

Third Moment
of judgments of taste, concerning the *relation*
of the ends that are taken into
consideration in them.

§ 10.

On purposiveness in general.

If one would define what an end is in accordance with its transcendental determinations (without presupposing anything empirical, such as the feeling of pleasure), then an end is the object of a concept insofar as the latter is regarded as the cause of the former (the real ground of its possibility); and the causality of a **concept** with regard to its **object** is purposiveness (*forma finalis*).^a Thus where not merely the cognition of an object but the object itself (its form or its existence) as an effect is thought of as possible only through a concept of the latter, there one thinks of an end. **The representation of the effect is here the determining ground of its cause, and precedes the latter.** The consciousness of the causality of a representation with respect to the state of the subject, **for maintaining** it in that state, can here designate in general what is called pleasure; in contrast to which displeasure is that representation that contains the ground for determining the state of the representations to their own opposite (hindering or getting rid of them).^{b,25}

5: 220

what is an end?

final causation

The faculty of desire, insofar as it is determinable only through concepts, i.e., to act in accordance with the representation of an end, would be the will.²⁶ An object or a state of mind or even an action, however, even if its possibility does not necessarily presuppose the representation of an end, is called purposive merely because its possibility can only be explained and conceived by us insofar as we assume as its ground a causality in accordance with ends, i.e., a will that has arranged it so in accordance with the representation of a certain rule. Purposiveness can thus exist without an end, insofar as we do not place the causes^c of this form in a will, but can still make the explanation of its possibility conceivable to ourselves only by deriving it from a will. Now we do not always necessarily need to have insight through reason (concerning its possibility) into what we observe. Thus we can at least observe a purposiveness concerning form, even without basing it in an end (as the matter of the *nexus finalis*),^d and notice it in objects, although in no other way than by reflection.

^a purposive form

^b The words in parentheses were added in the second edition.

^c This word was singular in the first edition.

^d purposive connection

this the understanding, as the faculty of concepts, and the imagination, as the faculty for exhibiting them, feel themselves strengthened *a priori* (which, together with the precision which is introduced by reason, is called its elegance): for here at least the satisfaction, although its ground lies in concepts, is subjective, whereas perfection is accompanied with an objective satisfaction.

§ 63.

On the relative purposiveness of nature
in distinction from internal purposiveness.

Experience leads our power of judgment to the concept of an objective and material purposiveness, i.e., to the concept of an end of nature, only if there is a relation of the cause to the effect to be judged^{*a} which we can understand as lawful only insofar as we find ourselves capable of subsuming the idea of the effect under the causality of its cause as the underlying condition of the possibility of the former. But this can happen in two ways: either if we regard the effect immediately as a product of art or if we regard it only as material for the art of other possible natural beings, thus if we regard it either as an end or as a means for the purposive use of other causes. The latter purposiveness is called usefulness (for human beings) or advantageousness (for every other creature), and is merely relative; while the former is an internal purposiveness of the natural being.

5: 367

Rivers, e.g., carry with them all sorts of soil helpful for the growth of plants, which they sometimes deposit in the middle of the land, sometimes in their deltas. On many coasts, the tide spreads this silt on the land, or deposits it on the bank, and, particularly if human beings help prevent the ebb from carrying it away again, the fruitful land increases, and the vegetable kingdom wins a place where previously fish and shellfish dwelt. Most of these sorts of extension of the land have been produced by nature, and it continues to do so, although slowly. – Now the question arises, is this to be judged^b as an end of nature, because it is useful for human beings? – for its usefulness for the vegetable kingdom cannot be brought into the balance, because

* Since in pure mathematics there can never be an issue of the existence of things, but only of their possibility, namely the possibility of an intuition corresponding to their concept, and hence there can never be an issue of cause and effect, all of the purposiveness that has been noted there must therefore be considered merely as formal, never as a natural end.

5: 366

^a zu beurtheilen ist

^b zu beurtheilen sei

just as much is taken away from the creatures of the sea as is added to the land.³

5: 368 Or, to give an example of the advantageousness of certain natural things as means for other creatures (if one presupposes them as ends^a): no soil is more favorable to pine trees than a sandy soil. Now the ancient sea, before it withdrew from the land, left so many sandy tracts behind in our northern regions that on this soil, otherwise so useless for any cultivation, extensive pine forests grew up, for the irrational eradication of which we frequently blame our ancestors; and here one can ask whether this ancient deposit of sandy strata was an end of nature for the sake of the pine forests that were possible there. This much is clear: that if one assumes this to be an end of nature, then one would also have to admit that the sand is an end, though only a relative one, for which in turn the ancient beach and the withdrawal of the sea were the means; for in the series of subordinated members of a connection of ends every intermediate member must be considered as an end (although not as the final end), for which its proximate cause is the means. In the same way, if cattle, sheep, horses, etc. were even to exist in the world, then there had to be grass on the earth, and saltwort had to grow in the desert if camels were to thrive, and these and other herbivorous animals had to be found if there were to be wolves, tigers and lions. Hence the objective purposiveness which is grounded on advantageousness is not an objective purposiveness of the things in themselves, as if the sand in itself, as an effect of its cause, the sea, could not be comprehended without ascribing a purpose to the latter and without considering the effect, namely the sand, as a work of art. It is a merely relative purposiveness, contingent in the thing itself to which it is ascribed; and although in the examples we have given the species of grasses themselves are to be judged^b as organized products of nature, hence as rich in art, nevertheless in relation to the animals which they nourish they are to be regarded as mere raw materials.

If, however, the human being, through the freedom of his causality, finds things in nature completely advantageous for his often foolish aims (colorful bird feathers for the decoration of his clothing, colored soils or juices of plants for painting himself), but sometimes also to his rational ends, as the horse for riding or the ox and in Minorca even the ass and the swine for plowing, one cannot assume here even a relative end of nature (for this use). For the human's reason knows how to bring things into correspondence with his own arbitrary inspi-

^a In the second edition, this is changed to "means"; the first edition seems preferable here.

^b *zu beurtheilen sind*

rations, to which he was by no means predestined by nature. Only if one assumes that human beings have to live on the earth would there also have to be at least no lack of the means without which they could not subsist as animals and even as rational animals (in however low a degree); but in that case those things in nature which are indispensable for this purpose^a would also have to be regarded as natural ends.

From this it can readily be seen that external purposiveness (advantageousness of one thing for another) can be regarded as an external natural end only under the condition that the existence of that for which it is advantageous, whether in a proximate or a distant way, is in itself an end of nature. This, however, can never be made out by mere contemplation of nature; thus it follows that relative purposiveness, although it gives hypothetical indications of natural ends, nevertheless justifies no absolute teleological judgments.

5: 369

In cold lands the snow protects the seeds^b from frost; it facilitates communication among humans (by means of sleds); the Laplanders find animals there that bring about this communication (reindeer), which find adequate nourishment in a sparse moss, which they must even scrape out from under the snow, and yet are easily tamed and readily deprived of the freedom in which they could otherwise maintain themselves quite well. For other peoples^c in the same icy regions the sea contains a rich supply of animals which, even beyond the nourishment and clothing that they provide and the wood which the sea as it were washes up for them for houses, also supplies them with fuel for warming their huts. Now here is an admirable confluence of so many relations of nature for one end: and this is the Greenlander, the Lapp, the Samoyed, the Yakut, etc. But one does not see why human beings have to live there at all. Thus to say that moisture falls from the air in the form of snow, that the sea has its currents which float the wood that has grown in warmer lands there, and that great sea animals filled with oil exist **because** the cause that produces all these natural products is grounded in the idea of an advantage for certain miserable creatures would be a very bold and arbitrary judgment. For even if all of this natural usefulness did not exist, we would find nothing lacking in this state of things for the adequacy of natural causes; rather, even merely to demand such a predisposition and to expect such an end of nature would seem to us presumptuous and ill-considered (for only the greatest incompatibility among human beings could have forced them into such inhospitable regions).⁴

^a *zu diesem Behuf*

^b reading *Saaten* with the first edition rather than *Staaten* (states) with the second.

^c The word “peoples” (*Völker*) was added in the second edition.

§ 64.

On the special character of
things as natural ends.

5: 370

In order to see that a thing is possible only as an end, i.e., that the causality of its origin must be sought not in the mechanism of nature, but in a cause whose productive capacity^a is determined by concepts, it is necessary that its form not be possible in accordance with mere natural laws, i.e., ones that can be cognized by us through the understanding, applied to objects of the senses, alone; rather even empirical cognition of their cause and effect presupposes concepts of reason.⁵ Since reason must be able to cognize the necessity in every form of a natural product if it would understand the conditions connected with its generation, the **contingency** of their form with respect to all empirical laws of nature in relation to reason is itself a ground for regarding their causality as if it were possible only through reason; but this is then the capacity^b for acting in accordance with ends (a will); and the object which is represented as possible only on this basis is represented as possible only as an end.

If someone were to perceive a geometrical figure, for instance a regular hexagon, drawn in the sand in an apparently uninhabited land, his reflection, working with a concept of it, would become aware of the unity of the principle of its generation by means of reason, even if only obscurely, and thus, in accordance with this, would not be able to judge as a ground of the possibility of such a shape the sand, the nearby sea, the wind, the footprints of any known animals, or any other non-rational cause, because the contingency of coinciding with such a concept, which is possible only in reason, would seem to him so infinitely great that it would be just as good as if there were no natural law of nature, consequently no cause in nature acting merely mechanically, and as if the concept of such an object could be regarded as a concept that can be given only by reason and only by reason compared with the object, thus as if only reason can contain the causality for such an effect, consequently that this object must be thoroughly regarded as an end, but not a natural end, i.e., as a product of **art** (*vestigium hominis video*^c).⁶

But in order to judge^d something that one cognizes as a product of nature as being at the same time an end, hence a **natural end**, something more is required if there is not simply to be a contradiction here.

^a *Vermögen zu wirken*

^b *Vermögen*

^c I see it as a trace of a human being.

^d *beurtheilen*

I would say provisionally that a thing exists as a natural end **if it is cause and effect of itself** (although in a twofold sense);^a for in this there lies a causality the likes of which cannot be connected with the mere concept of a nature without ascribing an end to it, but which in that case also can be conceived without contradiction but cannot be comprehended. We will first elucidate the determination of this idea of a natural end by means of an example before we fully analyze it.⁷

First, a tree generates another tree in accordance with a known natural law. However, the tree that it generates is of the same species;^b and so it generates itself as far as the **species** is concerned, in which it, on one side as effect, on the other as cause, unceasingly produces itself, and likewise, often producing itself, continuously preserves itself, as species.

Second, a tree also generates itself as an **individual**. This sort of effect we call, of course, growth; but this is to be taken in such a way that it is entirely distinct from any other increase in magnitude in accordance with mechanical laws, and is to be regarded as equivalent, although under another name, with generation. This plant first prepares the matter that it adds to itself with a quality peculiar to its species, which could not be provided by the mechanism of nature outside of it, and develops itself further by means of material which, as far as its composition is concerned, is its own product. For although as far as the components that it receives from nature outside of itself are concerned, it must be regarded only as an educt, nevertheless in the separation and new composition of this raw material there is to be found an originality of the capacity^c for separation and formation in this sort of natural being that remains infinitely remote from all art when it attempts to reconstitute such a product of the vegetable kingdom from the elements that it obtains^d by its decomposition or from the material that nature provides for its nourishment.

Third,^e one part of this creature also generates itself in such a way that the preservation of the one is reciprocally dependent on the preservation of the other. An eye from the leaf of one tree grafted into the twig of another brings forth a growth of its own kind in an alien stock, and similarly a scion attached to another trunk. Hence one can regard every twig or leaf of one tree as merely grafted or inoculated into it, hence as a tree existing in itself, which only depends on the other and

^a The phrase enclosed in these parentheses was added in the second edition.

^b *Gattung*

^c *-vermögens*

^d The word "obtains" (*erhält*) was inserted in the second edition.

^e The words "First" and "Second" in the preceding two paragraphs are not emphasized in Kant's text.

5: 372 nourishes itself parasitically. At the same time, the leaves are certainly products of the tree, yet they preserve it in turn, for repeated defoliation would kill it, and its growth depends upon their effect on the stem. The self-help of nature in the case of injury in these creatures, where the lack of a part that is necessary for the preservation of the neighboring parts can be made good by the others; the miscarriages or malformations in growth, where certain parts form themselves in an entirely new way because of chance defects or obstacles, in order to preserve that which exists and bring forth an anomalous creature: these I mention only in passing, although they belong among the most wonderful properties of organized creatures.

§ 65.

Things, as natural ends, are organized beings.

According to the characterization of the previous section, a thing that is to be cognized as a natural product but yet at the same time as possible only as a natural end must be related to itself reciprocally as both cause and effect, which is a somewhat improper and indeterminate expression, in need of a derivation from a determinate concept.

The causal nexus,^a insofar as it is conceived merely by the understanding, is a connection that constitutes a series (of causes and effects) that is always descending; and the things themselves, which as effects presuppose others as their causes, cannot conversely be the causes of these at the same time. This causal nexus is called that of efficient causes (*nexus effectivus*). In contrast, however, a causal nexus can also be conceived in accordance with a concept of reason (of ends), which, if considered as a series, would carry with it descending as well as ascending dependency, in which the thing which is on the one hand designated as an effect nevertheless deserves, in ascent, the name of a cause of the same thing of which it is the effect. In the practical sphere (namely, of art) such a connection can readily be found, e.g., the house is certainly the cause of the sums that are taken in as rent, while conversely the representation of this possible income was the cause of the construction of the house.⁸ Such a causal connection is called that of final causes (*nexus finalis*). The first could perhaps more aptly be called the connection of real causes, and the second that of ideal ones, since with this terminology it would immediately be grasped that there cannot be more than these two kinds of causality.

Now for a thing as a natural end it is requisite, **first**, that its parts

^a *Kausalverbindung*

(as far as their existence and their form are concerned) are possible only through their relation to the whole. For the thing itself is an end, and is thus comprehended under a concept or an idea that must determine *a priori* everything that is to be contained in it. But insofar as a thing is conceived of as possible only in this way it is merely a work of art, i.e., the product of a rational cause distinct from the matter (the parts), the causality of which (in the production and combination of the parts) is determined through its idea of a whole that is thereby possible (thus not through nature outside of it).⁹

But if a thing, as a natural product, is nevertheless to contain in itself and its internal possibility a relation to ends, i.e., is to be possible only as a natural end and without the causality of the concepts of a rational being outside of it, then it is required, **second**, that its parts be combined into a whole by being reciprocally the cause and effect of their form. For in this way alone is it possible in turn for the idea of the whole conversely (reciprocally) to determine the form and combination of all the parts: not as a cause – for then it would be a product of art – but as a ground for the cognition of the systematic unity of the form and the combination of all of the manifold that is contained in the given material for someone who judges^a it.

For a body, therefore, which is to be judged^b as a natural end in itself and in accordance with its internal possibility, it is required that its parts reciprocally produce each other, as far as both their form and their combination is concerned, and thus produce a whole out of their own causality, the concept of which, conversely, is in turn the cause (in a being that would possess the causality according to concepts appropriate for such a product) of it in accordance with a principle; consequently the connection of **efficient causes** could at the same time be judged^c as an **effect through final causes**.

In such a product of nature each part is conceived as if it exists only **through** all the others, thus as if existing **for the sake of the others** and **on account of** the whole, i.e., as an instrument (organ), which is, however, not sufficient (for it could also be an instrument of art, and thus represented as possible at all only as an end); rather it must be thought of as an organ that **produces** the other parts (consequently each produces the others reciprocally), which cannot be the case in any instrument of art, but only of nature, which provides all the matter for instruments (even those of art): only then and on that account can such a product, as an **organized** and **self-organizing** being, be called a **natural end**.

5: 374

^a *beurtheilt*

^b *beurtheilt*

^c *beurtheilt*

In a watch one part is the instrument for the motion of another, but one wheel is not the efficient cause for the production of the other: one part is certainly present for the sake of the other but not because of it. Hence the producing cause of the watch and its form is not contained in the nature (of this matter), but outside of it, in a being that can act in accordance with an idea of a whole that is possible through its causality. Thus one wheel in the watch does not produce the other, and even less does one watch produce another, using for that purpose other matter (organizing it); hence it also cannot by itself replace parts that have been taken from it, or make good defects in its original construction by the addition of other parts, or somehow repair itself when it has fallen into disorder: all of which, by contrast, we can expect from organized nature. – An organized being is thus not a mere machine, for that has only a **motive** power, while the organized being possesses in itself a **formative** power, and indeed one that it communicates to the matter, which does not have it (it organizes the latter): thus it has a self-propagating formative power, which cannot be explained through the capacity for movement alone (that is, mechanism).¹⁰

5: 375 One says far too little about nature and its capacity^a in organized products if one calls this an **analogue of art**: for in that case one conceives of the artist (a rational being) outside of it. Rather, it organizes itself, and in every species of its organized products, of course in accordance with some example in the whole, but also with appropriate deviations, which are required in the circumstances for self-preservation. Perhaps one comes closer to this inscrutable property if one calls it an **analogue of life**: but then one must either endow matter as mere matter with a property (hylozoism) that contradicts its essence, or else associate with it an alien principle **standing in communion** with it (a soul), in which case, however, if such a product is to be a product of nature, organized matter as an instrument of that soul is already presupposed, and thus makes that product not the least more comprehensible, or else the soul is made into an artificer of this structure, and the product must be withdrawn from (corporeal) nature. Strictly speaking, the organization of nature is therefore not analogous with any causality that we know.* Beauty in nature, since it is ascribed

5: 375 * One can, conversely, illuminate a certain association, though one that is encountered more in the idea than in reality, by means of an analogy with the immediate ends of nature that have been mentioned. Thus, in the case of a recently undertaken fundamental transformation of a great people into a state, the word **organization** has frequently been quite appropriately used for

^a *Vermögen*

to objects only in relation to reflection on their **outer** intuition, thus only to the form of their surfaces, can rightly be called an analogue of art. But **inner natural perfection**, as is possessed by those things that are possible only as **natural ends** and hence as organized beings, is not thinkable and explicable in accordance with any analogy to any physical, i.e., natural capacity that is known to us; indeed, since we ourselves belong to nature in the widest sense, it is not thinkable and explicable even through an exact analogy with human art.

The concept of a thing as in itself a natural end is therefore not a constitutive concept of the understanding or of reason, but it can still be a regulative concept for the reflecting power of judgment, for guiding research into objects of this kind and thinking over their highest ground in accordance with a remote analogy with our own causality in accordance with ends; not, of course, for the sake of knowledge of nature or of its original ground, but rather for the sake of the very same practical faculty of reason in us in analogy with which we consider the cause of that purposiveness.

Organized beings are thus the only ones in nature which, even if considered in themselves and without a relation to other things, must nevertheless be thought of as possible only as its ends, and which thus first provide objective reality for the concept of an **end** that is not a practical end but an end of **nature**, and thereby provide natural science with the basis for a teleology, i.e., a way of judging^a its objects in accordance with a particular principle the likes of which one would otherwise be absolutely unjustified in introducing at all (since one cannot at all understand the possibility of such a kind of causality *a priori*).

5: 376

§ 66.

~~On the principle for the judging^b of the internal purposiveness in organized beings~~

~~This principle, or its definition, states: **An organized product of nature is that in which everything is an end and reciprocally a means**~~

the institution of the magistracies, etc., and even of the entire body politic. For in such a whole each member should certainly be not merely a means, but at the same time also an end, and, insofar as it contributes to the possibility of the whole, its position and function should also be determined by the idea of the whole.¹¹

^a *Beurteilungsart*

^b *Beurteilung*

ends of nature. We may consider it as a favor* that nature has done for us that in addition to usefulness it has so richly distributed beauty and charms, and we can love it on that account, just as we regard it with respect because of its immeasurability, and we can feel ourselves to be ennobled in this contemplation – just as if nature had erected and decorated its magnificent stage precisely with this intention.

5: 381 In this section we have meant to say nothing except that once we have discovered in nature a capacity^a for bringing forth products that can only be conceived by us in accordance with the concept of final causes, we may go further and also judge^b to belong to a system of ends even those things (or their relation, however purposive)^c which do not make it necessary to seek another principle of their possibility beyond the mechanism of blindly acting causes; because the former idea already, as far as its ground is concerned, leads us beyond the sensible world, and the unity of the supersensible principle must then be considered as valid in the same way not merely for certain species of natural beings but for the whole of nature as a system.

§ 68.

On the principle of teleology as an internal principle of natural science.

The principles of a science are either internal to it, and are then called indigenous (*principia domestica*), or they are based on principles that can find their place only outside of it, and are *foreign* principles (*peregrina*).^d Sciences that contain the latter base their doctrines on auxiliary propositions (*lemmata*), i.e., they borrow some concept, and along with it a basis for order, from another science.¹⁷

Every science is of itself a system; and it is not enough that in it we build in accordance with principles and thus proceed technically; rather, in it, as a freestanding building, we must also work architecton-

5: 380 * In the aesthetic part it was said that **we would look on nature with favor** insofar as we have an entirely free (disinterested) satisfaction in its form. For in this mere judgment of taste there is no regard for the end for which these natural beauties exist, whether to arouse pleasure in us or without any relation to us as ends. In a teleological judgment, however, we do attend to this relation, and then we can **regard it as a favor of nature** that by means of the exhibition of so many beautiful shapes it would promote culture.

^a *Vermögen*

^b *beurtheilen*

^c Parentheses added in the second edition.

^d foreign

ically, and treat it not like an addition and as a part of another building, but as a whole by itself, although afterwards we can construct a transition from this building to the other or vice versa.

Thus if one brings the concept of God into natural science and its context in order to make purposiveness in nature explicable, and subsequently uses this purposiveness in turn to prove that there is a God, then there is nothing of substance in either of the sciences, and a deceptive fallacy^a casts each into uncertainty by letting them cross each other's borders.

The expression "an end of nature" is already enough to preclude this confusion so that there is no mix-up between natural science and the occasion that it provides for the **teleological** judging^b of its objects and the consideration of God, and thus a **theological** derivation; and one must not regard it as unimportant whether one exchanges the former expression for that of a divine purpose in the order of nature or even passes off the latter as more fitting and more suitable for a pious soul because in the end it must come down to deriving every purposive form in nature from a wise author of the world; rather, we must carefully and modestly restrict ourselves to the expression that says only exactly as much as we know, namely that of an end of nature. For even before we ask after the cause of nature itself, we find within nature and the course of its generation products generated in accordance with the known laws of experience within it, in accordance with which natural science must judge^c its objects and thus seek within itself for their causality in accordance with the rule of ends. Hence natural science must not jump over its boundaries in order to bring within itself as an indigenous principle that to whose concept no experience at all can ever be adequate and upon which we are authorized to venture only after the completion of natural science.

5: 382

Natural properties that can be demonstrated *a priori* and whose possibility can thus be understood from general principles without any assistance from experience, even though they are accompanied with a technical purposiveness, can nevertheless, because they are absolutely necessary, not be counted at all as part of the teleology of nature as a method of solving its problems that belongs within physics. Arithmetical and geometrical analogies as well as universal mechanical laws, no matter how strange and astonishing the unification of different and apparently entirely independent rules in a single principle in them may seem, can make no claim on that account to be teleological grounds of explanation within physics; and even if they deserve to be taken into

^a *Diallele*

^b *Beurtheilung*

^c *beurtheilen*

consideration within the general theory of the purposiveness of things in nature, this would still belong elsewhere, namely in metaphysics, and would not constitute any internal principle of natural science: whereas in the case of the empirical laws of natural ends in organized beings it is not merely permissible but is even unavoidable to use the teleological **way of judging**^a as the principle of the theory of nature with regard to a special class of its objects.

5: 383 Now in order to remain strictly within its own boundaries, physics abstracts entirely from the question of whether the ends of nature are **intentional** or **unintentional**; for that would be meddling in someone else's business (namely, in that of metaphysics). It is enough that there are objects that are **explicable** only in accordance with natural laws that we can think only under the idea of ends as a principle, and which are even internally **cognizable**, as far as their internal form is concerned, only in this way. In order to avoid even the least suspicion of wanting to mix into our cognitive grounds something that does not belong in physics at all, namely a supernatural cause, in teleology we certainly talk about nature as if the purposiveness in it were intentional, but at the same time ascribe this intention to nature, i.e., to matter, by which we would indicate (since there can be no misunderstanding here, because no intention in the strict sense of the term can be attributed to any lifeless matter) that this term signifies here only a principle of the reflecting, not of the determining power of judgment, and is thus not meant to introduce any special ground for causality, but is only meant to add to the use of reason another kind of research besides that in accordance with mechanical laws, in order to supplement the inadequacy of the latter even in the empirical search for all the particular laws of nature. Hence in teleology, insofar as it is connected to physics, we speak quite rightly of the wisdom, the economy, the forethought, and the beneficence of nature, without thereby making it into an intelligent being (since that would be absurd); but also without daring to set over it, as its architect, another, intelligent being, because this would be presumptuous;* rather, such talk is only meant to designate a

5: 383 * The German word **presumptuous**^b is a good, meaningful word. A judgment in which we forget to take the proper measure of our powers (of understanding) can sound very modest and yet make great claims and be very presumptuous. Most of the judgments by means of which we purport to exalt the divine wisdom are like this, since in them we ascribe intentions to the works of creation and preservation that are really intended to do honor to our own wisdom as subtle thinkers.

^a *Beurtheilungsart*

^b *vermessen*

kind of causality in nature, in accordance with an analogy with our own causality in the technical use of reason, in order to keep before us the rule in accordance with which research into certain products of nature must be conducted.

Why, then, does teleology usually not constitute a proper part of theoretical natural science, but is instead drawn into theology as a propaedeutic or transition? This is done in order to keep the study of the mechanism of nature restricted to what we can subject to our observation or experiments, so that we could produce it ourselves, like nature, at least as far as the similarity of its laws is concerned; for we understand completely only that which we ourselves can make and bring about in accordance with concepts. Organization, however, as the internal end of nature, infinitely surpasses all capacity^a for a similar presentation by art; and as far as natural arrangements that are held to be externally purposive are concerned (e.g., wind, rain, etc.), physics can very well consider their mechanism, but it cannot present their relation to ends, insofar as this is supposed to be a condition necessarily belonging to their cause, at all, because this necessity in the connection pertains entirely to the combination of our concepts and not to the constitution of things.

^a *Vermögen*

with the constitution of our (partly sensible) nature, it can serve as a universal **regulative principle** for ourselves and for every being standing in connection with the sensible world, so far as we can represent that in accordance with the constitution of our own reason and capacity," which does not determine the constitution of freedom, as a form of causality, objectively, but rather makes the rules of actions in accordance with that idea into commands for everyone and indeed does so with no less validity than if it did determine freedom objectively.

Likewise, as far as the case before us is concerned, it may be conceded that we would find no distinction between a natural mechanism and a technique of nature, i.e., a connection to ends in it, if our understanding were not of the sort that must go from the universal to the particular, and the power of judgment can thus cognize no purposiveness in the particular, and hence make no determining judgments, without having a universal law under which it can subsume the particular. But now since the particular, as such, contains something contingent with regard to the universal, but reason nevertheless still requires unity, hence lawfulness, in the connection of particular laws of nature (which lawfulness of the contingent is called purposiveness), and the *a priori* derivation of the particular laws from the universal, as far as what is contingent in the former is concerned, is impossible through the determination of the concept of the object, thus the concept of the purposiveness of nature in its products is a concept that is necessary for the human power of judgment in regard to nature but does not pertain to the determination of the objects themselves, thus a subjective principle of reason for the power of judgment which, as regulative (not constitutive), is just as necessarily valid for our **human power of judgment** as if it were an objective principle.

5: 405

§ 77.

On the special character of the human understanding, by means of which the concept of a natural end is possible for us.

In the remark, we have adduced special characteristics of our cognitive faculty (even the higher one) which we may easily be misled into carrying over to the things themselves as objective predicates; but they concern ideas for which no appropriate objects can be given in experience, and which could therefore serve only as regulative principles in the pursuit of experience. It is the same with the concept of a natural end, as far as the cause of the possibility of such a predicate is concerned, which can only lie in the idea; but the consequence that answers to it (the product) is still given in nature, and the concept of a causality of the latter, as a being acting in accordance with ends, seems

^a *Vermögens*

to make the idea of a natural end into a constitutive principle of nature; and in this it differs from all other ideas.

This difference, however, consists in the fact that the idea at issue is not a principle of reason for the understanding, but for the power of judgment, and is thus merely the application of an understanding in general to possible objects of experience, where, indeed, the judgment cannot be determining, but merely reflecting, hence where the object is, to be sure, given in experience, but where it cannot even be **determinately** (let alone completely appropriately) **judged** in accordance with the idea, but can only be reflected upon.

What is at issue is therefore a special character of **our** (human) understanding with regard to the power of judgment in its reflection upon things in nature. But if that is the case, then it must be based on the idea of a possible understanding other than the human one (as in the *Critique of Pure Reason* we had to have in mind another possible intuition if we were to hold our own to be a special kind, namely one that is valid of objects merely as appearances),¹⁰ so that one could say that certain products of nature, as far as their possibility is concerned, **must**, given the particular constitution of our understanding, **be considered by us** as intentional and generated as ends, yet without thereby demanding that there actually is a particular cause that has the representation of an end as its determining ground, and thus without denying that another (higher) understanding than the human one might be able to find the ground of the possibility of such products of nature even in the mechanism of nature, i.e., in a causal connection for which an understanding does not have to be exclusively assumed as a cause.

5: 406

What is at issue here is thus the relation of **our** understanding to the power of judgment, the fact, namely, that we have to seek a certain contingency in the constitution of our understanding in order to notice this as a special character of our understanding in distinction from other possible ones.

This contingency is quite naturally found in the **particular**, which the power of judgment is to subsume under the **universal** of the concepts of the understanding; for through the universal of **our** (human) understanding the particular is not determined, and it is contingent in how many different ways distinct things that nevertheless coincide in a common characteristic can be presented to our perception. Our understanding is a faculty of concepts, i.e., a discursive understanding, for which it must of course be contingent what and how different might be the particular that can be given to it in nature and brought under its concepts. But since intuition also belongs to cognition, and a faculty of a **complete spontaneity of intuition** would be a cognitive faculty distinct and completely independent from sensibility,

and thus an understanding in the most general sense of the term, one can thus also conceive of an **intuitive** understanding (negatively, namely merely as not discursive),^a which does not go from the universal to the particular and thus to the individual (through concepts), and for which that contingency of the agreement of nature in its products in accordance with **particular** laws for the understanding, which makes it so difficult for ours to bring the manifold of these^b to the unity of cognition, is not encountered – a job that our understanding can accomplish only through the correspondence of natural characteristics with our faculty of concepts, which is quite contingent, but which an intuitive understanding would not need.

5: 407

Our understanding thus has this peculiarity for the power of judgment, that in cognition by means of it the particular is not determined by the universal, and the latter therefore cannot be derived from the former alone; but nevertheless this particular in the manifold of nature should agree with the universal (through concepts and laws), which agreement under such circumstances must be quite contingent and without a determinate principle for the power of judgment.

Nevertheless, in order for us to be able at least to conceive of the possibility of such an agreement of the things of nature with the power of judgment (which we represent as contingent, hence as possible only through an end aimed at it), we must at the same time conceive of another understanding, in relation to which, and indeed prior to any end attributed to it, we can represent that agreement of natural laws with our power of judgment, which for our understanding is conceivable only through ends as the means of connection, as **necessary**.

Our understanding, namely, has the property that in its cognition, e.g., of the cause of a product, it must go from the **analytical universal** (of concepts) to the particular (of the given empirical intuition), in which it determines nothing with regard to the manifoldness of the latter, but must expect this determination for the power of judgment from the subsumption of the empirical intuition (when the object is a product of nature) under the concept. Now, however, we can also conceive of an understanding which, since it is not discursive like ours but is intuitive, goes from the **synthetically universal** (of the intuition of a whole as such) to the particular, i.e., from the whole to the parts, in which, therefore, and in whose representation of the whole, there is **no contingency** in the combination of the parts, in order to make possible a determinate form of the whole, which is needed by our understanding, which must progress from the parts, as universally con-

^a The words contained in the parentheses were added in the second edition.

^b *derselben*; this could refer back to any of “nature,” “its products,” or its “particular laws.”

ceived grounds, to the different possible forms, as consequences, that can be subsumed under it. In accordance with the constitution of our understanding, by contrast, a real whole of nature is to be regarded only as the effect of the concurrent moving forces of the parts. Thus if we would not represent the possibility of the whole as depending upon the parts, as is appropriate for our discursive understanding, but would rather, after the model of the intuitive (archetypal)^a understanding, represent the possibility of the parts (as far as both their constitution and their combination is concerned) as depending upon the whole, then, given the very same special characteristic of our understanding, this cannot come about by the whole being the ground of the possibility of the connection of the parts (which would be a contradiction in the discursive kind of cognition), but only by the **representation** of a whole containing the ground of the possibility of its form and of the connection of parts that belongs to that. But now since the whole would in that case be an effect (**product**) the **representation** of which would be regarded as the **cause** of its possibility, but the product of a cause whose determining ground is merely the representation of its effect is called an end, it follows that it is merely a consequence of the particular constitution of our understanding that we represent products of nature as possible only in accordance with another kind of causality than that of the natural laws of matter, namely only in accordance with that of ends and final causes, and that this principle does not pertain to the possibility of such things themselves (even considered as phenomena) in accordance with this sort of generation, but pertains only to the judging^b of them that is possible for our understanding. From this we at the same time understand why in natural science we are far from being satisfied with an explanation of the products of nature by means of causality in accordance with ends, since here we are required to judge^c the generation of nature as is appropriate for our faculty for judging^d them, i.e., the power of reflecting judgment, and not according to the things themselves as is appropriate for the determining power of judgment. And further, 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 ectypus*) and the contingency of such a constitution we are led to that idea (of an *intellectus archetypus*), and that this does not contain any contradiction.

5: 408

Now if we consider a material whole, as far as its form is concerned,

^a *urbildlich*

^b *Beurtheilung*

^c *beurtheilen*

^d *beurtheilen*

5: 409 as a product of the parts and of their forces and their capacity to combine by themselves (including as parts other materials that they add to themselves), we represent a mechanical kind of generation. But from this there arises no concept of a whole as an end, whose internal possibility presupposes throughout the idea of a whole on which even the constitution and mode of action of the parts depends, which is just how we must represent an organized body. But from this, as has just been shown, it does not follow that the mechanical generation of such a body is impossible; for that would be to say the same as that it is impossible (i.e., self-contradictory) to represent such a unity in the connection of the manifold **for every understanding** without the idea of that connection being at the same time its generating cause, i.e., without intentional production. Nevertheless, this would in fact follow if we were justified in regarding material beings as things in themselves. For then the unity that constitutes the ground of the possibility of natural formations would be merely the unity of space, which is however no real ground of generatings but only their formal condition; although it has some similarity to the real ground that we seek in that in it no part can be determined except in relation to the whole (the representation of which is thus the basis of the possibility of the parts).¹¹ But since it is still at least possible to consider the material world as a mere appearance, and to conceive of something as a thing in itself (which is not an appearance) as substratum, and to correlate with this a corresponding intellectual intuition (even if it is not ours), there would then be a supersensible real ground for nature, although it is unknowable for us, to which we ourselves belong, and in which that which is necessary in it as object of the senses can be considered in accordance with mechanical laws, while the agreement and unity of the particular laws and corresponding forms, which in regard to the mechanical laws we must judge^a as contingent, can at the same time be considered in it, as object of reason (indeed the whole of nature as a system) in accordance with teleological laws, and the material world would thus be judged in accordance with two kinds of principles, without the mechanical mode of explanation being excluded by the teleological mode, as if they contradicted each other.

From this we may also understand what we could otherwise easily suspect but only with difficulty assert as certain and prove, namely, that the principle of a mechanical derivation of purposive products of nature could of course subsist alongside the teleological principle, but could by no means make the latter dispensable; i.e., one could investigate all the thus far known and yet to be discovered laws of mechanical gener-

^a *beurtheilen*

ation in a thing that we must judge^a as an end of nature, and even hope to make good progress in this, without the appeal to a quite distinct generating ground for the possibility of such a product, namely that of causality through ends, ever being canceled out; and absolutely no human reason (or even any finite reason that is similar to ours in quality, no matter how much it exceeds it in degree) can ever hope to understand the generation of even a little blade of grass from merely mechanical causes. For if the teleological connection of causes and effects is entirely indispensable for the possibility of such an object for the power of judgment, even merely for studying it with the guidance of experience; if for outer objects, as appearances, a sufficient ground related to causes cannot even be found, but this, which also lies in nature, must still be sought only in its supersensible substratum, from all possible insight into which we are cut off: then it is absolutely impossible for us to draw from nature itself any explanatory grounds for purposive connections, and in accordance with the constitution of the human cognitive faculty it is necessary to seek the highest ground of such connections in an original understanding as cause of the world.

5: 410

§ 78.

On the unification of the principle of the universal
~~mechanism of matter with the~~
 teleological principle in the technique of nature.

It is of infinite importance to reason that it not allow the mechanism of nature in its productions to drop out of sight and be bypassed in its explanations; for without this no insight into the nature of things can be attained. As soon as it is granted to us that a highest architect immediately created the forms of nature as they have always existed or has predetermined those which in their course are continuously formed in accordance with one and the same model, our cognition of nature is not thereby in the least advanced, because we do not know the mode of action of such a being and the ideas which should contain the principles of the possibility of natural beings at all, and we cannot explain nature from that being as if from above (*a priori*). But if, in order to explain the forms of the objects of experience from below (*a posteriori*), we appeal from them to a cause acting in accordance with ends because we believe that we find purposiveness in these forms, then our explanation would be entirely tautological, and reason would be deceived with words, not to mention that where we stray into excess with this sort of explanation, where knowledge of nature cannot follow

^a *beurtheilen*