \textit{Critique}, Reich derives this table from the objective unity of apperception. See Reich [1932 & 1948] (1992). Brandt locates the systematicity of the table within an epistemic process, denying any genetic philosophical principle for the table as a whole. See Brandt [1991](1995). For another example of an epistemological account of the completeness of the table of judgements, see Wolff (1995).

\textsuperscript{367} Kant builds his unequivocal position on the irreducibility of existence to reality into the tables of judgements and categories. Assertoric judgements and existence belong to modality and are not reducible to affirmative judgements and quality. The separation of assertoric judgements and affirmative judgements, existence and reality in the tables of judgements and categories is an implication of Kant’s thesis that existence is not a predicate. Without this insight, critical philosophy degenerates into pre-Kantian rationalism.
In *Prolegomena*, referring indirectly to modality as “the unity of thinking in general,” Kant summarizes his derivation of the table of judgements and categories from a single act of the understanding in general. This act, as I discuss, is the disciplinary act of pure reason in pure or negative-modal-apodictic judging:

In order, however, to discover such a principle, I cast about for an act of the understanding that contains all the rest and that differentiates itself only through various modifications or moments in order to bring the multiplicity of representations under the unity of thinking in general; and there I found that this act of the understanding consists in judging. Here lay before me now, already finished though not yet wholly free of defects, the work of the logicians, through which I was put in the position to present a complete table of pure functions of the understanding, which were however undetermined with respect to every object. Finally, I related these functions of judging to objects in general, or rather to the condition for determining judgements as objectively valid, and there arose pure concepts of the understanding, about which I could have no doubt that precisely these only, and of them only so many, neither more nor fewer, can make up our entire cognition of things out of the bare understanding. (Prol 4:323-4)

**4.2.1 The absolute unity or whole of the table of judgements**

In his exposition of the metaphysical deduction of the categories, Kant offers two major interrelated reasons for placing the table of judgements at the beginning of the transcendental logic: first, the need to be certain with regard to the exhaustiveness and completeness of the faculty of cognition; second, the need to demonstrate that the categories arise from an organic unity and are generated systematically. The opening paragraph of the analytic of concepts explains:

If one sets a faculty of cognition into play, then on various occasions different concepts will become prominent that will make this faculty known and that can be collected in a more or less exhaustive treatise depending on whether they have been observed for a longer time or with greater acuteness. Where this investigation will
be completed can never be determined with certainty by means of this as it were mechanical procedure. Further, the concepts that are discovered only as the opportunity arises will not reveal any order and systematic unity, but will rather be ordered in pairs only according to similarities and placed in series only in accord with the magnitude of their content, from the simple to the more composite, which series are by no means systematic even if to some extent methodically produced. (KrV A66-7/B91-2)

The two reasons that Kant presents are directed at two major streams in the tradition of logic. The first stream, represented by Aristotle, has no comprehensive principle that exhausts the production of concepts. As a result, Kant thinks, in his list of the categories, Aristotle includes some derivative concepts as well as concepts that do not essentially belong to the understanding. Aristotle also misses some primary concepts that are integral to understanding (KrV A81/B107). The second stream, which is represented by Leibnizian-Wolffian school, reduces the organic systematicity of the categories to a merely logical systematicity that is based on the scholastic method. The Leibnizian-Wolffian school improves the systematicity of logic since it generates concepts “to some extent methodically.” Yet, merely relying on the principle of contradiction to organize concepts of understanding in dichotomy, the scholastic method cannot achieve the transcendental completeness or organic systematicity of metaphysical cognitions of pure reason. The organic systematicity of pure reason requires a discipline that arises immanently from pure reason itself.

Kant views the transcendental table of judgements as an attempt to address the deficiencies in Aristotle’s empirical and Wolff’s scholastic methods, aiming to make logic transcendentally systematic. Kant clearly speaks of a genetic approach and the need to focus on “the family tree [Stammbaum] of pure understanding” (KrV A82/B108) and systematically outline “ancestral concepts [Stammbegriffe] of pure understanding” (KrV
This outline primarily concerns the genetic-systematic, transcendental-methodological, completeness of the table of judgements and thus the table of categories, and it should not be mistaken for complete analytic elaboration of the categories. Highlighting the genetic-systematic connection between the transcendental tables of judgements and categories and the transcendental doctrine of method, Kant does not aim for analytic completeness: “I deliberately spare myself the definitions of these categories in this treatise, although I should like to be in possession of them. In the sequel I will analyze these concepts to the degree that is sufficient in relation to the doctrine of method that I am working up” (KrV A83/B108-9, italics added). The transcendental doctrine of method, as Kant indicates, is the culminating point or systematic ground of the first Critique. It functions as the ground from which the genetic systematicity of the table of judgements derives.

After indicating the systematic connection between the transcendental table of judgements and the transcendental doctrine of method, Kant immediately points to the absolute character of the transcendental systematic unity of pure reason as the source of the table of judgements and thereby the table of categories:

Transcendental philosophy has the advantage but also the obligation to seek its concepts in accordance with a principle, since they spring pure and unmixed from the understanding, as absolute unity, and must therefore be connected among themselves in accordance with a concept or idea. Such a connection, however, provides a rule by means of which the place of each pure concept of the understanding and the completeness of all of them together can be determined a priori, which would otherwise depend upon whim or chance. (KrV A67/B92)

Kant points to the moment of original formation of pure concepts of understanding, that is, the generation of the absolute unity or embryonic whole from which these concepts arise and organically find their place within the absolute unity. It is only due to this organic
formation of categories out of the absolute unity of pure reason that the table of categories can be exhaustive and systematic. Even though the categories of understanding proper appear first in the order of presentation in the first Critique, in transcendental-systematic (genetic) terms, they are secondary to the critical or disciplinary method of pure reason. That is to say, prior to the formation of the categories in the understanding, pure reason must generate the a priori ends for which they can be used in the transcendental doctrine of method. Without the genetic necessity of the discipline of pure reason, the categories lack an exhaustive and immanent principle.

In the metaphysical deduction, Kant requires presupposing the absolute unity or whole underlying the table of judgements, without discussing the nature and production of this unity. As Kant shows in the transcendental dialectic, the absolute unity of the table is not the idea of God (KrV A587/B615). It cannot belong to the unity of apperception either. To be sure, “the principle of the synthetic unity of apperception is the supreme principle of all use of the understanding” (KrV B136). But the legitimate use of the understanding in apperception presupposes the determination of the boundaries of this use in the discipline of pure reason. Neither can any conception of judgement or capacity to judge, which is defined primarily in terms of the object-relatedness of the understanding, supply the absolute unity or whole of the table of judgements. The absolute unity or grounding of the table of judgements belongs to reason and must be enacted as an embryonic whole that forms the natural spontaneity of reason. This absolute sense of reason cannot be found anywhere but in the modal-apodictic self-enactment of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason.

---

368 The generation of the a priori ends that the categories can pursue, discussed in chapters two and three, takes place in the transcendental doctrine of method. This generation in the discipline, canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason corresponds with the apodictic, disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements of pure reason.
reason. This negative sense constitutes the absolute form of the critical system of pure reason as it determines the boundaries of pure reason and thus organically determines the paradigmatic logic operating within these boundaries, i.e. the transcendental logic.\textsuperscript{369}

Kant’s discussion of the metaphysical deduction, nevertheless, implies that the absolute whole or unity underlying the table of judgements and thus the table of categories is the apodictic judgement of pure reason, i.e., the judgement through which pure reason enacts or disciplines itself as a whole or system of possible ends. The transcendental table of judgements is the family tree [\textit{Stammbaum}] of pure understanding whose root is the apodictic judgement of pure reason, the judgement that forms the critical system in its absolute form. This conclusion becomes explicit, if we follow Kant’s steps in the metaphysical deduction. Kant arrives at the transcendental table of judgements by taking two major steps: first, establishing the judgement in general as the source from which the concepts or acts of understanding can be exhaustively derived; second, supplying four explanatory paragraphs to justify the addition or reinterpretation of apodictic, disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements. Kant’s plan to render the traditional tables of judgements and categories transcendentally systematic rests on demonstrating the presence of a

\textsuperscript{369} Most interpretations of the systematicity of the table of judgements miss the methodological character of the “absolute unity” as the centerpiece of metaphysical deduction, the transcendental-speculative source, of the categories. The absolute unity requires articulating a sense of pure reason in complete abstraction from sensibility. Presenting the unity of apperception as the absolute unity of the table of judgements ignores the necessity of abstraction from sensibility for the table of judgements. E.g., Reich ignores the non-relational nature of this absolute unity in identifying it with the object-related unity of apperception. Reich discusses ‘I think’ without saying anything about the formation of ‘I think’ as that which accompanies all representations. Reich [1932&1948] (1992), pp. 21-29. Brandt denies any major significance of the absolute unity for transcendental philosophy. He presents a brief genetic account of the table of judgements only in historical terms, claiming that the philosophical “derivation of the pure concepts of the understanding from the absolute unity of the understanding would render the table of judgements superfluous” Brandt [1991](1995), p. 126 & p. 48. Brandt also ignores that without deriving the table of judgements from the absolute unity of pure reason Kant’s claim on the completeness of tables of judgements and categories lacks any philosophical foundation. For a criticism of Kant’s classification of the table of judgements, see Lovejoy (1907). Lovejoy ignores the absolute whole underlying the table of judgements. His interpretation fails to capture the principle that governs the division of the table.
special act of reason in apodictic, disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements. This special act generates the whole of possible ends of reason in modal, relational, qualitative, and quantitative terms.

4.2.2 The apodictic judgement: reason’s Last Judgement as the absolute unity of the table of judgements

In the first step, Kant justifies the derivation of pure concepts of understanding from judgements: pure concepts of understanding can be derived from judgements since the ends (cognitions) for which these concepts are generated in essence belong to judgements. It is in this sense that Kant sets himself the task of the “analysis of the faculty of understanding itself ... by seeking a priori concepts only in the understanding as their birthplace and analyzing its pure use in general” (KrV A65/B90). At its core, this analysis aims to capture the categories in their genetic formation, in the pure use of understanding in judgements. For Kant, the categories are public or universal means. The ends of the categories are generated in the pure use of understanding in judgements. Concepts or acts of understanding are means used in and for judging. The a priori ends of pure concepts of understanding, or the a priori ends in pursuit of which the understanding forms its acts, therefore, can be found in and derived from a priori ends of judgements.

Kant uses the language of “functions” to justify the derivation of pure concepts from judgements, and to describe the organic operation of pure concepts within a judgement.

---

370 Kant takes judgements to be unities of actions of understanding or unities of mind in which concepts are used. In Jäsche Logic, Kant argues against confusing judgements with concepts: “It is a mere tautology to speak of universal or common concepts – a mistake that is grounded in an incorrect division of concepts into universal, particular, and singular. Concepts themselves cannot be so divided, but only their use” (Log 9:91). That is to say, concepts can be divided only in terms of the ways (ends) in (for) which they are used in judgements. The relation between judgements and concepts is in analogy with that of whole (unity) and parts (e.g., subject-concepts and predicate-concepts).

371 Chapter three has discussed the categories of understanding as universal means or essential ends of pure reason.
Concepts rest on “functions” i.e., “the unity of the action or ordering different representations under a common one” (KrV A68/B93); “all judgements are ... functions of unity among our representations” (KrV A69/B94). These functions are unities of action or acts of understanding. Therefore, “we can ... trace all actions of the understanding back to judgements” (KrV A69/B93), i.e., to the unities in terms of which these actions are generated and organized. In this way, the “functions of the understanding can ... all be found together if one can exhaustively exhibit the functions of unity in judgements” (KrV A69/B94).

Kant discusses the judgement in its most general sense, in terms of “a faculty for judging,” which is “a faculty for thinking” (KrV A69/B94). At this point, Kant considers this faculty in purely methodological terms, in abstraction from objects. Kant reiterates this point about the table of categories: “This division is systematically generated from a common principle, namely the faculty for judging (which is the same as the faculty for thinking)” (KrV A81/B106).372

The centrality of judgement in the *metaphysical* deduction of the categories is neither accidental nor primarily epistemological. In critical philosophy, a judgement of

---

372 Here I take the faculty of judging or thinking to refer to the most basic methodological moment of critique in the discipline of pure reason. It is only the discipline of pure reason, or critique as pure reason’s self-preservation, that can be a common principle for all acts of understanding and reason. Critique is primarily pure reason’s self-preservation or self-enactment, which as I have discussed in chapter two, rests on the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of discipline. That is to say, the negative judgement of discipline makes all judgements of metaphysics systematic and thus functions as the foundation of the table of judgements. Differently put, Kant’s reference to the faculty of judging or thinking concerns what is known as the subjective deduction of the categories. The subjective deduction is in essence methodological and, as Kant states in his preface to the first edition of the first *Critique*, determines how “the faculty of thinking” is “itself possible” (KrV Axvii). Kant’s focus on the objective deduction of the categories and his inadequate discussion of the subjective deduction have motivated some interpreters to reduce this critical-methodological moment, which is foundational to the table of judgements, to a merely epistemological capacity in the understanding. For an example of reduction of the methodological or disciplinary ground of the faculty of thinking or judging to an epistemological “capacity to judge,” see Longuenesse [1993] (1998). This reduction is usually justified by invoking Kant’s merely logical or object-related definitions of judgement, does not engage with the most basic sense of judgement in critical philosophy, and overlooks the transcendental-speculative nature of Kant’s critical conception of judging as a retrospective self-enactment of pure reason prior to the object-related sense of judgement. This reductive interpretation of critical philosophy cannot explain in what sense Kant calls his deduction metaphysical and what is metaphysical about the origin of the categories in general.
metaphysics is primarily a negative or disciplinary judgement. In this sense, a judgement 
[Urteil] is a retrospective formation [Bildung], discipline, or whole whose matter – 
elements, parts, or Teile – is negatively embryonically formed.373 In other words, 
judgements of metaphysics are necessarily structurally eschatological. They are concerned 
with redeeming metaphysical ends of human reason in terms of transcendental-logical 
functions of judgements.374 In a structural sense, all judgements of metaphysics are enacted 
as species of the last judgement. In critical philosophy, the last judgement is the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of the discipline of pure reason, which determines the 
boundaries of pure reason or enacts pure reason’s faith/belief in itself. This boundary-
determination limits sensibility, imagination, or time, and negatively refers to the 
supersensible or eternity. In his late essay The end of all things, Kant explains how he 
understands eternity in terms of boundary-determination. Eternity is not “a time 
proceeding to infinity; for then the person would indeed never get outside time but would 
always progress only from one time into another”; eternity is “an end of all time along with 
the person’s uninterrupted duration; but this duration (considering its existence as a 
magnitude) as a magnitude (duratio Noumenon) wholly incomparable with time, of which 
we are obviously able to form no concept (except a merely negative one)” (EaD 8:327). The 
negative concept of eternity is the boundary or systematic ground of the positive concept of 
time. All object-related judgements of metaphysics take place in or presuppose

373 At different points, Kant presents different definitions of judgements. E.g., see (KrV A68/B93), (KrV B141), 
and (Log 9:101). All these definitions presuppose the negative judgement of discipline in the transcendental 
doctrine of method. The neglect towards the methodological (disciplinary) nature of judgement in critical 
philosophy is common to merely epistemological interpretations of critical philosophy. For Kant, the 
predicative judgements cannot function without the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of pure reason, 
which establishes the disciplinary unity of functions prior to the object-related functions of unity. 
374 Of course, in critical philosophy, the discipline of pure reason mediates these ends in terms of the needs of 
human reason rather than letting them be pursued enthusiastically.
imagination. The negative-modal-apodictic judgement of reason is the only judgement that limits rather than presuppose imagination or time. In this sense, it is the last judgement. In Kant’s presentation of the table of judgements, the apodictic judgement is literally the last judgement, genetically grounding all judgements of metaphysics.

The negative-modal-apodictic judgement, the finite form of the Last Judgement in human reason, is the genus. All object-related judgements of metaphysics are species of the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of discipline, the judgement by which pure reason redeems its natural metaphysical spontaneity. This judgement, or the disciplinary self-enactment of pure reason which remains concealed in relation to objects, is the transcendental-speculative origin/end of object-related judgements of metaphysics and thus the categories in general. Without appreciating the eschatological structure of object-related judgements of metaphysics, the metaphysical deduction of the categories loses its meaning, and critical philosophy starts to degenerate into naturalism.\textsuperscript{375} The metaphysical deduction of the categories is the derivation of the categories from the single simple disciplinary method of metaphysics. The “complete coincidence” of the categories in general with “the universal logical functions of thinking”, which is supposed to establish the a priori origin of the categories (KrV B159), is not a simple coincidence, and requires the generation of pure reason as a whole or the determination of the boundaries of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason. The first Critique performs the primacy of the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of discipline in its structure: the transcendental doctrine of

\textsuperscript{375} As discussed below, the table of judgements is grounded in the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of discipline. The few who engage with the table of judgements deny the genetic grounding of the table of judgements. E.g. Brandt claims: “The table metaphor does not suggest ... a genetic principle” Brandt [1991](1995), p. 60. Brandt’s claim cannot account for Kant’s reference to “the origin of the a priori categories in general” (KrV B159, italics added). The categories in general can have a single a priori origin only if all judgements of metaphysics are grounded in the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of discipline, which belongs to the genetic critical method of metaphysics.
method that makes the faculty of judging or thinking possible systematically forms the transcendental doctrine of elements. Despite the significance of transcendental reflection in formation of concepts in judgements, Kant’s critical conception of judgement cannot be primarily explained in terms of reflection. This conception of judgement belongs to the discipline of pure reason, and it is primarily transcendental-speculative rather than transcendental-reflective.\footnote{For an interpretation that attempts to explain away the metaphysical core of Kant’s theory of judgement, see Longuenesse [1993] (1998). Longuenesse presents Kant’s conception of judgement in a manner that excludes the negative-modal-apodictic judgement of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason. The reduction of the transcendental speculation of pure reason in the discipline of pure reason to transcendental reflection is central to Longuenesse’s interpretation. This reduction of transcendental-methodological speculation to transcendental reflection is also one of the common features of most versions of anti-Kantian Hegelianism and anti-Hegelian Kantianism.}

In the second major step of metaphysical deduction, Kant “abstracts from all content of a judgement in general” in order to “attend only to the mere form of the understanding in it” (KrV A70/B95). Through this abstraction, the mere form of the understanding, or the function of thinking, in judgement in general appears in quantitative, qualitative, relational, and modal terms. This set of functions “depart(s) in several points, although not essential ones, from the customary technique of the logicians” (KrV A70-1/B96).\footnote{By “essential points” Kant refers to the essential points of the traditional table of judgements consisting of pairs such as universal and particular judgements, affirmative and negative judgements.} Kant justifies his additional functions (judgements) as well as his reinterpretation of some of the traditional functions in four paragraphs. These paragraphs are the cornerstone of Kant’s plan to make the traditional table of judgements transcendentally systematic. Be it inadequately, they demonstrate the critical-methodological systematicity or completeness of the table of judgements. In particular, these explanatory paragraphs indicate the transcendental-systematic role of the apodictic judgement in generating the whole of possible ends of pure reason in modal, relational, qualitative, and quantitative terms.
In order to appreciate Kant’s derivation of the table of judgements from the disciplinary method of pure reason, we need to engage with the four explanatory paragraphs in reverse order, starting from the title of modality, particularly from the apodictic judgement as the last judgement of pure reason. As discussed in chapter two, the critical-methodological derivation or metaphysical deduction of the categories is a transcendental-speculative retrospection that runs contrary to Kant’s order of presentation.\(^{378}\) Among functions of unity in a judgement, those under titles of quantity, quality, and relation cannot supply the wholeness of a judgement in general and thereby ground the table of judgements. Despite being abstracted from sensible content, these functions, which belong to the transcendental logic proper, presuppose the possible givenness or existence of objects in sensibility. The absolute unity underlying the table of judgements can be captured only through a more radical abstraction, one from empirical \(\textit{and} \) transcendental-objective content. This abstraction, which presents reason in its self-relation, takes place in judgements of modality.

Kant starts his paragraph on modality by acknowledging the special function of judgements of modality in the table of judgements.\(^{379}\)

The modality of judgements is a quite special function of them, which is distinctive in that it contributes nothing to the content of the judgement (for besides quantity, quality, and relation there is nothing more that constitutes the content of a judgement), but rather concerns only the value of the copula in relation to thinking in general. \textit{Problematic} judgements are those in which one regards the assertion or

\(^{378}\) As discussed in previous chapters, Kant presents his exposition in the first \textit{Critique} and also the table of the categories and judgements in a synthetic order. This is not merely a technical procedure in presentation. This order of presentation in the first \textit{Critique} reflects the natural history of pure reason in its movement from its childhood to adolescence and then to mature adulthood. The whole \(\text{(life)}\) of pure reason is the starting point of pure reason only in a critical-methodological or de-naturalized sense.

\(^{379}\) In the three other explanatory paragraphs, Kant does not explain the meaning of titles of relation, quality, and quantity. Instead, he discusses judgements under these titles, particularly the three judgements that on Kant’s account exclusively belong to the transcendental logic proper: disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements.
denial as merely possible (arbitrary). Assertoric judgements are those in which it is considered actual (true). Apodictic judgements are those in which it is seen as necessary. (KrV A74-5/B99-100) 380

In Kant’s account, problematic judgements (“it is possible that ‘S is P’”), assertoric judgements (“it is true that ‘S is P’”), and apodictic judgements (“it is necessary that ‘S is P’”) are concerned merely with pure reason’s self-relation rather than relation to objects. In Jäsche Logic, Kant explains the abstraction of the modal reason: the “determination of merely possible or actual or necessary truth concerns only the judgement itself, then, not in any way the thing about which we judge” (Log 9:109). The whole of judgement, or “the judgement itself,” is its modality. The modality concerns “the relation of the whole judgement [des ganzen Urteils] to the faculty of cognition” (Log 9:108). In other words, despite abstracting “from all content of a judgement in general” (KrV A70/B95), judgements of relation, quality, and quantity are not completely abstracted from sensibility in general as they presuppose possible existence of objects. Modality does not make such presupposition but investigates whether judgements are logically possible, true, or necessary. Generally speaking, modal judgements are judgements about/of judgements, through which pure reason establishes a merely logical, actual, or necessary relation to itself. They are modes of pure judging, three types of modal abstraction, presupposed in object-related judgements of metaphysics.381 Modality represents “moments of thinking in general” (KrV A76/B101), in complete abstraction from the content of judgements,

380 In the table of categories, Kant uses Dasein (existence) rather than Wirklichkeit (actuality) even though he seems to mean the same.

381 In its most original form, pure judging is negative-modal-apodictic judging. This judging purifies reason of its illusions and errors. Kant explains the crucial significance of negative-modal-apodictic judging in critical philosophy: “But where the limits of our possible cognition are narrow, where the temptation to judge is great, where the illusion that presents itself is very deceptive, and where the disadvantage of error is very serious, there the negative in instruction, which serves merely to defend us from errors, is more important than many a positive teaching by means of which our cognition could be augmented” (KrV A709/B737).
whereas relation, quality, and quantity are concerned with moments of object-related and therefore predicative thinking.\textsuperscript{382} Appreciating the crucial role of the apodictic modality of pure reason as the transcendental-systematic form of thinking in general for all object-related judgements is central to the systematic grounding of metaphysics independent of the existence or non-existence of objects.\textsuperscript{383}

At the end of the quoted passage, Kant inserts a footnote identifying the higher faculties that generate the three modal judgements: “It is just as if in the first case thought were a function of the understanding, in the second of the power of judgement, and in the third of reason. This is a remark the elucidation of which can be expected only in the sequel” (KrV A76/B101).\textsuperscript{384} In the footnote, which is often ignored in interpretations of the

\textsuperscript{382} As three types of modal abstraction, problematic, assertoric, and apodictic judgements refer to merely logical, transcendental-objective, and critical-methodological abstraction. The uniqueness of critical-methodological abstraction lies in its generative ability to form the matter as distinct from the arbitrariness of the merely logical abstraction in relation to matter and the presupposition of possible existence in transcendental-objective abstraction.

\textsuperscript{383} In the analytic of principles, Kant reiterates the genetic-methodological significance of modality. In the first book of the analytic of principles, Kant discusses modality in terms of “the quintessential whole of time [Zeitbegriff]” (KrV A145/B184), i.e., the temporal form of the discipline of pure reason in pure imagination. In the second book of the analytic of principles, Kant discusses modality as “Postulates of empirical thinking in general.” Kant explains the separateness of modality in a manner that suggests the categories of modality are not categories in the strict sense: “The categories of modality have this peculiarity: as a determination of the object they do not augment the concept to which they are ascribed in the least, but rather express only the relation to the faculty of cognition. If the concept of a thing is already entirely complete, I can still ask about this object whether it is merely possible, or also actual, or, if it is the latter, whether it is also necessary” (KrV A219/B266, italics added). The thinking of a thing requires postulates of empirical thinking in general but these postulates do not belong to the thing proper. The postulates are distinct from transcendental-objective principles in axioms of intuition, anticipations of perception, and analogies of experience: “The principles of modality are not ... objective-synthetic, since the predicates of possibility, actuality, and necessity do not in the least augment the concept of which they are asserted in such a way as to add something to the representation of the object. But since they are nevertheless always synthetic, they are so only subjectively, i.e., they add to the concept of a thing (the real), about which they do not otherwise say anything, the cognitive power whence it arises and has its seat, so that, if it is merely connected in the understanding with the formal conditions of experience, its object is called possible; if it is in connection with perception (sensation, as the matter of the senses), and through this determined by means of the understanding, then the object is actual; and if it is determined through the connection of perceptions in accordance with concepts, then the object is called necessary” (KrV A233-4/B286, italics added); “The principles of modality therefore do not assert of a concept anything other than the action of the cognitive faculty through which it is generated” (KrV A234/B287).

\textsuperscript{384} This key footnote exemplifies Kant’s deferral of a complete sense of critique throughout the first Critique. In its most basic sense, critique must remain a promise of redemption.
metaphysical deduction of the categories, Kant speaks of reason as the a priori source of the apodictic judgement.\footnote{For an interpretation of Kant's conception of modality that ignores his footnote and the fundamental role of the apodictic judgement of pure reason as the systematic form of thought, see Longuenesse [1993] (1998), pp. 157-161. Focusing on object-related definitions of judgement, Longuenesse overlooks the most fundamental or genetic form of judgement in critical philosophy: the negative judgement of discipline. From a critical-methodological standpoint, judging is primarily the negativity (discipline) that gives unity to the functions of unity. All judgements in the table of judgements are modifications, or if you like species, of the negative judgement of discipline. For a logical-formalistic interpretation of Kant's conception of modality as "epistemic operators" see Wilson (1978).} This sense of reason is primarily self-relational, critical-methodological, or transcendentally negative, and remains irreducible to dialectical and moral senses of reason. In its dialectical and moral senses, reason operates in relational terms and, illegitimately or legitimately, presupposes the possible existence or non-existence of objects.\footnote{The sense of reason in the footnote is not the same that is implied in the correspondence between "understanding, the power of judgement, and reason" with "concepts, judgements, and inferences" (KrV A130/B169). As I have discussed in chapter two, reason in the transcendental dialectic is taken primarily as an extension of the understanding into the supersensible. By contrast, reason in its critical-methodological sense instructs (disciplines) itself. Critical philosophy considers the critical-methodological sense of reason, which sets the boundaries of pure reason in self-relational negativity, to be its primary sense.} The critical-methodological sense of pure reason, or reason's boundary determination, is transcendental-speculative. As a critical version of Kant's precritical conception of absolute positing, the critical-methodological sense of pure reason completely abstracts from sensibility and yet necessitates the possible existence of sensible objects.

In the second edition of the first Critique, Kant makes a remark with regard to the categories, which can be illuminating with regard to the pivotal role of the apodictic judgement in the transcendental systematicity of the table of judgements. Explaining the triadic division of categories under each title, Kant writes: "each class always has the same number of categories, namely three, which calls for reflection, since otherwise all a priori division by means of concepts must be a dichotomy. But here the third category always
arises from the combination of the first two in its class” (KrV B110). Kant explains his point for each title: “allness (totality) is nothing other than plurality considered as a unity, limitation is nothing other than reality combined with negation, community is the causality of a substance in the reciprocal determination of others, finally necessity is nothing other than the existence that is given by possibility itself” (KrV B111). Kant seems to suggest that the third categories somehow contain the first and second ones. The third categories represent a whole – i.e., necessity, community, limitation, or totality – in modal, relational, qualitative, or quantitative terms. The whole represented in the third category functions as the synthetic unity of the first and second categories. That the third category or the whole is arrived at through the combination of the first and second categories does not diminish the systematic significance of the third category. In a remark, which also gives us insight into Kant’s conception of critical-methodological retrospection or retroactivity, Kant emphasizes that “one should not think that the third category is ... a merely derivative one and not an ancestral concept of pure understanding.” The derivative concepts, or what Kant calls “predicables of pure understanding” (KrV A82/B108), have no place in the table of categories.

387 In the last part of his paragraph on modality, Kant writes: “Now since everything here is gradually incorporated into the understanding, so that one first judges something problematically, then assumes it assertorically as true, and finally asserts it to be inseparably connected with the understanding, i.e., asserts it as necessary and apodictic” (KrV A76/B101). Similar to the order of presentation in the first Critique, Kant presents the order of judgements of modality contrary to the order of transcendental grounding that is implied in the footnote. For an interpretation that fails to distinguish these two orders of grounding, see Brandt [1991] (1995). Ignoring the primacy of the apodicticity of the critical method, Brandt writes: “Associated with this methodology is a process of subjective assent and gradual acceptance”; “The three moments of modality are presented as three stages in one epistemic process. The path leads from an arbitrary assumption (albeit one not lacking in motivation) to knowledge of necessity” Brandt [1991] (1995), pp. 82 & 83. Brandt does not appreciate that, in a transcendental-methodological sense, the knowledge of necessity is the necessity of knowledge, i.e., the disciplinary self-enactment of pure reason underlying all human knowledge.
Most importantly, Kant conceives of the third category in a manner to involve a special act or function that is necessary for the combination of the first and second categories in the same title: “the combination of the first and second in order to bring forth the third concept requires a special act of the understanding, which is not identical with that act performed in the first and second” (KrV B111).\textsuperscript{388} Kant gives an example: “how one substance can be the cause of something in another substance, is not to be understood immediately by combining the concept of a \textit{cause} and that of a \textit{substance}. From this it is clear that a special act of the understanding is requisite for this; and likewise in the other cases” (KrV B111). Although Kant does not discuss this special act in detail, it is notable that Kant characterizes all four acts of understanding in the third categories as “a special act of the understanding,” implying the essential oneness of this act regardless of the form it takes under each title.

This special act, which forms the whole of a judgement in modal, relational, qualitative, and quantitative terms, is what the systematicity of the table of judgements and thereby the table of the categories rests on. Given that the categories are in essence “simple acts of reason” (KrV A xiv) in judgements, we can describe Kant’s remark in terms of the moments in the table of judgements. Accordingly, we need to take the last (third) judgement under each title to be including the first and the second judgements. Yet, the last judgement is not a mechanical combination of the first and second judgements. How does Kant understand the inclusion of the first and second judgements in the last judgement without implying that the first and second judgements under each title are derivative and

\textsuperscript{388} Kant’s addition of this remark in the second edition of the first \textit{Critique} indicates his increasing appreciation of the need to help the reader distinguish between the order of presentation and the order of transcendental grounding in the first \textit{Critique}. The remark implies pure reason’s retrospective power of appropriation.
therefore should not be assigned a distinct place in the table of judgements? In what sense can the first and second judgments presuppose the third judgement without being simply reducible to it? How to make sense of the special act of understanding and its place in the third judgements?

Kant’s footnote on the a priori origin of the three judgements of modality indicates the nature of the special act of the understanding in the third judgements and categories under each title. In the footnote, Kant presents reason as the a priori source of the apodictic judgement and thus the category of necessity. Given that Kant characterizes a special act of the understanding in terms of an essential oneness in the third categories, the essential oneness of this special act belongs to reason in its modal-apodictic sense. In speaking of “a special act of the understanding,” Kant uses understanding in a general rather than restricted sense. It is the faculty of reason that is concerned with the formation of a whole and absolute grounding of acts of the understanding proper in the first judgements and the acts of the power of judgement in the second judgements. In the first judgements, the understanding is used merely logically. In the second judgements, the understanding is used in the power of judgement. In the third judgements, these uses of the understanding are systematically grounded in terms of a whole that belongs to negative-modal-apodictic reason.

The special act is first and foremost the critical-methodological self-enactment of pure reason in the apodictic judgement of discipline, or the formation of critical (systematic) reason in complete abstraction from sensibility. This self-enactment generates the synthetic whole of synthetic a priori judgements in which the subject-concept relates to the predicate-concept beyond itself, forming the whole of possible ends that the
understanding and the power of judgement can pursue. Without this original self-enactment, acts of understanding and the power of judgement in the first and second judgements remain detached from the systematic whole of pure reason in which they perform their functions of unity. The special act, which is originally the transcendental-methodological function of all transcendental-objective functions of unity, forms the whole of pure reason in its modal sense, and has “the special job” (KrV A709/B737) of a priori correction or preventing dialectical errors. As examined in chapter two, Kant discusses this special act, or self-enactment of pure reason, under the name of the discipline of pure reason. Performing the transcendental-speculative retrospection of reason, the special act forms the reason of human species as thinking in general, as a transcendental system or whole of possible ends.

Kant’s interest in the third judgements lies primarily in the fact that they contain the special act of pure reason, the discipline of pure reason, and generate the whole of pure reason in relational, qualitative, or quantitative terms. The finite human reason can generate a unity or whole in relation to objects only in re-enacting the original negativity of the special act – the absolute positing – of pure reason in its apodictic judgements. In this light, the last judgement under titles of relation, quality, and quantity represents the last judgement of critical philosophy, the apodictic judgement of pure reason. While the first and second judgements are concerned with the judgement merely in predicative terms, the third judgements situate the judgement in terms of its place within the cognition in general or the faculty of thinking in general. The third is neither the first nor the second and yet it contains both in a transcendental-speculative (genetic) sense. This thoroughgoing determination of the judgement in quantitative, qualitative, and relational terms
transcendently-systematically grounds the predicative judgements of quantity, quality, and relation.\textsuperscript{389}

4.2.3 The apodictic grounding of predicative judgements

As discussed above, the apodictic judgement of pure reason forms the transcendental-speculative whole, the critical-methodological necessitation, or the absolute positing of relation between the subject and the predicate. The apodictic judgement is the genus of synthetic a priori judgements. The understanding can go beyond the subject-concept to the predicate-concept only if pure reason absolutely posits such relation in the apodictic judgement. As the methodological ground or transcendental-systematic form of all judgements of metaphysics, the apodictic judgement grounds the predicative logic of understanding in relation to objects. This grounding, formative of the transcendental logic, takes place through re-enacting the apodictic judgement of pure reason, the modal whole

\textsuperscript{389} In relation to objects, the special act of the understanding, or the discipline of pure reason, takes the form of transcendental reflection. Transcendental reflection is the re-enactment of the discipline of pure reason in relational terms in pure imagination. Transcendental reflection is the “action through which I make the comparison of representations in general with the cognitive power in which they are situated” (KrV A261/B317). Transcendental reflection is the transcendental-methodological speculation of reason in its relational form: “It is the consciousness of the relation of given representations to our various sources of cognitions, through which alone their relation among themselves can be correctly determined” (KrV A260/B316). Transcendental reflection is necessary for organizing the theoretical use of the understanding in the discipline of pure reason, prior to relation to objects in sensibility. Such organization is necessary since judgements of metaphysics are not immediately (intuitively) certain, and therefore it is necessary to attend to the grounds of truth of these judgements. Transcendental reflection, as Kant says, is the preparation for formation of concepts with regard to objects. It establishes the ground upon which the grounds of truth, the sources of representations in pure imagination, are identified. This identification takes place through comparing representations in terms of their belonging to the pure understanding or to pure intuition. In \textit{Jäsche Logic}, Kant emphasizes the role of reflection and abstraction in concept-formation. Discussing the “logical origin of concepts,” Kant writes: the “origin of concepts as to mere form rests on reflection and on abstraction from the difference among things that are signified by a certain representation.” He adds, the “logical actus of the understanding, through which concepts are generated as to their form, are: 1. \textit{Comparison [Vergleichung]} of representations among one another in relation to the unity of consciousness; 2. \textit{reflection [Überlegung]} as to how various representations can be conceived in one consciousness; and finally 3. \textit{abstraction} of everything else in which the given representations differ” (Log 9:94). In short, comparison of concepts requires transcendental reflection, in which it is determined “how various representations can be conceived in one consciousness.” Transcendental reflection in turn requires a transcendental abstraction that functions as the negative condition to separate the concept from other ones. This separation of the concept forms it as a whole, repeating the movement of reason in the discipline of pure reason in relation to other concepts.
of possible ends of pure reason, in relational, qualitative, and quantitative terms in pure imagination. This re-enactment is in essence the re-enactment of the discipline of pure reason, the special act of reason, in object-related terms as the whole or domain [Umfang] of the subject, the whole of possible predicates, and the whole of possible relations between the subject and the predicate in object-related judgements of metaphysics. Without the transcendental determination of the relational whole, qualitative whole, and quantitative whole, no use of the understanding in metaphysical cognitions (judgements) can be completely – i.e., organically-systematically – determined. In the transcendental doctrine of method, Kant speaks of these systematic conditions under the name of the canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason. The disjunctive judgement, in which the relational species of the apodictic judgement is enacted, generates the whole of possible relations (final ends) in judgements of metaphysics. The infinite judgement, in which the qualitative species of the apodictic judgement is enacted, generates the whole of possible predicates (essential ends) in judgements of metaphysics. The singular judgement, in which the quantitative species of the apodictic judgement is enacted, generates the whole of the

390 To be sure, in the analytic of principles, Kant describes the synthesis of the subject and the predicate in terms of time and pure imagination, but the synthetic function of imagination itself rests on the underlying role of the modal-apodictic reason in the unity of apperception: “If it is thus conceded that one must go beyond a given concept in order to compare it synthetically with another, then a third thing is necessary in which alone the synthesis of two concepts can originate. But now what is this third thing, as the medium of all synthetic judgements? There is only one whole [Inbegriff] in which all of our representations are contained, namely inner sense and its a priori form, time. The synthesis of representations rests on the imagination, but their synthetic unity (which is requisite for judgement), on the unity of apperception” (KrV A155/B194). The unity of apperception is the re-enactment of the discipline of pure reason in the object-related terms of a theoretical cognition.

391 This re-enactment of the apodictic judgement in pure imagination – as disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements – is the ground of synthesis in general. It is in this sense that Kant describes “synthesis in general” as “the mere effect of the imagination” (KrV A78/B103). The apodictic judgement enacts the original unity of all a priori synthesis in pure imagination. The genus of synthetic a priori judgements is the apodictic judgement of pure reason. In his discussion of the central question of the first Critique (how are synthetic a priori judgements possible?), Kant focuses on the objective aspect of this question and does not clarify the role of the apodictic judgement as the genus of synthetic a priori judgements.
subject (individual ends) in judgements of metaphysics. Disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgments redeem reason’s objective incompleteness in the supersensible in pure imagination. They are indispensable for transcendental logic since their essence lies in the delimitation of the whole of possible relations, qualities, and quantities. That is to say, these judgements respectively enact the canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason. The last judgements under titles of relation, quality, and quantity contain the special act of reason and as a result point to the whole in which the first and second judgements of the same title operate systematically.\footnote{Generally speaking, Kant’s transcendental table of judgements can be taken as a critical version of the medieval doctrine of the transcendentals. This doctrine is primarily concerned with articulating the relation among the categories, the transcendentals, and the divine. A general schema seems to be common among multiple versions of the medieval doctrine of the transcendentals: on the one hand, the transcendentals or primary divine names — i.e., being, one, true, and good — ground the categories, and, on the other hand, the transcendentals are ways of connecting to the divine. God is beyond the categories but is connected to the transcendentals. See Aertsen (1996), pp. 71-112. Kant presents his philosophy as a critical version of “the transcendental philosophy of the ancients.” He quotes the scholastic proposition “\textit{quodlibet ens est unum, verum, bonum} (every thing is one, true, and good),” and traces the origin of “these supposedly transcendental predicates of things in nothing other than logical requisites and criteria of all cognition of things in general” (KrV B 113-114). Kant presents the one\textit{ness}, trueness, and goodness of things through singular, infinite, and disjunctive judgements, which in turn are grounded in the negative-modal-apodictic judgement, self-cognition of pure reason, or being as absolute positing. The self-cognition of reason functions as the methodological criterion of all cognition of things in general. Despite Kant’s break with the scholastic approach, there seems to be a certain structural parallel between critical philosophy and the generic version of the medieval doctrine of transcendentals. Kant transposes the distinction between the categories and the transcendentals in the medieval doctrine of transcendentals into the distinction between the relational-objective and modal-apodictic notions of the transcendental, or the distinction between singular, infinite, and disjunctive judgements on the one hand and the apodictic judgement on the other hand. Prior to Kant, modalities were not included among the categories. Kant finds this inclusion necessary for his critical-methodological account of the immanent generation of the logic of objects. Also, similar to the transcendentals, Kant’s modal-apodictic judgement refers to the divine but strictly negatively-methodologically. In critical philosophy, the divine takes the form of the necessary need or the negative apodictic modality of pure reason. The negative-modal transcendental apodicticity of pure reason – enacted in negative judgements of discipline – in turn grounds the transcendental logic proper. The division between modal and relational senses of transcendental, absolute positing and relative positing seems to be structurally similar to Scotus’ account of one, true, and good as the three attributes of being. As King describes: “Scotus identifies three proper attributes of being: one, true, and good. These features are coextensive with being, but each adds something distinctive to the notion of a being, something apart from being itself. What each one is, then, involves something other than being itself, and so ‘being’ cannot be predicated \textit{in quid} of its proper attributes (n. 134)…. Scotus concludes that we can say that being is the primary object of the intellect and the proper subject of metaphysics only with the qualification that ultimate differentiae and the proper attributes of being are included not quidditatively but in a derivative fashion” King (2003), p. 7.}
The primary aim of Kant’s explanatory paragraph on judgements of relation is to identify the relational form of the special act of reason, which forms the relational whole of the understanding in pure imagination. The act systematically underlies the disjunctive judgement (“S or P or Q”), and is presupposed in the categorical judgement (“S is P”) and the hypothetical judgement (“If S, then P”). The disjunctive judgement contains an act in which the categorical and hypothetical determinations of relations are combined in terms of a transcendental genetic whole of possible relations. Kant describes the role of the disjunctive judgement in generating the relational whole of the understanding in this way:

the disjunctive judgement contains the relations of two or more propositions to one another, though not the relation of sequence, but rather that of logical opposition, insofar as the sphere of one judgement excludes that of the other, yet at the same time the relation of community, insofar as the judgements together exhaust the sphere of cognition proper; it is therefore a relation of the parts of the sphere of a cognition where the sphere of each part is the complement of that of the others in the total whole [dem ganzen Inbegriff] of the divided cognition. (KrV A73-4/B99)\textsuperscript{393}

Disjunctive judgements thus enact the relational whole of “a certain community of cognitions, consisting in the fact that they mutually exclude each other, yet thereby determine the true cognition in its entirety [Ganzen], since taken together they constitute the entire [ganzen] content of a particular given cognition” (KrV A75/B99). In Jäsche Logic, Kant describes the organic relation between each part of the disjunctive judgement with its whole: “one member determines every other here only insofar as they stand together in community as parts of a whole sphere of cognition, outside of which, in a certain relation, nothing may be thought” (Log 9:107). In Kant’s view, there is no relation to objects that

\textsuperscript{393} Similarly, in Jäsche Logic, Kant writes: “A judgement is disjunctive if the parts of the sphere of a given concept determine one another in the whole or toward a whole [in dem Ganzen oder zu einem Ganzen] as complements (complementa) (Log 9:106).
does not presuppose the relational whole of the understanding. This relational whole is presupposed in the givenness of objects in the transcendental aesthetic, although this presupposition remains concealed in the operation of sensibility.

Kant’s explanatory paragraph on the infinite judgement (“S is not-P”) points to the special act of reason underlying this judgement. Through this act, the merely logical affirmation and the merely logical negation of the predicate are a priori combined in terms of the transcendental wholeness of possible predicates. This act grounds affirmative judgements (“S is P”) and negative judgements (“S is not P”). Kant starts his paragraph on infinite judgements arguing against their identification with affirmative judgements:

In a transcendental logic infinite judgements must also be distinguished from affirmative ones, even though in general logic they are rightly included with the latter and do not constitute a special member of the classification. General logic abstracts from all content of the predicate (even if it is negative), and considers only whether it is attributed to the subject or opposed to it. Transcendental logic, however, also considers the value or content of the logical affirmation made in a judgement by means of a merely negative predicate, and what sort of gain this yields for the whole of cognition. (KrV A71-2/B97)

Kant considers the identification of infinite judgements with affirmative judgements as the reduction of transcendental logic to general logic. General logic ignores the content of predicates and is merely concerned with whether the predicate is or is not included in the subject. That is why affirmative and negative judgements affirm and negate the copula and abstract from the content of the predicate. As Kant states, “in negative judgements the negation always affects the copula; in infinite ones it is not the copula but rather the predicate that is affected” (Log 9:104). Transcendental logic concerns not only the logical

---

394 The concept of community in disjunctive judgements is itself enacted in the canon of pure reason. This concept corresponds to the concept of good in Kant’s moral philosophy.

395 In the appendix to the transcendental analytic, Kant briefly discusses the special act of pure reason in relational terms. The special act takes the form of a transcendental reflection that forms the systematic ground that brings “the inner and the outer” (KrV A265/B321), the categorical and hypothetical judgements, together.
forms but also the content of the predicate. The special act underlying infinite judgements determines the whole of possible predicates. Not all merely logical possible predicates are transcendently possible predicates. Prior to affirmation and negation, the whole of the possible predicates that can be affirmed or negated must be transcendently-genetically determined in pure imagination. This determination takes place in infinite judgements, which are “merely limiting with regard to the content of cognition in general” (KrV A73/B98).

In the explanatory paragraph on judgements of quantity, Kant hints at the special act of reason underlying the singular judgement (“The S is P”). The singular judgement contains an act in which the merely logical universality and the empirical plurality of the subject are combined in terms of the transcendental wholeness of the subject. This whole systematically grounds universal judgements (“Every S is P”) and particular judgements (“Some S is P”). Kant argues that, unlike general logic, transcendental logic cannot treat singular judgements as universal ones. To be sure, because singular judgements “have no domain (extension) [Umfang] at all,” their predicates hold of the subject-concept without exception, just as if it is the case in universal judgements. But, from the standpoint of transcendental logic, singular judgements are distinct from universal ones: “if ... we compare a singular judgement with a generally valid one, merely as cognition, with respect to quantity, then the former relates to the latter as unity relates to infinity, and is therefore in itself essentially different from the latter.” The transcendental significance of singular

---

396 In the appendix to the transcendental analytic, Kant briefly discusses the special act of pure reason in qualitative terms. The special act appears as a transcendental reflection that forms the systematic ground that brings “agreement and opposition” (KrV A264/B320), the affirmative and negative judgements, together.

397 Kant defines domain, sphere, or extension (Umfang or Sphäre) in terms of concepts that are subordinate to it rather than things that fall under it.
judgements does not lie in their “internal validity” but in their role “as cognition in general” “in comparison with other cognitions” (KrV A71/B96). Singular judgements are not different from universal judgements with regard to their merely logical form and yet the domain of these types of judgement is not the same. Singular judgements contain the genetic whole of possible quantity that can be included and excluded in the subject of universal and particular judgements. Thus, the significance of singular judgements in the table of judgements is primarily systematic, far beyond mere determination of the quantity of the subject.398

***

As discussed, pure reason’s transcendental-speculative compulsion to preserve itself, or reason’s special act in the apodictic judgement to form itself as a whole of possible ends, is the transcendental-systematic ground of the table of judgements. The modifications of the apodictic judgement in relation to objects take the form of the relational, qualitative, and quantitative whole, in disjunctive, infinite, and singular judgements. These wholes in turn transcendentally ground the traditional pairings of logical judgements – i.e., hypothetical and categorical judgements, negative and affirmative judgements, and particular and universal judgements – in the table of judgements. Thus, Kant renders the traditional table of judgements systematic by adding and reinterpreting judgements in which reason enacts itself as an organic whole in modal, relational, qualitative, and quantitative terms.

The systematic grounding of the table of judgements in the absolute unity of apodictic judgements is the guiding principle of the metaphysical deduction, and reveals

---

398 In the appendix to the transcendental analytic, Kant briefly discusses the special act of pure reason in quantitative terms. The special act takes the form of a transcendental reflection that forms the systematic ground that brings “identity and difference” (KrV A263/B319), the universal and particular judgements, together.
how critique is the metaphysical origin of the categories of the understanding. Critique, or the absolute unity underlying the table of judgements, is enacted in the transcendental doctrine of method, as an awareness of the original loss of God in the transcendental dialectic. This original loss, as discussed in chapter two, turns into the discipline of pure reason, and works as the non-relational or negative-modal-apodictic ground of relational properties or predicates of possible empirical objects. The immanent discipline of pure reason, which determines the boundaries of pure reason, is Janus-like. It is concerned with both the sensible and the supersensible, separating them in objective terms and connecting them in methodological terms. On one side, as the awareness of the original loss of God in objective terms, the discipline of pure reason negatively presupposes the maximal realities that are fit to be divine properties and contain possible properties of things in themselves. On the other side, the discipline operates as the methodological ground for a priori knowledge of possible empirical objects, that is, as the absolute unity of the categories of the understanding, by which we can schematize properties of sensible objects. Rather than a ground that is arrived at through the negation of relational properties and thus implicated with them, the discipline of pure reason is the transcendental-speculative or non-relational ground of relational properties, which is itself derived from the original loss of God in objective terms.

In his 1786 essay on the pantheism controversy, Kant formulates the function of the disciplinary reason in a manner that more explicitly demonstrates the double-sided role of the metaphysical deduction with regard to the sensible and the supersensible:

Since reason needs to presuppose reality as given for the possibility of all things, and considers the differences between things only as limitations arising through the negations attaching to them, it sees itself necessitated to take as a ground one single possibility, namely that of an unlimited being, to consider it as original and all others
as derived. Since also the thoroughgoing possibility of every thing must be encountered within existence as a whole – or at least since this is the only way in which the principle of thoroughgoing determination makes it possible for our reason to distinguish between the possible and the actual – we find a subjective ground of necessity, i.e., a need in our reason itself to take the existence of a most real (highest) being as the ground of all possibility. (WDO 8:138)

Kant explains the necessity or need of pure reason to presuppose God. On the one hand, human reason “lack[s] objective ones [grounds],” i.e., reason becomes aware of the original loss of God in objective terms and acknowledges the lack of access to divine properties as well as to possible properties of things in themselves. On the other hand, with regard to empirical objects, reason is “necessitated to judge” and to do so it needs to make “a necessary presupposition” of the existence of God. Reason enacts this necessary presupposition negatively, as the immanent discipline of pure reason to preserve itself in the supersensible, which is distinct from the extrinsically prohibitive “discipline of the scholastic method” (WDO 8:138).

In short, the metaphysical deduction of the categories shows how a critique of pure reason is in essence the disciplinary articulation of the relation between the supersensible and the sensible. This articulation, which arises in response to the need of reason to protect itself against dialectical errors and preserve itself in the supersensible, does not belong to the sensible and yet grounds our cognition of sensible objects. As a finite version of God’s creation from nothing, this disciplinary grounding of human cognition transcendentally-speculatively generates the whole or system of possible ends, from which transcendental schematic determinations of sensible objects – the categories – can be derived.

To be sure, “a subjective ground of necessity” involves transcendental reflection in the sense that Kant discusses in the appendix to the transcendental analytic. But it primarily refers to the discipline of pure reason, which underlies transcendental reflection. For a recent example of an interpretation of the first Critique which ignores the fundamental role of the discipline of pure reason and presents the subjective ground of necessity in terms of the regulative function of the psychological idea in transcendental reflection, see Goldman (2012).
Conclusion

The primary aim of this dissertation has been to develop an account of the transcendental systematicity of pure reason in epigenetic terms. The dissertation argues that critique is a system of epigenesis of pure reason, which constantly redeems reason's original loss of God in transcendental-speculative terms. As demonstrated, the outline of this epigenetic system or redemptive structure of pure reason is laid out in the transcendental doctrine of method in the first *Critique*. The discipline of pure reason generates pure reason as an embryonic whole or system of possible ends, and thereby prepares the negative ground – i.e., the systematic ground free from dialectical errors – for the positive use of pure reason. The canon, architectonic, and history of pure reason articulate the disciplinary whole of pure reason into organic parts. They delimit the organic ends of each and every faculty of the mind, and thereby prepare the systematic conditions of the practical, theoretical, and reflecting use of reason in relation to objects. This organic systematicity of pure reason is embodied in the transcendental table of judgements.

The dissertation begins to redress a substantial deficiency in Kant scholarship: the neglect of the critical method in almost all accounts of critical philosophy over the past two centuries. Kant characterizes *Critique of Pure Reason* as “a treatise on the method” and yet no interpretation of this treatise takes the cue from its culminating section, the transcendental doctrine of method. In contrast to German Idealist, psychologistic, neo-Kantian, epistemological, phenomenological, anti-metaphysical, and merely metaphysical interpretations of critical philosophy, the dissertation appreciates the most important and yet the most neglected characteristic of critical philosophy: the negative-generative nature
of the critical method of pure reason prior to any relation to objects. It demonstrates how
the generative negativity of the critical method forms the transcendental-speculative life of
pure reason and functions as the systematic ground of its object-related operation in
theoretical, practical, and empirical realms.

The epigenetic methodological interpretation presented in this dissertation also
contains far-reaching implications for the way we approach the object-related faculties or
parts of the critical system—theoretical reason, practical reason, and the power of
judgement. In establishing the transcendental-systematic ground or whole of pure reason
in the transcendental doctrine of method, the dissertation produces a new program for
approaching the object-related parts of pure reason. According to this program,
understanding the transcendental organic systematicity of the practical, theoretical, and
reflecting (aesthetic/teleological) parts of critical philosophy in the three Critiques requires
working out how the whole of pure reason runs through, holds together, and animates its
object-related parts. The methodological organization of the whole of possible ends of pure
reason as ends of object-related faculties suggests that we should approach the practical
cognition of the second Critique, the theoretical cognition of the first Critique, and the
reflecting use of reason in the third Critique from the standpoint of the canon of pure
reason, the architectonic of pure reason, and the history of pure reason respectively. This
approach is essential for an organic-systematic understanding of each part of the critical
philosophy. It provides the foundation for elaborating how the disciplinary whole of pure
reason underlies moral autonomy, the transcendental unity of apperception, and the
reflecting unity of purposiveness, i.e., how practical, theoretical, and reflecting philosophy
operate as organic parts of a living system of human reason.
As the history of interpretation of Kant's critical philosophy manifests, there can be no assurance that critique, or the transcendental-speculative negativity of pure reason, will not ossify into some form of positivism. Being generative, critique ineluctably runs the risk of degeneration. A commitment to the spirit of critique does not consist in Kantianism. It consists in the re-enactment of reason's self-formative self-destruction or generative negativity: human reason lives on only if it redeems itself.
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