7
Referências bibliográficas

ADORNO, T. W. ***Kant´s* Critique of Pure Reason**. Tradução Rodney Livingstone. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

_____. **Metaphysics**. Tradução Edmund Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

_____. **Problems of Moral Philosophy**. Tradução Rodney Livingstone. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

ALLISON, H. E. **Kant´s Transcendental Idealism**: Revised and Enlarged Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

_____. "Spontaneity and Autonomy in Kant´s Conception of the Self." Em: AMERIKS, K / STURMA, D. (Eds.) **The Modern Subject: Conceptions of the Self in Classical Germany Philosophy.** Albany: SUNY Press, 1995. pp. 11-29.

ARISTÓTELES. **Analítica Posterior**. Em: ARISTÓTELES. **Aristóteles** (Tomo I). The Great Books, Vol. 8. Tradução W. D. Ross. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1952.

BACON, F. **Novum Organum.** Em: **Bacon**. The Great Books, Vol. 30. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1952.

BAUDELAIRE, C. O Pintor da Vida Moderna. Em: BAUDELAIRE, C. **A Invenção da Modernidade.** Tradução Pedro Tamen. Lisboa: Relógio D'Água Editores, 2006

BAUMAN, Z. **Modernidade e Ambivalência.** Tradução Marcus Penchel. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 1999.

BEISER, F. Kant's Intellectual Development: 1746-1781 Em: **The Cambridge Companion to Kant**. GUYER, P. (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. pp. 26-61.

_____. The Enlightenment and Idealism Em: AMERIKS, K. (Ed.) **The Cambridge Companion to German Idealism.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. pp. 18-36.

BICCA, L. **Racionalidade Moderna e Subjetividade.** São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 1997.

BERKELEY, G. **The Principles of Human Knowledge.** Em: **LOCKE, BERKELEY, HUME.** The Great Books, Vol. 35. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1952.

BORNHEIM, G. **Introdução ao filosofar**. São Paulo: Globo, 2003.

BUENO, V. C. de A. Kant, Aristóteles e a ciência do ser enquanto ser. Em: **Studia Kantiana**, Revista da Sociedade Kant Brasileira. São Paulo, Novembro de 2003, nº.5, pp.27-46.

_____. Kant e o Conceito de Fé racional Em: **O que nos faz pensar?** Cadernos do Deptº de Filosofia da PUC - Rio, Dezembro de 2005 – nº. 8: A Querela do Panteísmo, pp. 61-76.

BURNYEAT, M. F. Can the Sceptic Live his Scepticism? Em: SCHOFIELD, M / BURNYEAT, M. / BARNES, J. (Eds.) **Doubt and Dogmatism.** Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980, pp. 20-53.

CASSIRER, E. **An Essay on Man.** New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

_____. **Indivíduo e Cosmos na Filosofia do Renascimento**. Tradução João Azenha Jr. São Paulo: Editora Martins Fontes, 2001.

_____. **Rousseau, Kant, Goethe.** Tradução James Gutmann, Paul Oskar Kriesteller e John Hermann Randall, Jr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

_____. **Kant´s Life and Thought.** Tradução James Haden. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981**.**

CAYGILL, H. **Dicionário Kant.** Tradução Álvaro Cabral. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 2000.

_____. Kant's Apology for Sensibility Em: JACOBS, B. / KAIN, P. (eds.) **Essays on Kant´s Anthropology.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. pp. 164-93.

CHATEAUBRIAND, O. The Tyranny of Belief. Em: **O que nos faz pensar?** Cadernos do Deptº de Filosofia da PUC - Rio, Novembro de 1994 – nº. 8: Especial sobre Ceticismo, pp. 39-54.

CHÂTELET, F. **Uma História da Razão**. Tradução Lucy Magalhães. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 1994.

CHEDIAK, K. **Uma Abordagem da Crítica de Hegel a Kant a partir do Princípio de Identidade.** Dissertação de Mestrado, Faculdade de Filosofia, PUC - Rio, Rio de Janeiro, 15 de Junho de 1988.

COMTE-SPONVILLE, A. **A Filosofia**. Tradução Joana Angélica D'Ávila Melo. São Paulo: Editora Martins Fontes, 2005.

DESCARTES, R. **Regras para a Orientação do Espírito.** Tradução Maria Ermentina Galvão. São Paulo: Editora Martins Fontes, 2007

_____. **Discurso do Método**. Tradução Maria Ermentina Galvão. Editora Martins Fontes: São Paulo, 2003.

_____. **Meditações sobre a Filosofia Primeira**. Tradução Prof. Gustavo de Fraga. Coimbra: Livraria Almedina, 1988.

FERNANDES, S. C. de L**. Foundations of Objective Knowledge**. Dordrecht: D. Reisel Publishing Company, 1985.

FOGELIN, R. J. **Hume's Skepticism in the Treatise of Human Nature.** London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.

FORSTER, M. N. **Kant and Skepticism.** Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

FOUCAULT, M. **As Palavras e as Coisas**. Tradução Salma Tannus Muchail. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2002.

_____. Filosofia e Psicologia Em: FOUCAULT, M. **Ditos e Escritos**, Vol. I. Tradução Vera Lucia Avellar Ribeiro. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2006, pp. 220-31.

_____. O Que São as Luzes? Em: FOUCAULT, M. **Ditos e Escritos**, Vol. II. Tradução Elisa Monteiro. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2005, pp. 335-51.

_____. What Is Critique. Tradução Kevin Paul Geiman. Em: SCHMIDT, J (ed.) **What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions.** Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996. pp.382-398.

GAMAMER, H.-G. **O Problema da Consciência Histórica.** Tradução Paulo César Duque Estrada. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 1998.

GIDE, A. **O Pensamento Vivo de Montaigne**. Tradução Sérgio Milliet. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora S. A., 1953.

GIL, F. (org.). **Recepção da Crítica da Razão Pura.** Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1992.

GUYER, P. The Starry heavens and the Moral Law Em: GUYER, P. (ed.) **The Cambridge Companion to Kant**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. pp. 1-25.

HABERMAS, J. **O Discurso Filosófico da Modernidade.** Tradução L. S. Repa e R. Nascimento. São Paulo: Editora Martins Fontes, 2002.

_____. **Conhecimento e Interesse.** Tradução José N. Heck. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 1982.

HEGEL G. W. F. **Lectures on the History of Philosophy.** 1825-6 Vol. II: Greek Philosophy. Tradução Robert F. Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

HORKHEIMER, M. **Eclipse da Razão.** Tradução Sebastião Uchoa Leite. São Paulo: Centauro Editora, 2003.

_____**.** Reason Against Itself: Some Remarks on Enlightenment. Em: SCHMIDT, J (ed.) **What is Enlightenment? Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions.** Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996. pp. 359-367.

HUME, D. **A Treatise of Human Nature.** Norton / Norton (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

_____. **An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding.** Em: LOCKE, BERKELEY, HUME. The Great Books, Vol. 35. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1952.

_____. **Tratado da Natureza Humana**. Tradução Déborah Danowski. São Paulo: Editora UNESP: Imprensa Oficial do Estado, 2001.

JACOBI, F. H. **The Main philosophical Writings and the Novel Allwill.** Tradução George di Giovanni. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.

JASPERS, K. **Kant.** Tradução Ralph Manheim. San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1962.

_____. **Man in the Modern Age.** Tradução Eden and Cedar Paul. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1957

JORGE FILHO, E. J. Notas sobre Lógica, Dever, Consciência (Gewissen), e Liberdade, em Kant (1ª. Parte). Em: **Síntese Nova Fase**, Belo Horizonte, v. 24, n. 78, pp. 378- 382, 1997.

_____. Notas sobre Lógica, Dever, Consciência (Gewissen), e Liberdade, em Kant (2ª. Parte). Em: **Síntese Nova Fase**, Belo Horizonte, v. 24, n. 79, pp. 513- 546, 1997.

KANT, I. **Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View**. Tradução Robert B. Louden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

_____. **Correspondence**. Tradução Arnulf Zweig. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

_____. **Crítica da Faculdade do Juízo**. Tradução Valério Rohden e Antonio Marques. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2002.

_____. Crítica da Razão Pura. Tradução Manuela Pinto dos Santos e Alexandre Fradique Morujão. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2001.

_____. **Crítica da Razão Prática**. Tradução Artur Morão. Lisboa: Edições 70, s/ data.

_____. **Critique of the Power of Judgement**. Tradução Paul Guyer e Eric Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

_____. **Idéia de uma história universal de um ponto de vista cosmopolita.** Tradução Ricardo Ribeiro Terra. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004.

_____. **Lectures on Ethics**. Tradução Peter Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

_____. **Lectures on Logic**. Tradução J. Michael Young. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

_____. **Lectures on Metaphysics.** Tradução Karl Ameriks e Steve Naragon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

_____. **Lógica.** Tradução Guido Antônio de Almeida. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1992.

_____. **Notes and Fragments**. Tradução Curtis Bowman, Paul Guyer e Frederick Rauscher. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

_____. **Opus postumum**. Tradução Eckart Förster e Michael Rosen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

_____. **Os Progressos da Metafísica**. Tradução Artur Morão. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1995.

_____. **Practical Philosophy**. Tradução Mary J. Gregor e Allen Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

_____. **Prolegômenos a toda Metafísica Futura**. Tradução Artur Morão. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1988.

_____. **Religion and Rational Theology**. Tradução Allen W. Wood e George di Giovanni. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

_____. **Textos seletos**. Tradução Raimundo Vier e Floriano de Sousa Fernandes. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 2005.

_____. **Theoretical Philosophy after 1781**. Tradução Gary Hatfield, Michael Friedman, Henry Allison e Peter Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

_____. **Theoretical Philosophy 1755-1770**. Tradução David Walford e Ralf Meerbote. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

KUEHN, M. **Kant.** A Biography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

LALANDE, A. **Vocabulário Técnico e Crítico da Filosofia**. Tradução Fátima Sá Correia, Maria Emília V. Aguiar, José Eduardo Torres e Maria Gorete de Souza. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1999.

LEIBNIZ, G.W. **Novos Ensaios Sobre o Entendimento Humano** [Col. Os Pensadores, vol. I]. Tradução Luis João Baraúna. São Paulo: Editora Abril Cultural, 1980.

LOCKE, J. **An Essay Concerning Human Understanding**. The Great Books, Vol. 35. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1952.

LONGUENESSE, B. **Kant and the Capacity to Judge**. Tradução Charles T. Wolfe. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

LOUDEN, R. B. The Second Part of Morals. Em: JACOBS, B. / KAIN, P. (eds.) **Essays on Kant´s Anthropology**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. pp. 60-84.

MAIMON, S. **An Autobiography**. Tradução J. Clark Murray. Boston: Kessinger Publishing, s/ data.

MANN, T. **Carlota em Weimar**. Tradução Vera Mourão. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nova Fronteira, 1984.

MARCONDES, D. O Argumento do Conhecimento do Criador e o Ceticismo Moderno. Em: CHAUÍ, M / ÉVORA, F. (EDS.) **Figuras do Racionalismo**. Campinas, São Paulo: ANPOF, 1999, pp. [1]-30.

_____. O Problema do Erro no Surgimento da Filosofia Moderna: Entre o 'Véu de Idéias' e o 'Abuso das Palavras' Em: CUPANI, A. e MORTARI,

C.A. (orgs.) 2002 **Linguagem e Filosofia. Anais do segundo Simpósio Internacional Principia.** Coleção Rumos da Epistemologia, vol.6. Florianópolis: NEL, pp.146-62.

_____. **Iniciação à História da Filosofia**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 2005.

MARTIN, L. F. A presença do ceticismo na filosofia do jovem Hegel. Em: SMITH, P. J. / FILHO, W. S. (Orgs.) **Ensaios sobre o ceticismo.** São Paulo: Alameda Casa Editorial, 2007, pp. 153-171.

MONTAIGNE. **Ensaios**. Tradução Sérgio Milliet. São Paulo: Editora Abril Cultural [col. Os Pensadores], 1974.

MORA, J. F. **Dicionário de Filosofia** (4 tomos). Tradução Maria Stela Gonçalves, Adail U. Sobral, Marcos Bagno, Nicolas Nyimi Campanário. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2001.

PASCAL, B. **Pensées**. The Great Books, Vol. 33. Tradução W. F. Trotter. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1952.

POPKIN, R. The High Road to Pyrrhonism. Em: **American Philosophical Quarterly**. Volume 2, Number I, January 1965. pp. 18-32.

_____**. História do Ceticismo, de Erasmo a Spinoza**. Tradução Danilo Marcondes. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 2000.

POPPER, K. **Em Busca de um Mundo Melhor**. Tradução Milton Camargo Mota. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2006.

SCHELLING, F. W. J. **Cartas sobre o Dogmatismo e o Criticismo**. Em: **Obras Escolhidas** [Col. Os Pensadores]. Tradução Rubens Rodrigues Torres Filho. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1989.

SCHOPENHAUER, A. **O Mundo como Vontade e como Representação**. Tradução Jair Barboza. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2005.

_____. **Fragmentos para a História da Filosofia**. Tradução Maria Lúcia Cacciola. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2003.

SEXTO EMPÍRICO. **Against the Logicians**. Tradução Richard Bett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

_____. **Against Physicists / Against Ethicists**. Tradução R. G. Bury. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

_____. **Against the Professors**. Tradução R. G. Bury. London: Harvard University Press, 2000.

_____. **Outlines of Scepticism**. Tradução Julia Annas e Jonathan Barnes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

SHABEL, L. Kant's Philosophy of Mathematics Em: GUYER, P. (Ed.) **The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. pp. 94-128.

SNELL, B. **A Cultura Grega e as Origens do Pensamento Europeu.** Tradução Pérola de Carvalho. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2005.

SUZUKI, M. **O Gênio Romântico**. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 1998.

TORRES FILHO, R. R. Dogmatismo e Antidogmatismo: Kant na sala de aula. Em: **Revista Tempo Brasileiro**, número 91, Out. – Dez. de 1987, pp. 11-27.

VAZ, H. C. L. **Antropologia Filosófica** (2 vols.) São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2003.

_____. **Escritos de Filosofia VII**. Raízes da Modernidade. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2002.

ZIMMERMAN, A. **Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany.** Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.

8
Anexo I

CAPÍTULO 1

2. Transcendental philosophy is the capacity of the self-determining subject to constitute itself as *given* in intuition, through the systematic complex of the ideas, which, *a priori*, make the thoroughgoing determination of the subject as object (its existence) into a problem. *To make oneself*, as it were.

13. The critical method applies not to cognition itself or to the object, but rather to the understanding. Therefore it is not objective, but rather subjective.

16. *Method* is the unity of a whole of cognition according to principles.

17. The doctrine of method contains the precepts for the possibility of a system of cognition of the understanding and of reason.

18. True skepticism, at all events, is a thing of great usefulness, and as such it is nothing other than an exact, careful investigation of all *dogmata* that are put forth as apodeictic, which, insofar as they actually are so and stand the test, shine forth and strike the eye in all their *valeur*, in all their strength, only after this test.

20. Bacon of Verulam

The Great Instauration. Preface

Of our own person we will say nothing. But as to 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.

21. Both the claims that method enables the avoidance of error and that its ultimate objective is not only utility but also the dignity of mankind are obviously central to Kant´s own conception of his philosophy enterprise.

26. A new light broke upon the first person who demonstrated the isosceles triangle (whether he was called “Thales” or had some other name). For he found that what he had to do was not to trace what he saw in this figure, or even trace its mere concept, and read off, as it were, from the properties of the figure; but rather that he had to produce the latter from what he himself thought into the object and presented (through construction) according to *a priori* concepts, and that in order to know something securely *a priori* he had to ascribe to the thing nothing except what followed necessarily from what he himself had put into it in accordance with its concept.

It took natural science much longer to find the highway of science; for it is only about one and a half centuries since the suggestion of the ingenious Francis Bacon partly occasioned this discovery and partly stimulated it, since one was already on its tracks – which discovery, therefore, can just as much be explained by a sudden revolution in the way of thinking.

29. Those who have treated of the sciences have been either empirics or dogmatical.

31. For the human understanding is no less exposed to the impressions of fancy than to those of vulgar notions.

32. The human understanding is no less exposed to the impressions of fancy than to those of vulgar notions

33. The empiric school produces dogmas of a more deformed and monstrous nature than the sophistic or theoretical school; not being founded in the light of common notions (which however poor and superstitious, is yet in a manner universal and of a general tendency), but in the confined obscurity of a few experiments.

38. (…) assert that nothing can be known, by the present method; their next step, however, is to destroy the authority of the senses and understanding, whilst we invent and supply them with assistance.

39. The formation of notions and axioms on the foundation of true induction is the only fitting remedy by which we can ward off and expel these idols.

41. The idols of the tribe are inherent in human nature and the very tribe or race of man; for man's sense is falsely asserted to be the standard of things; on the contrary, all the perceptions both of the senses and the mind bear reference to man and not to the universe, and the human mind resembles those uneven mirrors which impart their own properties to different objects, from which rays are emitted and distort and disfigure them.

42. (…) must be abjured and renounced with firm and solemn resolution.

43.(…) those of each individual; for everybody (in addition to the errors common to the race of man) has his own individual den or cavern, which intercepts and corrupts the light of nature, either from his own peculiar and singular disposition, or from his education and intercourse with others, or from his reading, and the authority acquired by those whom he reverences and admires, or from the different impressions produced on the mind, as it happens to be preoccupied and predisposed, or equable and tranquil, and the like; so that the spirit of man (according to its several dispositions), is variable, confused, and, as it were, actuated by chance; and Heraclitus said well that men search for knowledge in lesser worlds, and not in the greater or common world.

45. There are also idols formed by the reciprocal intercourse and society of man with man, which we call idols of the market, from the commerce and association of men with each other; for men converse by means of language, but words are formed at the will of the generality, and there arises from a bad and unapt formation of words a wonderful obstruction to the mind. Nor can the definitions and explanations with which learned men are wont to guard and protect themselves in some instances afford a complete remedy; words still manifestly force the understanding, throw everything into confusion, and lead mankind into vain and innumerable controversies and fallacies.

46. The idols imposed upon the understanding by words are of two kinds. They are either the names of things which have no existence (for as some objects are from inattention left without a name, so names are formed by fanciful imaginations which are without an object), or they are the names of actual objects, but confused, badly defined, and hastily and irregularly abstracted from things.

47. (…) there are idols which have crept into men's minds from the various dogmas of peculiar systems of philosophy, and also from the perverted rules of demonstration, and these we denominate idols of the theatre: for we regard all the systems of philosophy hitherto received or imagined, as so many plays brought out and performed, creating fictitious and theatrical worlds.

48. (…) are not innate, nor do they introduce themselves secretly into the understanding, but they are manifestly instilled and cherished (…).

50. (…) it would be a very naïve sort of dogmatism to assume that there exists an absolute reality of things which is the same for all living beings. Reality is not a unique and homogeneous thing, it is immensely diversified, having as many different schemes and patterns as there are different organisms.

57. Time can no more be intuited externally as space can be intuited as something in us.

61. All principles are on the one side *a posteriori*, i.e., taken empirically, and this in turn either from one's own experience or from the testimony about the experience of others, hence experience (*in strictu sensu*) or history.

All principles are on the other side *a priori* and taken from reason, but this either from reason insofar as it judges merely in accordance with concepts, hence philosophical principles, or insofar as it judges in accordance merely with the construction of concepts, i.e., their exhibition *a priori* in intuition.

70. Thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts are blind. It is thus just as necessary to make the mind's concepts sensible (i.e., to add on object to them in intuition) as it is to make its intuitions understandable (i.e., to bring them under concepts).

71. (…) the sphere of metaphysics in the precise sense only comes into being where this tension is itself the subject of philosophy, where it comes within the purview of thought. It might be said, therefore, that metaphysics arises at the point where the empirical world is taken seriously, and where its relation to the supra-sensible world, which was hitherto taken for granted, is subjected to reflection.

72. on the one hand, metaphysics is always, if you will, rationalistic as a *critique* of a conception of true, essential being-in-itself which does not justify itself before reason; but, on the other, it is always also an attempt to *rescue* something which the philosopher's genius feels to be fading and vanishing.

73. Metaphysics is thus, one might say, something fundamentally modern – if you do not restrict the concept of modernity to our world but extend it to include Greek history.

74. The question is whether metaphysics deals with objects that can be cognized through pure reason, or with the subject, namely the principles and laws is the use of pure reason. Since we can cognize all objects through our subject, especially those that do not affect us, it is subjective

75. Human reason has the peculiar fate in one species of its cognition that it is burdened with questions which it cannot dismiss, since they are given to it as problems by the nature of reason itself, but which it also cannot answer, since they transcend every capacity of human reason.

76. The battlefield of these endless controversies is called **metaphysics**.

77. All philosophical derivation of that which is given or can be given in our cognition is either physical or metaphysical or hyperphysical, the first from empirical principles of nature cognized through experience; the second from the principles of the possibility of our *a priori* cognition in general, independent from the empirically cognized nature of things; the third from the representation of objects beyond nature. The latter takes our cognition entirely outside the conditions of the use of our reason *in concreto*, the metaphysical manner of explanation is objective if it rests on the universal conditions under which alone we cognize objects as given to us. It does not exclude the supernatural, but restricts our reason merely to the natural.

78. 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 its proper place among the disciplines of human knowledge and that the true and lasting welfare of the human race depends on metaphysics (…) As for the stock of knowledge currently available, which is now publicly for sale, I think it is best to pull off its dogmatic dress and treat its pretended insights skeptically. My feelings are not the result of frivolous inconstancy but of an extensive investigation.

79. 1. *What can I know?*
2. *What ought I to do?*
3. *What may I hope?*
4. *What is man?*

Metaphysics answers the first question, *morals* the second, *religion* the third, and *anthropology* the fourth. Fundamentally, however, we could reckon all of this as anthropology, because the first three questions relate to the last one.

CAPÍTULO 2

1. (…) the reason we always fall so horribly into error is that we seek to find outside of us what is only within us.

4. Criticism is not opposed to the **dogmatic procedure** of reason in its pure cognition as science (for science must always be dogmatic, i.e., it must prove its conclusions strictly a priori from secure principles); rather, it is opposed only to dogmatism, i.e., to the presumption of getting on solely with pure cognition from (philosophical) concepts according to principles, which reason has been using for a long time without first inquiring in what right it has obtained them. Dogmatism is therefore the dogmatic procedure of pure reason, **without an antecedent critique of its own capacity.**

5. Mathematics exhibits the greatest dignity of human reason, metaphysics, however, its limits and proper vocation.

8. (…) mathematics arrives at its concepts synthetically.

9. (…) the concept of a thing is always given, albeit confusedly or in an insufficiently determined fashion.

11. An intuitive principle is called an *axioma*. There is no word in philosophy for discursive principles, for no one has ever made the distinction between intuitive and discursive principles. One could call it an *acroama*, however, a proposition that can be

expressed only through words and through *pure* universal concepts. An *axioma*, however, can only be exhibited in intuition.

14. Nevertheless, the method can always be **systematic**. For our reason itself (subjectively) is a system, but in its pure use, by means of pure concepts, only a system for research in accordance with principles of unity, for which **experience** alone can give the matter.

15. (…) criticism is the preparatory activity necessary for the advancement of metaphysics as a well-grounded science, which must necessarily be dogmatic, carried out systematically in accordance with the strictest requirement (…)

16. In its transcendental efforts, therefore, reason cannot look ahead so confidently, as if the path on which it has traveled leads quite directly to the goal, and it must not count so boldly on the premises that ground it as if it were unnecessary for it to frequently to look back and consider whether there might not be errors in the progress of its inferences to be discovered that were overlooked in its principles and make it necessary either to determine them further or else to alter them entirely.

17. Dogmatism is the manner in thinking that is attached to assertions without critique (i.e., examination of principles.) The most natural tendency of mankind with regard to cognition is towards dogmatism: 1. on account of laziness, since going back to principles is more difficult than proceeding to the application of principles that have already been assumed and are in circulation. 2. Because through critique cognition is not expanded, but only rendered secure. 3. From fear of revealing the poverty of our knowledge to ourselves and others.

18. *Dogmatism* is a pillow to fall asleep on, and an end to all vitality, which latter is precisely the benefit conferred by philosophy.

19. If one wishes to extend his cognition of reason through mere concepts, then if no further critique occurs, then one is a dogmatist.

20. The dogmatic spirit in philosophy is [thus] the proud language of the ignorant, who like to decide everything and do not like to investigate anything at all, whereas our understanding is quite inclined to examine everything first and to investigate it exactly before it accepts and maintains anything, also to look around well first without blindly rejecting something that occurs to us.

21. Human nature is actually far more inclined to decide than always to examine, and to settle rather than always to investigate. For we are not at all satisfied when we have to leave something uncompleted, especially in our cognition, but instead we want to settle everything, so that in case the need occurs we can recur to a completely certain and reliable cognition.

Our understanding is actually more satisfied by decision.

22. The usual scholastic and doctrinal methods of philosophy make one dumb, insofar as they operate with a mechanical thoroughness. They narrow the understanding and make it incapable of accepting instruction. By contrast, critique broadens the concepts and makes reason free. The scholastic philosophers operate like pirates who as soon as they arrive on an unoccupied coast fortify it.

23. The greater part of mankind are naturally apt to be affirmative and dogmatical in their opinions; and while they see objects only on one side, and have no idea of any counterpoising argument, they throw themselves precipitately into the principles, to

which they are inclined; nor have they any indulgence for those who entertain opposite sentiments. (…) But could such dogmatical reasoners become sensible of the strange infirmities of human understanding, even in its most perfect state, and when most accurate and cautious in its determinations; such a reflection would naturally inspire them with more modesty and reserve, and diminish their fond opinion of themselves, and their prejudice against antagonists.

25. The first step in matters of pure reason, which characterizes its childhood, is **dogmatic**.

26. Wolff did great things in philosophy; but he got ahead of himself and extended cognition without securing, altering, and reforming it through a special critique. His works are therefore very useful as a magazine for reason, but not as an architectonic for it. Perhaps it is in the order of nature, although certainly not to be approved of in Wolff, that at least the experiments of the understanding should first multiply without a correct method of knowledge, and be brought under rules only later. Children.

29. There is naught more important than that we should not follow like sheep the herd that has gone before, going not where we should but where the herd goes.

31. (…) the task of reason, whose existence as part of our natural constitution is viewed essentially as positive, is to do away with all dogma, delusion and knowledge that has been merely handed down.

32. The common human understanding (*sensus communis*) is also in itself a touchstone for discovering the mistakes of the *artificial* use of the understanding. This is what it means *to orient* oneself *in thought* or in the speculative use of reason by means of the common understanding, when one uses the *common* understanding as a test for passing judgment on the correctness of the *speculative* use.

33. On the one hand, reason is subjected to criticism entirely in the spirit of the Enlightenment and Kant marshals a whole host, indeed the entire panoply, of skeptical arguments against the dogmatic transformation of reason into an absolute. At the same time, however, because reason is criticizing itself, he retains the *idea* of reason and, with it, the idea of objective truth. You see then in Kant a hesitation, an inconsistency, if you like, a disinclination simply to follow the smooth path of progress. I detect in this a particular deliberateness and conscientiousness (…) and I feel this to be the sign of an extraordinary seriousness. That is to say, the movement of the Enlightenment can only achieve fulfillment if its own meaning, that is, the idea of truth, is retained; and if, in the midst of the dialectical movement to which these concepts are subjected, the concepts still survive. This glorious insight is present in Kant.

36. The indispensable supplement to reason is something that, though not part of speculative philosophy, lies in reason itself, something we can name (viz., freedom, a supersensible power of causality within us), but that cannot grasp. (…) One can just as well admit that if the Gospels had not previously instructed us in the universal moral laws in their total purity, our reason would not yet have discovered them so completely; still, once we are in possession of them, we can convince anyone of their correctness and validity using reason alone.

37. In interpreting the Biblical conception, figures, dogmas "within the limits of mere reason", Kant assumes that there is, at the confines of reason, a realm of the unfathomable and mysterious. But the unfathomable is not the irrational; rather, it is something which reason experiences as the limit of reason and draws into the light of reason. (…) The understanding with its logical reflection acts as a judge over dogmatic

and mythical figures, but reason as a whole is the area in which they operate and are ethically tested by the essence of the rational men who live by them. Faith is hope when reason shatters against the unfathomable, but it is a hope grounded in reason itself and not in some other guarantee coming from outside. Reason grasps, not being in itself, but being as it becomes accessible to a finite creature in his reason. Hence in Kant (…) religion is not an independent source.

38. (…) Whereas dogma requires historical scholarship, reason alone is sufficient for religious faith. Reason does, it is true, claim to interpret dogma, in so far as it is the vehicle of religious faith. But since the value of dogma is only that of a means to religion as its final end, could such a claim be more legitimate? And can there be any principle higher than reason for settling arguments about truth?

39. I distinguish the *teachings* of Christ from the *report* we have of those teachings. In order that the former may be seen in their purity, I seek above all to separate out the moral teachings from all the dogmas of the New Testament. These moral teachings are certainly the fundamental doctrine of the Gospels, and the remainder can only serve as an auxiliary to them. Dogmas tell us only what God has done to help us see our frailty in seeking justification before him, whereas the moral law tells us what we must do to make ourselves worthy of justification.

41. Freedom of communication is indispensable for freedom of thought.

43. The only thing that was perhaps not typical about Kant´s life was the great role that socializing with his friends assumed in it. Kant was a very gregarious and social being – not so much the solitary, isolated, and somewhat comical figure that many have com to see in him. Dialogue was more important to him than many people now want to admit. His critical philosophy is an expression of this form of life, and it makes sense first and foremost in the context of this form of life. What Kant "crushed", or meant to crush, in his Critique were the monsters that impeded this life. It was born out of dialogue, something that the large role of "dialectic" in it should already have made more than clear. As such, it can also be seen as an attempt to show why different positions within the conversation should not be assumed dogmatically to present the only truth, and why everyone engaged in the conversation of mankind should be assured an equal say.

44. "Society is the true spice of life, and it makes the *dignified* (*würdige*) person useful; and when the learned cannot converse, this is the result of their assiduity, or of the scorn of society. The latter is founded on the lack of knowledge of the world and the value of scholarship. The scholar must be able to converse with all classes because he is outside of all classes…"

46. You know very well that I am inclined not only to try to refute intelligent criticism but that I always weave them together with my own judgements and give them the right to overthrow all my previously cherished opinions. I hope that in that way I can achieve an unpartisan perspective, by seeing my judgements from the standpoint of others, so that a third opinion may emerge, superior to my previous ones.

48. Publicity is crucial for the life of the community, because communicability and unrestricted communication are the essence of reason. Philosophy understands and engenders the will to communicate. Without the air of communication reason is stifled.

Communicability is essential to all forms of reason. Concepts are communicable, not feelings. (…)

Only through communication can reason be amplified and verified. Communication is the indispensable condition of humanity. Humanity consists in "communicability". In observing the function of taste in social culture, Kant declares that

"feelings are valuated only insofar as they can be communicated to all; then, even though the pleasure may be inconsiderable, the Idea of its universal communicability increases its value almost beyond measure."

49. (…) a conversation, according to this view, has three parts; a narrative or story, a discussion, and jest. The conversation begins with someone telling a story, which is then discussed.

50. Pietists make the idea of religion dominant in all conversation and discourse, while it can be concluded from their common behavior that this idea has lost the sense of novelty, they are nothing but gossips.

51. (…) to pass over into the territory of idealizing reason and transcendent concepts, where there is no further need to make observations and to inquire according to the laws of nature, but rather only to think and invent, certain that it can never be refuted by facts of nature because it is not bound by their testimony by may go right past them, or even subordinate them to a higher viewpoint, namely that of pure reason.

52. Universal rules and condition for avoiding error in general are: 1) to think for oneself, 2) to think for oneself in the position of someone else, and 3) always to think in agreement with oneself. The maxim of thinking for oneself can be called the *enlightened mode of thought*; the maxim of putting oneself in the viewpoint of others in thought, the *extended mode of thought*; and the maxim of always thinking in agreement with one self, the *consequent [consequente] or coherent [bündige] mode of thought*.

53. Kant strove to act in the world as the only place accessible to man. He did not regard himself as a wise man or as a saint situated outside it. If he labored to create a better school of philosophy, it was in the interest of worldly wisdom. He had no wish to stand apart; what he sought in philosophy was something which helps the human race, which helps each man as a man, to do his task.

Thought is of no value without communicability. Kant strove for understanding, communication, peace, but in the movement of life. His goal was not the contentment of an animal at pasture, the tranquility that corrupts, but the all-embracing reason which links all man's potentialities together and permits them to unfold. No other thinker of the Enlightenment attained to so lofty a concept of reason.

Kant was open to the world, even to its remotest aspects. He respected intelligence and human stature wherever he found them: "Because philosophy can use everything that the man of letters or the eccentric visionary provides, a philosopher values everything that demonstrates a certain strength of mind Moreover, he is accustomed to taking different standpoints and, because he never loses sight of the mysterious character of the whole, he distrusts his own judgement . . Philosophy makes a man humble, or rather, it teaches him to measure himself by the Idea and not in comparison to others." Kant's sense of humanity raised him above all philosophical arrogance, although the lucidity and range of his thinking made him dangerously superior to all his contemporaries.

57. The Transcendental Analytic (…) has this important result: That the understanding can never accomplish *a priori* anything more than to anticipate the form of a possible experience in general, and, since that which is not appearance cannot be an object of experience, it can never overstep the limits of sensibility, within which alone objects are given to us. Its principles are mere principles of the exposition of appearances, and the proud name of an ontology, which presumes to offer synthetic *a priori* cognitions of things in general as a systematic doctrine (e.g., the principle of causality), must give way to the modest one of a mere analytic of the pure understanding.

58. Ontology is the science of things in general, i.e., of the possibility of our cognition of things a priori, i.e., independently from experience. It can teach us nothing of things in themselves, but only of the a priori conditions under which we can cognize things in experience in general, i.e., principles of the possibility of experience.

59. We have spoken of ontology of concepts of the understanding the use of which in experience is possible because they themselves make experience possible.

60. Kant forgoes richness of content, because he wishes to convey a pure consciousness of the "forms". Forms are superior to philosophical embodiment, because, if I think them through, they make me produce my thinking. They act upon my nonobjective inwardness, my freedom. Forms have the power to awaken. They give shape to my thinking and must therefore be complemented by reality: by individual *Existenz*, scientific inquiry, historical vision, the contemplation of art and poetry.

CAPÍTULO 3

1. (...) Until we fix our *observations* more on *human beings*, all our wisdom is folly.

7. Scepticism is an ability to set out oppositions among things which appear and are thought of in any way at all, an ability by which, because of the equipollence in the opposed objects and accounts, we come first to suspension of judgement and afterwards to tranquility.

9. The sceptical persuasion, then, is also called Investigative, from its activity in investigating and inquiring; Suspensive, from the feeling that comes about in the inquirer after the investigation; Aporetic, either (as some say) from the fact that it puzzles over and investigates everything, or else from its being at a loss whether to assent or deny; and Pyrrhonian, from the fact that Pyrrho appears to us to have attached himself to Scepticism more systematically and conspicuously than anyone before him.

11. Others have said that human beings are mortal rational animals, capable of understanding and knowledge. Now since we show in the first mode of suspension that no animal is irrational but that all are capable both of understanding and of knowledge then – so far as the Dogmatist say goes – we shall not know what on earth they mean.

13. And we say all this without holding any opinions.

15. This standpoint of doubt is the opposite of skepticism. Doubt is restless because it wants to find rest in something set in opposition to rest, and can find it nowhere.

19. We must not translate skepsis as a 'doctrine of doubt'. Skepticism is not a doubt, for doubt is the very opposite of tranquility that ought to be Skepticism's result. Doubt [Zweifel] derives from zwei [two]; it is a vacillation between two or more points (…)

20. (…) philosophy has (…) gained far more from the *sceptici* than from the proud dogmatists: although it is true, of course, that the former, through misuse, finally degenerated into bitter sarcasm. Skepticism, however, or the method of skeptical doubt, where one establishes a distrust in oneself, considers the ground for and against the cognition that one has, and in this way strives to come to complete certainty concerning

it, this is the *kathartikon*, reason's best means of purgation. This skepticism hinders errors as much as possible, leads man to more inquiry, and is the path to the truth of the matter (although not all at once and suddenly, of course, but instead slowly and gradually through more and closer investigation).

The doubt of postponement is thus actually a certain mark of the maturity of reason and of experience in the truth of cognition.

21. This sceptical doubt, both in regard to reason and the senses, is a malady, which can never be radically cur'd, but must return upon us every moment, however we may chace it away, and sometimes may seem entirely free from it. 'Tis impossible upon any system to defend either our understanding or senses; and we but expose them farther when we endeavour to justify them in that manner. As the sceptical doubt arises naturally from a profound and intense reflection on those subjects, it always encreases, the farther we carry our reflections, whether in opposition or conformity to it. Carelessness and inattention alone can afford us any remedy.

24. In common speech the word doubt means any uncertainty, and in this respect and this sense doubt is either dogmatic or skeptical. The former is a doubt of decision, but the latter a doubt of retardation, of postponement. From the former certainty arises, but from the latter closer investigation and inquiry, in order to attain proper and undoubted certainty of cognition.

In dogmatic doubt we reject all inquiry and do not accept something toward which we have, or believe ourselves to have, a grounded doubt. We decide, in short, and say: In this matter there is no question of attaining any certainty. Thus dogmatic doubt regards very many cognitions as if nothing at all could be established or settled concerning them.

25. (…) Dogmatic doubt consists in nothing but judging that one can never attain complete certainty with cognition, and that all inquiry, furthermore, is thus always conducted in vain and for nothing.

Skeptical doubt, on the other hand, consists in being conscious of the uncertainty with a cognition and thus in being compelled to inquire into it more and more, so that finally one may nonetheless attain certainty with the help of careful investigations. The former, then, the dogmatist, rejects certainty completely and altogether. The latter, the skeptic, however, searches for it little by little. (…) the *scepticus* constantly inquires, he examines and investigates, he distrusts everything, but never without a ground. In this he resembles a judge, who weighs the grounds for something as well as against it, and listens to the plaintiff as well as the defendant, prior to and before deciding the matter and passing judgement. He postpones his final judgement quite long before he dares to settle something fully. These were the ancient and pure attributes of *scepticismus* and of an unadulterated skeptic.

26. (…) a touchstone with which to distinguish truth from deception, since different but equally persuasive metaphysical propositions lead inescapably to contradictory conclusions, with the result that one proposition inevitably casts doubt on the other: I had some ideas for a possible reform of this science then, but I wanted my ideas to mature first before submitting them to my friend's penetrating scrutiny.

27. (…) it is not *thoughts* but *thinking* (*nicht Gedanken, sondern denken*) which the understanding ought to learn.

28. The method of instruction, peculiar to philosophy, is *zetetic*, as some of the philosophers of antiquity expressed it (from *zetein*). In other words, the method of philosophy is the method of e*nquiry [forschend]*. It is only when reason has already grown more practiced and only in certain areas, that this method becomes *dogmatic*, that is to say, *decisive [entschieden]*.

30. Kant never was a convinced skeptic, but he was in some ways skeptical about his very enterprise. It may therefore prove useful to make clearer what kind of skepticism Kant had assimilated. (…) Kant's musings of 1768 show he was a skeptic about philosophical and especially metaphysical claims. (…) While not doubting the possibility of scientific knowledge and the validity of moral claims, he was uneasy about the metaphysical accounts given on these matters. This uneasiness can be described as a form of *metaphysical* skepticism, or as a skepticism concerning the method followed in metaphysics.

32. Metaphysics, with which, as fate would have it, I have fallen in love but from which I can boast of only a few favors, offers two kinds of advantage. The first is this: it can solve the problems thrown up by the enquiring mind, when it uses reason to spy after the more hidden property of things. But hope is here all two often disappointed by the outcome. And, on this occasion, too, satisfaction has escaped our eager grasp.

(...)

The second advantage of metaphysics is more consonant with the nature of the human understanding. It consists both in knowing whether the task has been determined by reference to what one can know, and in knowing what relation the question has to the empirical concepts, upon which all our judgments must at all times be based. To that extent metaphysics is a science of the *limits of human reason*.

40. I have not been able to bring these considerations to this conclusion without at the same time attending to the other influences of the pure philosophy that I have at the same time completed. For I am not of the same opinion as an excellent man who recommends that when one has once convinced himself of something one should afterward not doubt it anymore. In pure philosophy that will not do. Even the understanding already has a natural resistance to that. One must rather weigh the propositions in all sorts of applications and even borrow a particular proof from these, one must try out the opposite, and postpone decision until the truth is illuminated from all sides.

41. If I only achieve as much as being convincing that one must suspend the treatment of this science until this point has been settled, then this text will achieve its purpose.

Initially I saw this doctrine as if in twilight. I tried quite earnestly to prove propositions and their opposite, not in order to establish a skeptical doctrine, but rather because I suspected I could discover in what an illusion the understanding was hiding. The year ´69 gave me a great light.

42. "Approximately a year ago", he wrote in September 1770, "I arrived at a concept which I believe I shall never have to change, though no doubt it will require amplification Through it all sorts of metaphysical questions can be appraised according to perfectly certain and simple criteria, and through it one can determine with certainty whether or not they are susceptible of solution."

43. By themselves, openness, skepticism and patience led nowhere. If Kant's negative insight was not to be mere resignation, he would have to find new certainty along new paths of metaphysical thinking.

Kant took a decisive step by introducing method into his skepticism.

44. "The Pyrrhonian '*non liquet!*' is, as a wise oracular saying, supposed to make difficult and hateful our empty brooding". These passages show not only that Kant was acquainted with Pyrrhonism, but also that he did not reject it outright. In fact, Pyrrho is explicitly called "a man of merit".

47. (…) to recommend the conviction and confession of its ignorance, not merely as a cure for dogmatic self-conceit but also as the way in which to end the conflict of reason with itself, is an entirely vain attempt, by no means suitable for arranging a peaceful retirement for reason; rather it is at best only a means for awaking it from its sweet dogmatic dreams in order to undertake a more careful examination of its condition.

48. This method of watching or even occasioning a contest between assertions, not in order to decide it to the advantage of one party or the other, but to investigate whether the object of the dispute is not perhaps a mere mirage [*Blendwerk*] at which each would snatch in vain without being able to gain anything even if he met with no resistance – this procedure, I say, can be called the **skeptical method**. It is entirely different from **skepticism**, a principle of artful [*kunstmässig*] and scientific ignorance that undermines the foundations of all cognition, in order, if possible, to leave no reliability or certainty anywhere.

49. All skeptical polemicizing is properly directed only against the dogmatist, who continues gravely along his path without any mistrust of his original objective principles, i.e., without critique, in order to unhinge his concept and bring him to self-knowledge.

50. For the skeptical method aims at certainty, seeking to discover the point of misunderstanding in disputes that are honestly intended and conduced with intelligence by both sides, in order to do as wise legislators do when from embarrassment of judges in cases of litigation they draw instruction concerning that which is defective and imprecisely determined in their laws. The antinomy that reveals itself in the application of the law is for our limited wisdom the best way to test nomothetics, in order to make reason, which does not easily become aware of its false steps in abstract speculation, attentive to the moments involved in determining its principles.

52. *You must have a direction if you are to get ahead*.

55. The ground of the antinomy is the conflict: I. All empirical synthesis is conditioned, the mathematical as well as the dynamical. A. All appearance has parts and is itself a part. B. Everything that happens is a consequence (what is, is conditioned) and is itself a ground. There is thus no first and last. No simple, no boundary of magnitude, no first ground, no necessary being. I.e., we **cannot arrive at these among the appearances** and must not appeal to them. By contrast, the transc. synthesis through pure concepts of reason is unconditioned, but also takes place through purely intellectual concepts; thus there is actually no antinomy. The world is restricted. It consists of simples. There is freedom. There is a necessary being.

56. **If the conditioned is given, then the whole sum of conditions, and hence the absolutely unconditioned, is also given**, through which alone the conditioned was possible.

57. If any sum total of dogmatic doctrines is called a "thetic," then by "antithetic" I understand not the dogmatic assertion of the opposite but rather the conflict between what seem to be dogmatic cognitions (thesin cum antithesi), without the ascription of a preeminent claim to approval of one side or the other. Thus an antithetic does not concern itself with one-sided assertions, but considers only the conflict between general cognitions of reason and the causes of this conflict. The transcendental antithetic is an investigation into the antinomy of pure reason, its causes and its result.

60. (…) reason really cannot generate any concept at all, but can at most only **free** a **concept of the understanding** from the unavoidable limitations of a possible experience, and thus seek to extend it beyond the boundaries of the empirical, though still in connection with it. This happens when for a given conditioned reason demands an absolute totality on the side of the conditions (under which the understanding subjects all appearances to synthetic unity), thereby making the category into a transcendental idea, in order to give absolute completeness to the empirical synthesis through its progression toward the unconditioned (which is never met with in experience, but only in the idea).

61. All the pure cognitions of the understanding are such that their concepts can be given in experience and their principles confirmed through experience; by contrast, the transcendent cognitions of reason neither allow what relates to their ideas to be given in experience, nor their theses ever to be confirmed or refuted through experience; hence, only pure reason itself can detect the error that perhaps creeps into them, though this is very hard to do, because this selfsame reason by nature becomes dialectical through its ideas, and this unavoidable illusion cannot be kept in check through any objective and dogmatic investigation of things, but only through a subjective investigation of reason itself, as a source of ideas.

63. (…) nothing is left except to reflect on the origin of this disunity of reason with itself, on whether a mere misunderstanding might perhaps be responsible for it (…)

64. There is (…) no real polemic in the field of pure reason. Both parties fence in the air and wrestle with their shadows, for the go beyond nature, where there is nothing that their dogmatic grasp can seize and hold. Fight as they may, the shadows that they cleave apart grow back together in an instant, like the heroes of Valhalla, to amuse themselves anew in bloodless battles.

66. Transcendental illusion (…) does not cease even though it is uncovered and its nullity is clearly seen into the transcendental criticism (e.g., the illusion in the proposition: "The world must have a beginning in time")… an **illusion** that cannot be avoided at all, just as little as we can avoid it that the sea appears higher in the middle than at the shores, since we see the former through higher rays of light than the latter, or even better, just as little as the astronomer can prevent the rising moon from appearing larger to him, even when he is not deceived by this illusion.

68. Thesis

The world has a beginning in time, and in space it is also enclosed in boundaries.

Antithesis

The world has no beginning and no bounds in space, but is infinite with regard to both time and space.

71. (…) one necessarily thinks of the fully elapsed time up to the present moment as also given (even if not as determinable by us). But as to the future, since it is not a condition for attaining to the present, it is a matter of complete indifference for comprehending the present what we want to hold about future time, whether it stops somewhere or runs to infinity.

72. (…) **the world has no beginning**; then it is too **big** for your concept, for this concept, which consists in a successive regress, can never reach the whole eternity that has elapsed. Suppose **it has a beginning**, then once again it is **too small** for your concept of understanding in the necessary empirical regress. For since the beginning always

presupposes a preceding time, it is still not unconditioned, and the law of the empirical use of the understanding obliges you to ask for a still higher temporal condition, and the world is obviously too small for this law.

It is exactly the same with the two answers to the question about the magnitude of the world in space. For **if it is infinite** and unbounded, then it is **too big** for every possible empirical concept. **If it is finite** and bounded, then you can still rightfully ask: What determines this boundary? Empty space is not a correlate of things that subsists by itself, and it cannot be a condition with which you can stop, still less an empirical condition that constitutes a part of a possible experience. (For who can have an experience of what is absolutely empty?) But for the absolute totality of the empirical synthesis it is always demanded that the unconditioned be an empirical concept. Thus a **bounded** world **is too small** for your concept.

73. Thesis

Every composite substance in the world consists of simple parts, and nothing exists anywhere except the simple or what is composed of simples.

Antithesis

No composite thing in the world consists of simple parts, and nowhere in it does there exist anything simple.

74. Thesis

Causality in accordance with laws of nature is no t the only one from which all the appearances of the world can be derived. It is also necessary to assume another causality through freedom in order to explain them.

Antithesis

There is no freedom, but everything in the world happens solely in accordance with laws of nature.

Thesis

To the world belongs something that, either as a part of it or as its cause, is an absolutely necessary being.

Antithesis

There is no absolutely necessary being existing anywhere, either in the world or outside the world as its cause.

75. The dogmatic proofs culminating in contradictions are not an imposture, but perfectly sound if it is assumed that phenomena are things in themselves. Or in other terms: The absolute cannot be conceived without contradictions. But if things are phenomena, in no sense unconditional, and if they draw their character from our manner of representing them, there ceases to be any contradiction.

76. Wherever a constituent of the world we experience shoes itself to be determined by a series of conditions that we are unable to follow through to their endpoint, our thinking becomes entangled in an insoluble contradiction as soon as this series of conditions turns out to be one that *exists in and for itself*.

77. The transcendental attempts of pure reason (…) 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.

80. The understanding constitutes an object for reason, just as sensibility does for the understanding. To make systematic unity of all possible empirical actions of the understanding is a business of reason, just as the understanding connects the manifold of appearances through concepts and brings it under empirical laws.

84. (…) by marking off limits (the "discipline of pure reason"), it [Kant's critical philosophy] freed thought from all manner of phantasms in order to make room for the positive. It opened the way not only to the sure progress of science but also to faith, a faith grounded in reason. For dogmatism always leads ultimately to skepticism and unbelief, while critique leads to science and faith.

85. Both taken together are, namely, the pure forms of all sensible intuition, and thereby make possible synthetic *a priori* propositions. But these *a priori* sources of cognition determine their own boundaries by that very fact (that they are merely conditions of sensibility), namely that they apply to objects only so far as they are considered as appearances, but do not present things in themselves.

89. One can call a procedure of this sort, subjecting the *facta* of reason to examination and when necessary to blame, the **censorship** of reason. It is beyond doubt that this censorship inevitably leads to **doubt** about all transcendent use of principles. But this is only the second step, which is far from completing the work. The first step in matters of pure reason, which characterizes its childhood, is **dogmatic**. The just mentioned second step is **skeptical**, and gives evidence of the caution of the power of judgment sharpened by experience. Now, however, a third step is still necessary, which pertains only to the mature and adult power of judgment, 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** but rather the determinate **boundaries** of it – not merely ignorance in one part or another but ignorance in regard to all possible questions of a certain sort – are not merely suspected but are proved from principles. Thus skepticism is a resting-place for human reason, which can reflect upon its dogmatic peregrination and make a survey of the region in which it finds itself in order to be able to choose its path in the future with greater certainty, but it is not a dwelling-place for permanent residence; for the latter can only be found in a complete certainty, whether it be one of the cognition of the objects themselves or of the boundaries within which all our cognitions of objects is enclosed.

91. Boundaries (in extended things) always presuppose a space that is found outside a certain fixed location, and that encloses that 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.

93. If I represent the surface of the earth (in accordance with sensible appearance) as a plate, I cannot know how far it extends. But experience teaches me this: that wherever I go, I always see a space around me in which I could proceed farther; thus I cognize the limits of my actual knowledge of the earth at any time, but not the boundaries of all possible description of the earth. But if I have gotten as far as knowing that the earth is a sphere and its surface the surface of a sphere, then from a small part of the latter, e.g., from the magnitude of one degree, I can cognize its diameter and, by means of

this, the complete boundary, i.e., surface of the earth, determinately and in accordance with a priori principles; and although I am ignorant in regard to the objects that this surface might contain, I am not ignorant to the magnitude and limits of the domain that contains them.

94. What we *cannot* know is *beyond* our horizon, what we do not need to know is *outside* our horizon.

98. The consciousness of my ignorance (if this is not at the same time known to be necessary) should not end my enquiries, but is rather the proper cause to arouse them. All ignorance is either that of things or of the determination and boundaries of my cognition. Now if the ignorance is contingent, then in the first case it must drive me to investigate the things (objects) **dogmatically**, in the second case to investigate the boundaries of my possible cognition **critically**. But that my ignorance is absolutely necessary and hence absolves me from all further investigation can never be made out empirically, from **observation**, but only critically, **by getting to the bottom of [*Ergründung*]** the primary sources of our cognition.

CAPÍTULO 4

1. Between dogmatism and skepticism the intermediate and only lawful manner of thinking is criticism.

2. Kant advocated eclecticism, saying 'we will take what is good wherever it comes from.'

3. The contradictions and conflict of systems are the only thing that have in modern times prevented human reason from falling into complete disuse in the matters of metaphysics. Although they are all dogmatic to the highest degree, they still represent perfectly the position of skeptics for one who looks on the whole of this game. For this reason we can thank a Crusius as well as a Wolff for the fact that through the new paths they trod they at least prevented understanding from allowing its rights to become superannuated in stupid idleness and still preserved the seed for a more secure knowledge. Analyst and architectonical philosopher. In such a way the course of nature finally leads its beautiful although mostly mysterious order through obstacles toward perfection. Even a *système de la Nature* is advantageous to philosophy.

4. In order to find a way for the need of our age to steer successfully between the two cliffs of dogmatism and skepticism, and at the same time to determine both of these concepts suitably for this need, we must first of all establish its character with respect to the manner of thinking that makes this caution necessary.

Extensive knowledge and the possession of a large number of sciences do not yet comprise the character of this manner of thinking, for this concerns the quality and specific constitution of the power of judgement and the principles that determine what sort of use is intended for it. Whether our age has advanced very far in knowledge and whether its cognition should be called great can only be judged comparatively; our posteriority may well find it small. But a faculty may well already have ripened so that the later world need add nothing further to it (because it is not the quantity but the quality in the use of our cognitive faculty which is at issue), and this is the faculty of the power of judgement (*iudicium discretiuum*)

Our age is the age of critique, i, e., of an acute judging of the foundation of all assertions to which we have been brought by the experiences of many years, perhaps also by the careful investigation of nature through observation and experiment which was set

into motion by the famous *Bacon of Verulam*, not only in the assertions of natural science but also, by analogy, in other areas, of which the ancients knew nothing and where they were therefore accustomed to shaky opinions. It will be difficult for a future age to do better than us in this, unless out of negligence we do not make use of these principles as we should. Certainly no past age has done better than us in this regard, and this can therefore be called the scientific character of our age.

9. I had been an adherent of all philosophical systems in succession, Peripatetic, Spinozist, Leibnitzian, Kantian, and finally Sceptic; and I was devoted to that system, which for the time I regarded as alone true. At last I observed that all these systems contain something true, and are in certain respects equally useful. (..) the difference of philosophical systems depends on the ideas which lie at their foundation in regard to the objects of nature (…)

14. To proceed dogmatically with all cognitions, i.e., to hope for decided certainty without taking into consideration the grounds of the opposite, produces an insufficient illusion. For if I believe that nothing more can be sought out against the truth, then I stop investigating at once. But then the matter also has little foundation. One can well investigate something dogmatically, but not proceed dogmatically. With the dogmatic method one must also proceed skeptically, i.e., when I test whether I cannot say something in the matter on the side of an opponent. Skepticism, then, is where something is maintained dogmatically on both sides. One can do this by oneself, but then which of the two can decide better? Now comes the critical method, i.e., I investigate the sources of the dogmatic and the skeptical methods, and then I begin to see on which grounds a claim rests and on which grounds its opposite rests. Critical method is thus the intermediate method through which a cognition can attain certainty. It guards against the dogmatic method because it opposes dogmatism with skepticism[;] and since it has thereby weighed the grounds of both, it alone can decide how many grounds I have for holding-to-be-true.

15. [...] Kant finds himself (…) at a watershed of bourgeois consciousness. In a sense he provides the model for a habit of thought that has been widespread in normal bourgeois consciousness down to our own day. This is that curious synthesis of scepticism and dogmatism that each and every one of you will probably have experienced during your youth and from your family circumstances; it is, incidentally, a combination that does not fit badly with Kant himself since his philosophy represents a forced alliance of Humean scepticism and the dogmatism of classical rationalism. By scepticism I mean basically the bourgeois gesture that expresses the idea, well, what is truth? And which presumably likes nothing better in the New Testament better than the passage when Pilates asks that very question: What is truth? We should note that the only purpose of this question is to exclude every theoretical authority, every authoritative intervention of thought from the realm of experience. This was an attitude that made its contribution to the readiness of the bourgeoisie to swallow fascism and other forms of totalitarianism. On the other hand, however, certain ideas are to remain inviolate and to be immune to all criticism. Such ideas remain dogmatic; they must not be touched. These two elements: the doubt that anything can be true and the unquestioned authority of norms that are regarded simply as givens within existing reality – this situation corresponds fairly precisely to the division that is rooted in Kant´s philosophy.

17. Our author talks of the spirit of contradiction, of the cult of paradox, or crankiness in judgment. Paradox is good, if it does not entail acceptance of some particular point that is made. It is the unexpected element in thinking, by which men are often diverted into a new train of thought. The spirit of contradiction is evinced in company by dogmatism.

19. On the Physical Effect of Philosophy. It is the *health (status salubritatis) of reason*, as effect of philosophy.

20. The critique of pure reason is a prophylactic against a sickness of reason that has its germ in our nature. It is the opposite of the inclination that chains us to our fatherland (homesickness): a longing to leave our circle and to relate to other worlds.

22. Two metaphysici, one of whom proves the thesis, the other the antithesis, occupy in the eyes of a third observer the position of a skeptical examination. One must do both oneself.

25. [Critical philosophy] is an outlook ever-armed (against those who perversely confound appearances with things-in-themselves), and precisely because of this unceasingly accompanies the activity of reason, offers the prospect of an eternal peace among philosophers, through the impotence, on the one hand, of theoretical proofs to the contrary, and through the strength of the practical grounds for accepting its principles on the other; a peace having the further advantage of constantly activating the powers 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.

29. In the beginning, under the administration of the dogmatists, her rule was despotic. Yet because her legislation still retained traces of ancient barbarism, this rule gradually degenerated through internal wars into complete anarchy; and the skeptics, a kind of nomads who abhor all permanent cultivation of the soil, shattered civil unity from time to time. But since there were fortunately only a few of them, they could not prevent the dogmatists from continually attempting to rebuild, though never according to a plan unanimously accepted among themselves.

30. Now as far as the observers of a scientific method are concerned, they have here the choice of proceeding either **dogmatically** or **skeptically**, but in either case they have the obligation of proceeding **systematically**. If I here name with regard to the former the famous Wolff, and with regard to the latter David Hume, then for my present purposes I can leave the others unnamed. The **critical** path alone is still open.

31. A treatment of science is dogmatic when one does not trouble to investigate from which powers of the mind a cognition arises, but rather lays down as a basis certain general propositions and infers the rest from them; a treatment is critical when one attempts to discover the sources from which it arises. (…)

We must therefore investigate the powers of the mind out of which the cognitions arise, in order to see whether we can trust them, regardless of whether they seem to be obviously true - - and then, to cognize something a priori, which is what the faculty in general is based on. The critical method examines the proposition not objectively or according to its content, but rather subjectively. – Accordingly, the method of metaphysics is critical and dogmatic in order to find a criterion for distinguishing between the cognitions which legitimately arise from understanding and from reason, and those which come about through an illusion or through one's deceiving oneself.

32. One must rebuild on the plot where one has torn down, or at least, if one has disposed of the speculative brainstorm, one must make the understanding pure insights dogmatically intelligible and delineate its limits. With this I am now occupied (…)

33. One should not believe that everything before now was written and conceived as a mere loss. The dogmatic attempts can always go on, but a critique of them must follow, and they can only be used to judge about the illusion that human reason experiences if it confuses the subjective with the objective and sensibility with reason. (…)

I certainly believe that this doctrine will be the only one that will be left once minds have cooled from dogmatic fever ant that it must then endure forever; but I very much doubt that I will be the one that produces this alteration.

34. (…) where Kant had believed he was posing an absolutely necessary and universally valid problem, they saw only the expression of a personal view and dogma.

35. (...) on the one hand, reason is anti-dogmatic and denies itself the right to go beyond the limits of possible experience. (…)

On the other hand, however, it is this selfsame theoretical reason that actually installs this block which prevents reason to go beyond that point. It is theoretical reason in Kant that commands reason to stop and prevents it from carrying out its original task, namely, to think the Absolute.

45. Reflection (*reflexio*) does not have to do with objects themselves, in order to acquire concepts directly from them, but is rather the state of mind in which we first prepare ourselves to find out the subjective conditions under which we can arrive at concepts. It is the consciousness of the relation of given representations to our various sources of cognition, through which alone their relation among themselves can be correctly determined. The first question prior to all further treatment of our representation is this: In which cognitive faculty do they belong together? Is it the understanding or is it the senses before which they are connected or compared?

46. Allow me to call the position that we assign to a concept either in sensibility or in pure understanding its **transcendental place**. In the same way, the estimation of this position that pertains to every concept in accordance with the difference in its use, and guidance for determining this place for all concepts in accordance with rules, would be the **transcendental topic**, a doctrine that would thoroughly protect against false pretenses of the pure understanding and illusions arising therefrom by always distinguishing to which cognitive power the concepts properly belong.

47. 1. the sources of human knowledge,
2. the extent of the possible and profitable use of all knowledge, and finally
3. the limits of reason.

48. (…) if <he> obtains inner experience <from> himself, and if he persues this investigation as far as he can, he will have to confess that self-knowledge would lead to an unfathomable depth, to an abyss in the exploration of his nature.

50. (…) expression of captivity: as knowing subjects we know only ourselves. In this sense we are never able to get outside ourselves; we are imprisoned within ourselves.

51. That in every kind of connection in the sensible world there is never an absolutely first thing, thus that no infinity can be represented as entirely given, consequently that there is no absolute totality, proves that the absolute must be thought of as outside of it, and that the world itself exists only is relation to our senses.

64. In *addition* to the property of *self-consciousness*, by which man is to be distinguished above all other animals, and in virtue of which he is a *rational* animal (…), there is also the *itch* to use this power for *trifling*, and thereafter to trifle methodically and even by concepts alone, i.e, to *philosophize*; and then also to grate polemically upon others with one's philosophy, ie., to *dispute*, and since this does not readily happen without emotion, to *squabble* on behalf of one's philosophy, and finally, united in masses against one another (school against school, as contending armies) to *wage* upon *warfare*; this itch, I say, or rather *drive*, will have to be viewed as one of the beneficent and wise

arrangements of Nature, whereby she seeks to protect man from the great misfortune of decaying in living flesh.

65. All historical knowledge is empirical, and hence knowledge of things as they are, not that they necessarily have to be that way. Rational knowledge presents them according to their necessity. Thus a historical presentation of philosophy recounts how philosophizing has been done hitherto, and in what order. But philosophizing is a gradual development of human reason, and this cannot have set forth, or even have begun, upon the empirical path, and that by mere concepts. There must have been a need of reason (theoretical or practical) which obliged it to ascend from its judgments about things to the grounds thereof, up to the first, initially through common reason, e.g., from the world-bodies and their motion. But purposes were also encountered: and finally, since it was noticed that rational grounds can be sought concerning all things, a start was made with enumerating the concepts of reason (or those of the understanding) beforehand, and with analyzing thinking in general, without any object. The former was done by Aristotle, the latter even earlier by the logicians.

66. A philosophical history of philosophy is itself possible, not historically or empirically, but rationally, i.e., *a priori*. For although it establishes facts of reason, it does not borrow them from historical narrative, but draws them from the nature of human reason, as philosophical archaeology.

72. (…) if we were to ask (…) which method of philosophizing will be the most appropriate and the best in academies and which will please the most, the dogmatic or the skeptical?

Then we would necessarily have to answer: the dogmatic.

If a learned man steps up here and establishes something dogmatically concerning this or that cognition, then nothing can be easier for the listener[;] he need not examine anything, investigate anything, but instead only fix in his memory the little that the teacher says and expounds to him. In this way he remains completely at rest and in comfort[;] he need only memorize; whereas doubt about cognitions is far less comfortable, but instead is far more unsettling, and requires one's own reflection and investigation.

76. Not even death (…) can be deemed something by nature dreadful, just as life cannot be deemed something naturally fine. None of these things is thus and so by nature: all are matters of convention and relative.

CONCLUSÃO

2. The nature of man is wholly natural, *omne animal*.

There is nothing he may not make natural; there is nothing natural he may not lose.

9
Anexo II

Poema
*Biografia*_____

À Profª. Vera Cristina Bueno

Em abril nascia uma raposa, um chinês, um sábio
da Prússia
Quer idealista, empirista (dedica a *Crítica da Razão Pura* a Bacon de Verulâmio)
quer realista, materialista,
de pele rosada
Foi, do alto de seus 1,57m
sobretudo dualista, pluralista e iluminista

Empolgou-se com a revolução francesa, com Napoleão, como a maioria,
porém não alterou seu juízo frente ao Terror.
entende que a natureza e a humanidade fazem-nos *sociais insociáveis,*
matéria de uma madeira torta

A fevereiro de 1804, morre aos seus quase 80 anos
Uma vida planejada simplesmente e com certa dose de ambição,
quando havia de ser, à morte de seu pai

Kant sentira uma revolução em si e acreditou na revolução de si mesmo
Na maneira de viver e atuar no mundo, para pensar e exercer
a possibilidade da liberdade
como uma força viva

Pois é ainda racionalista, preceptor, Magister, Privat-Dozent
Acreditara na pedagogia da maioridade, na *Zétesis* e na crítica,
na Determinação da Necessidade e na Causalidade da Autonomia.
No reconhecimento da razão,
e o Entendimento dos seus elementos, seus conflitos e intrigas
E também o que a motiva e satisfaz

Não queria ensinar *pensamentos*, nem somente lecionar Geografia,
Antropologia, Metafísica , mas sim a *pensar*

Que saibam, nunca transou, morreu virgem
Jamais se casou, nunca teve uma namorada.

Requisitado na vida social,
inclusive pelos russos, efusivamente, à época das festas na invasão de *Königsberg*

Bebia socialmente, na sua intimidade fumava no seu cachimbo todas as manhãs.

Foi um querido professor e ensinou a mesma matéria, numa aula muito popular, durante "uns trinta anos", para oficiais, advogados, mercadores, estudantes de humanidades se orientarem no pensamento.

Mas então cansou um pouco de lecionar, estava arquitetando um edifício transcendental.
Após *renascer* (alguns têm o privilégio ou a desgraça de nascer somente uma única vez) não ouvia mais música, nem devia ler poesia, Alexander Pope o seu preferido
Na sua palingenesia pessoal, passa a dormir cedo e torna-se *I*mmanuel, conhecido então como ponteiro de relógio, por influência de seu amigo inglês Green.

Seu enterro, com dissensões acadêmico-políticas,
Um misto de respeito e desgosto, como o de Mozart

Referência para Goethe e Schiller (poeta e dramaturgo que estudou e
publicou filosofia no intervalo de cinco anos), caçoado por Ephraim Lessing, nos primórdios, que publica uma provocação dirigida ao *Magister Kant* sobre as "*Forças* [*Vivas*" da sua fase "pré-crítica"]
porém, logo cortada das obras completas do erudito judeu

Com a sua *crítica da capacidade de julgar* se dá o início do famigerado Idealismo [Alemão],
apazigua ao orientar Jacobi e Mendelssohn em *Panteismusstreit*
Honra a memória de David Hume ao berço da sua maturidade, e
Rousseau, no retrato único em adorno de seu escritório sóbrio e robusto.

Assusta Mendelssohn ao ser *Alleszermalmer* das filosofias de Wolff, Baumgarten, e outros seguidores de Leibniz, e ainda a deste, que fora, por sua vez, influenciado por Spinoza.
Chama-os de metafísicos dogmáticos, contudo sabe como abarcá-los e,
da História da Filosofia, considera ninguém estúpido,

Mas, a si mesmo, como a realização máxima da estória de seus conflitos tateantes, todos eles, saibam ou não, aos seus olhos, em tentativa una de conhecer a si mesmo e à razão.
Os abraça na sua *Dialética* da razão, os refuta com a sua *Analítica* do entendimento.
Assim representa, ao máximo e consistentemente, as forças em contradição e o labirinto interior, a ambivalência da *Aufklärung* e da modernidade.

Professor de Hamann e Herder,
estuda Vico e Newton, a eletricidade e terremotos
e, dentre todas as coisas, a lei anímica e o céu estrelado.

Es ist gut: suspira suas últimas palavras.