The Transcendental Doctrine of Method Third Chapter

The

architectonic of pure reason

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

Under the government of reason our cognitions cannot at all constitute a rhapsody but must constitute a system, in which alone they can support and advance its essential ends. I understand by a system, however, the unity of the manifold cognitions under one idea. This is the rational concept of the form of a whole, insofar as through this the domain of the manifold as well as the position of the parts with respect to each other is determined a priori. The scientific rational concept thus contains the end and the form of the whole that is congruent with it. The unity of the end, to which all parts are related and in the idea of which they are also related to each other, allows the absence of any part to be noticed in our knowledge of the rest, and there can be no contingent addition or undetermined magnitude of perfection that does not have its boundaries determined a priori. The whole is therefore articulated (articulatio) and not heaped together (coacervatio);^a it can, to be sure, grow internally (per intus susceptionem)^b but not externally (per appositionem),^c like an animal body, whose growth does not add a limb but rather makes each limb stronger and fitter for its end without any alteration of proportion.

For its execution the idea needs a **schema**, i.e., an essential manifoldness and order of the parts determined *a priori* from the principle^d of the end. A schema that is not outlined in accordance with an idea,

" Literally, "heaped up."

^b from an internal cause

' by juxtaposition

^d Princip

А833/в861

Doctrine of Method. Ch. III

i.e., from the chief end of reason, but empirically, in accordance with aims occurring contingently (whose number^a one cannot know in advance), yields **technical** unity, but that which arises only in consequence of an idea (where reason provides the ends *a priori* and does not await them empirically) grounds **architectonic** unity. What we call science, whose schema contains the outline (*monogramma*) and the division of the whole into members in conformity with the idea, i.e., *a priori*, cannot arise technically, from the similarity of the manifold or the contingent use of cognition *in concreto* for all sorts of arbitrary external ends, but arises architectonically, for the sake of its affinity and its derivation from a single supreme and inner end, which first makes possible the whole; such a science must be distinguished from all others with certainty and in accordance with principles.^b

а834/в862

A835/B863

Nobody attempts to establish a science without grounding it on an idea. But in its elaboration the schema, indeed even the definition of the science which is given right at the outset, seldom corresponds to the idea; for this lies in reason like a seed, all of whose parts still lie very involuted and are hardly recognizable even under microscopic observation. For this reason sciences, since they have all been thought out from the viewpoint of a certain general interest, must not be explained and determined in accordance with the description given by their founder, but rather in accordance with the idea, grounded in reason itself, of the natural unity of the parts that have been brought together. For the founder and even his most recent successors often fumble around with an idea that they have not even made distinct to themselves and that therefore cannot determine the special content, the articulation (systematic unity) and boundaries of the science.

It is too bad that it is first possible for us to glimpse the idea in a clearer light and to outline a whole architectonically, in accordance with the ends of reason, only after we have long collected relevant cognitions haphazardly^c like building materials and worked through them technically with only a hint from an idea lying hidden within us. The systems seem to have been formed, like maggots, by a *generatio aequivoca*³⁹ from the mere confluence of aggregated concepts, garbled at first but complete in time, although they all had their schema, as the original seed, in the mere self-development of reason, and on that account are not merely each articulated for themselves in accordance with an idea but are rather all in turn purposively united with each other as members of a whole in a system of human cognition, and allow an architectonic to all human knowledge, which at the present time, since so much mater-

^a Menge

^b Principien

^c rhapsodistisch

The architectonic of pure reason

ial has already been collected or can be taken from the ruins of collapsed older edifices, would not merely be possible but would not even be very difficult. We shall content ourselves here with the completion of our task, namely, merely outlining the **architectonic** of all cognition from **pure reason**, and begin only at the point where the general root of our cognitive power divides and branches out into two stems, one of which is **reason**. By "reason" I here understand, however, the entire higher faculty of cognition, and I therefore contrast the rational to the empirical.

If I abstract from all content of cognition, objectively considered, then all cognition, considered subjectively, is either historical or rational. Historical cognition4º is cognitio ex datis,4 rational cognition, however, cognitio ex principiis.^b However a cognition may have been given originally, it is still historical for him who possesses it if he cognizes it only to the degree and extent that it has been given to him from elsewhere, whether it has been given to him through immediate experience or told to him or even given to him through instruction (general cognitions). Hence he who has properly learned a system of philosophy, e.g., the Wolffian system, although he has in his head all of the principles, explanations, and proofs together with the division of the entire theoretical edifice, and can count everything off on his fingers, still has nothing other than a complete historical cognition of the Wolffian philosophy; he knows and judges only as much as has been given to him. If you dispute one of his definitions, he has no idea where to get another one. He has formed himself according to an alien reason, but the faculty of imitation is not that of generation, i.e., the cognition did not arise from reason for him, and although objectively it was certainly a rational cognition, subjectively it is still merely historical. He has grasped and preserved well, i.e., he has learned, and is a plaster cast of a living human being. Rational cognitions that are objectively so (i.e., could have arisen originally only out of the reason of human beings themselves), may also bear this name subjectively only if they have been drawn out of the universal sources of reason, from which critique, indeed even the rejection of what has been learned, can also arise, i.e., from principles.^c

Now all rational cognition is either cognition from concepts or cognition from the construction of concepts; the former is called philosophical, the latter mathematical. I have already dealt with the inner difference between the two in the first chapter.⁴¹ A cognition can accordingly be objectively philosophical and yet subjectively historical, as A836/B864

A837/B865

cognition

693

[&]quot; cognition from data, or from what is given.

^b cognition from principles

^c Principien

Qu.

is the case with most students and with all of those who never see beyond their school and remain students their whole lives. But it is strange that mathematical cognition, however one has learned it, can still count subjectively as rational cognition, and that the difference present in the case of philosophical cognition is not present in this case. The cause of this is that the sources of cognition on which alone the teacher can draw lie nowhere other than in the essential and genuine principles^{*a*} of reason, and consequently cannot be derived from anywhere else by the student, nor disputed in any way, precisely because reason is here used *in concreto* though nevertheless *a priori*, founded, that is, in pure and therefore error-free intuition, and excludes all deception and error.⁴² Among all rational sciences (*a priori*), therefore, only mathematics can be learned, never philosophy (except historically); rather, as far as reason is concerned, we can at best only learn **to philosophize**.

Now the system of all philosophical cognition is **philosophy**. One must take this objectively if one understands by it the archetype for the assessment^b of all attempts to philosophize, which should serve to assess^c each subjective philosophy, the structure of which is often so manifold and variable. In this way philosophy is a mere idea of a possible science, which is nowhere given *in concreto*, but which one seeks to approach in various ways until the only footpath, much overgrown by sensibility, is discovered, and the hitherto unsuccessful ectype, so far as it has been granted to humans, is made equal to the archetype. Until then one cannot learn any philosophy; for where is it, who has possession of it, and by what can it be recognized? One can only learn to philosophize, i.e., to exercise the talent of reason in prosecuting its general principles^d in certain experiments that come to hand, but always with the reservation of the right of reason to investigate the sources of these principles themselves and to confirm or reject them.⁴³

Until now, however, the concept of philosophy^e has been only a scholastic concept,^f namely that of a system of cognition that is sought only as a science without having as its end anything more than the systematic unity of this knowledge, thus the logical perfection of cognition. But there is also a cosmopolitan concept^g (conceptus cosmicus) that has always grounded this term, especially when it is, as it were, personified and represented as an archetype in the ideal of the philosopher. From this point of view philosophy is the science of the relation of all

- ^a Principien
- ^b Beurtheilung
- ^c beurtheilen
- ^d Principien
- ^e Added in Kant's copy of the first edition: "Idealist, idea" (E CLXXXII, p. 54; 23:50).
- f Schulbegriff
- g Weltbegriff

А838/в866

scholastic vs cosmopolitan conception of philosophy

A830/B867

694

cognition to the essential ends of human reason (teleologia rationis bumanae),^a and the philosopher is not an artist of reason but the legislator of human reason. It would be very boastful to call oneself a philosopher in this sense^b and to pretend to have equaled the archetype, which lies only in the idea.

The mathematician, the naturalist, the logician are only artists of reason, however eminent the former may be in rational cognitions and however much progress the latter may have made in philosophical cognition. There is still a teacher in the ideal, who controls all of these and uses them as tools to advance the essential ends of human reason. Him alone we must call the philosopher; however, since he himself is still found nowhere, although the idea of his legislation is found in every human reason, we will confine ourselves to the latter and determine more precisely what philosophy, in accordance with this cosmopolitan concept,* prescribes for systematic unity from the standpoint of ends.

Essential ends are on this account not yet the highest, of which (in the complete systematic unity of reason) there can be only a single one. Hence they are either the final end,^c or subalternate ends, which necessarily belong to the former as means. The former is nothing other than the entire vocation^d of human beings, and the philosophy of it is called moral philosophy. On account of the preeminence which moral philosophy had over all other applications of reason, the ancients understood by the name of "philosopher" first and foremost the moralist, and even the outer appearance of self-control through reason still suffices today for calling someone a philosopher after a certain analogy, in spite of his limited knowledge.

Now the legislation of human reason (philosophy) has two objects, nature and freedom, and thus contains the natural law as well as the moral law, initially in two separate systems but ultimately in a single philosophical system. The philosophy of nature pertains to everything that **is**; that of morals only to that which **should be**.

All philosophy, however, is either cognition from pure reason or rational cognition from empirical principles.^e The former is called pure philosophy, the latter empirical.

* A cosmopolitan concept here means one that concerns that which necessarily interests everyone; hence I determine the aim of a science in accordance with scholastic concepts if it is regarded only as one of the skills for certain arbitrary ends.

 $\bullet \gamma = \int d^{1/2} \frac{d^2}{M_{\odot}} \frac{d^2}{d^2}$

а 839/ в 867

" teleology of human reason

- ^b Bedeutung
- Endzweck
- ^d Bestimmung
- e Principien

A840/B868

а841/в869

Now the philosophy of pure reason is either **propaedeutic** (preparation), which investigates the faculty of reason in regard to all pure *a priori* cognition, and is called **critique**, or, second, the system of pure reason (science), the whole (true as well as apparent) philosophical cognition from pure reason in systematic interconnection, and is called **metaphysics**; this name can also be given to all of pure philosophy including the critique, in order to comprehend the investigation of everything that can ever be cognized *a priori* as well as the presentation of that which constitutes a system of pure philosophical cognitions of this kind, but in distinction from all empirical as well as mathematical use of reason.

Metaphysics is divided into the metaphysics of the **speculative** and the **practical** use of pure reason, and is therefore either **metaphysics of nature** or **metaphysics of morals**. The former contains all rational principles^{*a*} from mere concepts (hence with the exclusion of mathematics) for the **theoretical** cognition of all things; the latter, the principles^{*b*} which determine **action and omission** *a priori* and make them necessary. Now morality is the only lawfulness of actions which can be derived entirely *a priori* from principles.^{*c*} Hence the metaphysics of morals is really the pure morality, which is not grounded on any anthropology (no empirical condition). The metaphysics of speculative reason is that which has customarily been called metaphysics **in the narrower sense**;^{*d*} but insofar as the pure doctrine of morals nevertheless belongs to the special stem of human and indeed philosophical cognition from pure reason, we will retain this term for it, although we set it aside here as not **now** pertaining to our end.

It is of the utmost importance to **isolate** cognitions that differ from one another in their species and origin, and carefully to avoid mixing them together with others with which they are usually connected in their use. What chemists do in analyzing materials, what mathematicians do in their pure theory of magnitude, the philosopher is even more obliged to do, so that he can securely determine the proper value and influence of the advantage that a special kind of cognition has over the aimless use of the understanding. Hence human reason has never been able to dispense with a metaphysics as long as it has thought, or rather reflected,^e though it has never been able to present it in a manner sufficiently purified of everything foreign to it. The idea of such a science is just as old as speculative human reason; and what reason does

- ^b Principien
- · Principien
- ^d Verstande
- * nach gedacht

[&]quot; Principien

not speculate, whether in a scholastic or a popular manner? One must nevertheless admit that the distinction of the two elements in our cognition, one of which is in our power completely a priori but the other of which can be derived only from experience a posteriori, has remained very indistinct, even among professional thinkers, and hence the determination of the bounds of a special kind of cognition, and thus the genuine idea of a science with which human reason has so long and so intensively occupied itself, has never been accomplished. When it was said that metaphysics is the science of the first principles" of human cognition,44 an entirely special kind of cognition was not thereby marked off, but only a rank in regard to generality, through which, therefore, it could not be clearly differentiated from empirical cognition; for even among empirical principles^b some are more general and therefore higher than others, and in the series of such a subordination (where one does not differentiate that which can be cognized completely a priori from that which can be cognized only a posteriori), where is one to make the cut that distinguishes the first part and highest members from the last part and the subordinate members?45 What would one say if chronology could designate the epochs of the world only by dividing them into the first centuries and the rest that follow them? One would ask, Do the fifth century, the tenth century, and so on also belong among the first ones?; likewise I ask, Does the concept of that which is extended belong to metaphysics? You answer, Yes! But what about that of body? Yes! And that of fluid body? You are stumped, for if it goes on this way, then everything will belong to metaphysics. From this one sees that the mere degree of subordination (the particular under the universal) cannot determine any boundaries for a science, but rather, in our case, only the complete heterogeneity and difference of origin can. But what obscured the fundamental idea of metaphysics from yet another side was that, as a priori cognition, it shows a certain homogeneity with mathematics, to which, as far as a priori origin is concerned, it is no doubt related; but the comparison between the kind of cognition from concepts in the former with the manner of judging a priori through the mere construction of concepts in the latter requires a difference between philosophical and mathematical cognition - thus a decided heterogeneity is revealed, which was always felt, as it were, but was never able to be brought to distinct criteria. Thus it has been the case until now that since philosophers themselves erred in the development of the idea of their science, its elaboration could have no determinate end and no secure guideline, and philosophers, with such arbitrarily designed projects, ignorant of the path they had to take, and

^a Principien

^b Principien

A843/B871

А844/ В872

Doctrine of Method, Ch. III

always disputing among themselves about the discoveries that each would like to have made on his own, have brought their science into contempt first among others and finally even among themselves.

Thus all pure a priori cognition, by means of the special faculty of cognition in which alone it can have its seat, constitutes a special unity, and metaphysics is that philosophy which is to present that cognition in this systematic unity. Its speculative part, to which this name has been especially appropriated, namely that which we call metaphysics of nature and which considers everything insofar as it is (not that which ought to be) on the basis of a priori concepts, is divided in the following way.^a

transcendental philosophy

A845/B873

the physiology of pure reason

А846/ В 874

Metaphysics in this narrower sense^b consists of transcendental philosophy and the physiology of pure reason. The former considers only the understanding and reason itself in a system of all concepts and principles that are related to objects in general, without assuming objects' that would be given (Ontologia); the latter considers nature, i.e., the sum total of given objects (whether they are given by the senses or, if one will, by another kind of intuition), and is therefore physiology (though only rationalis).46 Now, however, the use of reason in this rational consideration of nature is either physical or hyperphysical, or, better, either immanent or transcendent. The former pertains to nature so far as its cognition can be applied in experience (in concreto), the latter to that connection of the objects of experience which surpasses all experience. Hence this transcendent physiology has either an inner connection to its object or an outer one, both of which, however, go beyond possible experience; the former is the physiology of nature in its entirety, i.e., the transcendental cognition of the world, the latter that of the connection of nature in its entirety to a being beyond nature, i.e., the transcendental cognition of God.47

Immanent physiology, on the contrary, considers nature as the sum total of all objects of the senses, thus considers it as it is given to us, but only in accordance with a priori conditions, under which it can be given to us in general. There are, however, only two sorts of objects for this. 1. Those of outer sense, thus the sum total of these, corporeal nature. 2. The object of inner sense, the soul, and, in accordance with the fundamental concepts of this in general, thinking nature. The meta-

" Inserted in Kant's copy of the first edition:

"I would divide it in accordance with the classes of the categories, so that in each class the third category, which contains the other two, yields the idea of the science:

"1. General ontology [Allgemeine Wesenlebre]; 2. Theory of nature; 3. Cosmology [Weltwissenschaft]; 4. Theology." (E CLXXXIII, p. 54; 23:43). This is the last emendation Kant made in his copy of the first edition.

^b Verstande

· Objecte

physics of corporeal nature is called **physics**, but, since it is to contain only the principles of its *a priori* cognition, **rational physics**. The metaphysics of thinking nature is called **psychology**, and because of the cause that has just been adduced only the **rational cognition** of this is here meant.

Accordingly, the entire system of metaphysics consists of four main parts. **1. Ontology. 2. Rational Physiology. 3. Rational Cosmology. 4. Rational Theology.** The second part, namely the doctrine of nature of pure reason, contains two divisions, *physica rationalis*^{*} and *psychologia rationalis*.⁴⁸

The original idea of a philosophy of pure reason itself prescribes this division; it is therefore **architectonic**, in conformity with its essential ends, and not merely **technical**, in accordance with contingently perceived affinities and, as it were, established by good luck; and for that very reason it is unchangeable and legislative. However, there are several points here which could arouse reservations and weaken the conviction of its lawfulness.

First, how can I expect an *a priori* cognition and thus a metaphysics of objects that are given to our senses, thus given *a posteriori?* And how is it possible to cognize the nature of things in accordance with *a priori* principles^{*a*} and to arrive at a **rational** physiology? The answer is: We take from experience nothing more than what is necessary to **give** ourselves an object, ^{*b*} partly of outer and partly of inner sense. The former is accomplished through the mere concept of matter (impenetrable lifeless extension), the latter through the concept of a thinking being (in the empirically inner representation "I think"). Otherwise, we must in the entire metaphysics of these objects abstain entirely from any empirical principles^{*c*} that might add any sort of experience beyond the concept in order to judge something about these objects.

* One should not think, indeed, that I understand by this what is commonly called *pbysica generalis*, which is more mathematics than philosophy of nature. For the metaphysics of nature abstracts entirely from mathematics, and has nowhere near as many ampliative insights to offer as the latter, yet it is still very important with regard to the critique of the pure cognition of understanding that is to be applied to nature in general; in its absence even mathematicians, depending on certain common but in fact metaphysical concepts, have without noticing it burdened the doctrine of nature with hypotheses that disappear in a critique of these principles^d without doing the least damage to the use of mathematics in this field (which is entirely indispensable).

⁴ Principien

^b Object

^c Principien

^d Principien

А847/В875

А848/ В876

A847/B875

Doctrine of Method. Ch. III

Second: Once one gives up the hope of achieving anything useful a priori, where does that leave empirical psychology, which has always asserted its place in metaphysics, and from which one has expected such great enlightenment in our own times?49 I answer: It comes in where the proper (empirical) doctrine of nature must be put, namely on the side of **applied** philosophy, for which pure philosophy contains the *a* priori principles.^a which must therefore be combined but never confused with the former. Empirical psychology must thus be entirely banned from metaphysics, and is already excluded by the idea of it. Nevertheless, in accord with the customary scholastic usage one must still concede it a little place (although only as an episode) in metaphysics, and indeed from economic motives, since it is not yet rich enough to comprise a subject on its own and yet it is too important for one to expel it entirely or attach it somewhere else where it may well have even less affinity than in metaphysics. It is thus merely a long-accepted foreigner, to whom one grants refuge for a while until it can establish its own domicile in a complete anthropology (the pendant to the empirical doctrine of nature).

This is, therefore, the general idea of metaphysics, which, since we initially expected more from it than could appropriately be demanded and long amused ourselves with pleasant expectations, in the end fell into general contempt when we found ourselves deceived in our hopes. From the whole course of our critique we will have been sufficiently convinced that even though metaphysics cannot be the foundation of religion, yet it must always remain its bulwark, and that human reason, which is already dialectical on account of the tendency of its nature, could never dispense with such a science, which reins it in and, by means of a scientific and fully illuminating self-knowledge,^b prevents the devastations that a lawless speculative reason would otherwise inevitably perpetrate in both morality and religion. We can therefore be sure that however obstinate or disdainful they may be who know how to judge a science not in accord with its nature, but only from its contingent effects, we will always return to metaphysics as to a beloved from whom we have been estranged, since reason, because essential ends are at issue here, must work without respite either for sound insight or for the destruction of good insights that are already to hand.

Thus the metaphysics of nature as well as morals, but above all the **preparatory** (propaedeutic) critique of reason that dares to fly with its own wings, alone constitute that which we can call philosophy in a genuine sense.^c This relates everything to wisdom, but through the path of

^a Principien

A849/B877

A850/B878

^b Selbsterkenntnis

· Verstande

science, the only one which, once cleared, is never overgrown, and never leads to error. Mathematics, natural science, even the empirical knowledge of humankind, have a high value as means, for the most part to contingent but yet ultimately to necessary and essential ends of humanity, but only through the mediation of a rational cognition from mere concepts, which, call it what one will, is really nothing but metaphysics.

Just for this reason metaphysics is also the culmination of all **culture** of human reason, which is indispensable even if one sets aside its influence as a science for certain determinate ends. For it considers reason according to its elements and highest maxims, which must ground even the **possibility** of some sciences and the **use** of all of them. That as mere speculation it serves more to prevent errors than to amplify cognition does no damage to its value, but rather gives it all the more dignity and authority through its office as censor, which secures the general order and unity, indeed the well-being of the scientific community, and prevents its cheerful and fruitful efforts from straying from the chief end, that of the general happiness.

A851/B879