

Kant's Theory of the Self

Arthur Melnick

Kant's Theory of the Self

Routledge Studies in Eighteenth Century Philosophy

1. Naturalization of the Soul

Self and Personal Identity in the
Eighteenth Century

Raymond Martin and John Barresi

2. Hume's Aesthetic Theory

Taste and Sentiment

Dabney Townsend

3. Thomas Reid and Scepticism

His Reliabilist Response

Philip de Bary

4. Hume's Philosophy of the Self

A E Pitson

5. Hume, Reason and Morality

A Legacy of Contradiction

Sophie Botros

6. Kant's Theory of the Self

Arthur Melnick

Kant's Theory of the Self

Arthur Melnick

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
New York London

First published 2009
by Routledge
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016

Simultaneously published in the UK
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2008.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

© 2009 Taylor & Francis

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Melnick, Arthur.

Kant’s theory of the self / by Arthur Melnick.

p. cm. — (Routledge studies in eighteenth century philosophy ; 6)

Includes bibliographical references (p. 181) and index.

ISBN 978-0-415-99470-5

1. Kant, Immanuel, 1724–1804. 2. Self (Philosophy) I. Title.

B2799.S37M45 2009

126.092—dc22

2008023418

ISBN 0-203-88699-2 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN10: 0-415-99470-5 (hbk)

ISBN10: 0-203-88699-2 (ebk)

ISBN13: 978-0-415-99470-5 (hbk)

ISBN13: 978-0-203-88699-1 (ebk)

Contents

Preface vii

PART I **Preliminary Overview**

- 1 The Reality of the Thinking Subject 3
- 2 The Paralogisms and Transcendental Idealism 12

PART II **The Thinking Subject**

- 3 The First Paralogism 29
- 4 The Second Paralogism 39
- 5 Transcendental Self-Consciousness 51
- 6 Other Interpretations of the Paralogisms 61

PART III **The Cognizing Subject**

- 7 Empirical Apperception 75
- 8 Pure Apperception 94

PART IV

The Person as Subject

9	Apperception and Inner Sense	111
10	The Third Paralogism and Kant's Conception of a Person	131

PART V

The Subject and Material Reality

11	The Embodied Subject	151
12	The Fourth Paralogism	160
	<i>Notes</i>	177
	<i>Bibliography</i>	181
	<i>Index</i>	185

Preface

Apperception for Kant is something real, and the ‘I think’ it generates contains my existence as an intelligence: an existence that is neither appearance nor a thing in itself. The aim of this book is to clarify this “third status” of the thinking subject in Kant. I argue that the thinking subject is not appearance because it does not and cannot arise in the course of either inner or outer attending. However, as accompanying and bringing unity to the progressiveness of inner attending, it itself unfolds progressively (is temporal) and so is not a thing in itself. The thinking subject or the self for Kant is the abiding intellectual action for unifying inner attending. In this view the distinction between the subject or bearer and thoughts that belong to it is a distinction within abiding action, not a distinction between an entity (material or not) and thoughts as actions that belong to it. The person for Kant is then the often inactivated capacity for such intellectual action or for being a bearer or subject of inner states. This is opposed both to views according to which a person is a substance or entity and views according to which a person is just a series of states suitably connected by psychological relations.

I contend that this “third status” of accompanying action is not an afterthought by which Kant tried to fit into his view something (the ‘I think’) that otherwise didn’t quite fit. Rather it can be said to dominate all his discussions of the nature of the self. After setting out the view and how it is demanded by Kant’s transcendental idealism in Part I, in Part II, I show how the view explains Kant’s text in the first two Paralogisms. Then in Part III, I argue that it clarifies Kant’s doctrine of the identity of apperception in the A edition Deduction. In Part IV, I use the view to explain his key discussion of the relation between the determining and the determinable self (apperception vs. inner sense) in the B edition Deduction and his conception of a person in the Third Paralogism. Finally, in Part V, I consider the issue of the separability of the subject from material reality and how the subject can be in immediate relation to such reality. If my position is correct, then Kant’s view of the subject escapes the dilemma of either invoking noumenal reality as the subject or else reducing the subject to a Hume-like series of inner states (the only thing about the person that is

given in intuition or inner attending for Kant). Kant, that is, has an abiding, non-noumenal subject as bearer of thoughts and perceptions. This position I believe also provides for viable accounts of the nature of transcendental self-consciousness (Chapter 5), the nature of self-representation (Chapter 9) and the nature of personal identity (Chapter 10).

The view I develop can be called a dynamical–phenomenological view of the self. The self is a dynamical action that envelops thoughts that emerge from it, and this action is supposed to be phenomenologically discernible from a first-person point of view. Kant says in the Paralogisms that the cogito is the “sole text” of rational psychology. My contention is that Kant believes there are ontological conclusions to be drawn from the cogito (from undergoing being a thinking subject); only they are not those the rational psychologist draws. Even in the Transcendental Deduction, it is this first person “undergoing” that underlies his claims of what it is to be an abiding or constant thinking self (the identity of apperception) through extended episodes. This view of the basis of Kant’s doctrines contrasts not only with noumenal–metaphysical accounts and Humean accounts, but also with accounts according to which the ‘I think’ is merely logical or formal or intentional or semantic, and with functionalist accounts as well. I postpone a discussion of these contrasting views until I have set out my view in a preliminary way in Chapters 1 and 2 and compared it to the text of the first two Paralogisms. In this way, by the time I discuss these contrasting views in Chapter 6, I will be in a position to argue why, though plausible in certain ways, they simply do not stand up against Kant’s text.

Although my perspective is phenomenological and I have learned a great deal from Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and Sartre, I also engage, where relevant, the more analytic tradition that includes Sellars, Strawson, Cassam, McDowell, Parfit, and Rosenthal, among others. This book is about the ontological status of the thinking self in the First Critique and does not attempt to incorporate an account of the practical–moral self, though I believe that, in some respects, it prepares the way for such an account.

At various stages of being stuck in writing this book I have profited greatly from the writings of Karl Ameriks, Robert Howell, and especially Richard Aquila. This is not to say there haven’t been many other admirable books recently on Kant’s theory of the self. It is just that they go off in a direction so disparate from mine that they weren’t as helpful in my thinking. One last point—I have used the Kemp Smith translation throughout, not necessarily because I think it is better than the newer Cambridge translation, but because after many years I know my way around it so easily. To a large degree, in each chapter after the first two, my textual exegesis covers consecutive paragraphs in Kant, so once readers employing the Cambridge translation locate the relevant section in Kant, they can follow my exegesis of it fairly easily.

Part I

Preliminary Overview

1 The Reality of the Thinking Subject

In this chapter and the next, I present what I take to be Kant's basic view of the thinking subject: the view, I claim, that constitutes his positive account in the first two Paralogisms as against the rational psychologist's bogus view. I shall use Kant's own words to motivate the view, but the ultimate defense will be the detailed and consistent exegesis of the text of the two Paralogisms in Chapters 3 and 4.

For now what I mean by the thinking subject is the subject in the context of the cogito, which is also the context within which the rational psychologist proceeds. The first point to note is that the thinking subject for Kant is real. He says in footnote (a) to B422 that the 'I think' expresses an indeterminate perception that signifies

something real that is given, given indeed to thought in general and so not as appearance, nor as thing in itself (noumenon) but as something which actually exists, and which in the proposition, 'I think,' is denoted as such. (compare B157)

Taking Kant at his word, then, the thinking subject is real or has ontological status. It is not merely logical, merely formal, or merely intentional. Just as clearly its ontological status is not that of an entity either in the Kantian sense of an intuitable substance or in the rational psychologist's sense of a conceptually graspable self-subsistent substance. But if it is not an entity, what sort of status does it have?

A clue is given in Kant's discussion in the Second Paralogism. In that discussion Kant says that the simplicity or undividedness of the subject in regard to a thought

may relate just as well to the collective unity of different substances acting together (as the motion of a body is the composite motion of all of its parts) as to the absolute unity of the subject. (A353)

He seems to be distinguishing here the subject's being undivided or simple in action, from the action being due to one or more substances. The

4 Kant's Theory of the Self

indivisibility of the 'I' in regard to a thought, that is, pertains to action but not to a supposed entity acting. If so, Kant would be saying that the simple thinking subject or the 'I think' is literally an action, not an entity.

The question now is what sort of action am I? Clearly the answer for Kant is that in some way I am intellectual or intelligent action. He says at B159,

I exist as an intelligence which is conscious solely of its power of combination.

I exist then as an intellectual action conscious of itself not as an entity but as the power it is. Kant says the *actus* 'I think' is

the application or employment of the pure intellectual faculty. (footnote (a) to B423)

A faculty or capacity is not an action except insofar as it is engaged or marshaled, and Kant seems to be suggesting that the action of being a thinking subject is literally an engagement or marshaling of the intellectual faculty. The ontological status (the very existence or reality) then of the thinking subject is that it is a marshaling of intellectual capacity. Note Kant's claim is that the employment or marshaling is not a thought, or a thinking, but is *my* having a thought or *my* thinking (the *actus* 'I think'). At B137 he refers to the 'I think' (not thinking by itself) as the act of apperception. Thus, intellectual marshaling action is not the existence of a thought; it is the existence of a thought belonging to me, the subject. In sum my intellectual subjectivity, or my being as a subject of thought, is nothing more than intellectual marshaling action.

The question now is how can an action have the structure not just of a thinking but of a being which thinks (a subject of thought)? How literally can a subject of thought exist in an action? Kant says in the First Paralogism (A349),

Now in all our thought the "I" is the subject in which thoughts inhere only as determinations.

All thinking is a matter of a subject having thoughts as its determinations. To see how being a subject with thoughts as determinations can all exist within intellectual marshaling action, consider someone playing chess who is thinking about what move to make. To begin with, the thinking may be inchoate, unformed, and unsettled (as though subliminally going from thought to thought without yet a particular thought being focused on). Suppose they come to settle on a thought of a specific move as their tentative option. The marshaling then is one of settling provisionally on a move, which is having a particular explicit thought as the focus of how

one is marshaled in one's chess capacity. It is not, however, as if the inchoate unsettledness simply disappears, giving way to nothing but the specific thought. Rather, the marshaling settles on and coalesces around the particular thought. Roughly, inchoate, unformed thoughts that are close in content to the focal thought are in readiness to themselves form, whereas unconnected thoughts (not pertinent to the move), though part of my chess capacity, remain dormant and so not part of the marshaling (they remain only as what can be accessed). Once settled, then, the marshaling action is a focal, formed thought around which coalesces a context of unformed, inchoate thoughts, which are more than merely what can be accessed, but less than formed or focal. The marshaling action then is not swallowed up or exhausted by a particular thought, but involves a coalescence or concentration on the thought. This coalescence either maintains the thought in focus or, if the inchoate comprehension is that the move is not a good one, it may move it out of focus. Within the marshaling action, there is a distinction between the particular thought and that which settles on it, encompasses it, and holds it. In these regards, the thought is a determination of (belonging to) the overall inchoate intellectual marshaling action. The marshaling action, then, includes within it not just the thought but that which it is a determination of, and so the thinking subject (that from which the thought emerges, that which concentrates on the thought, that which holds the thought) exists literally *within* the action of intellectual marshaling, not as a self-subsistent entity to which the marshaling action itself belongs.

Kant says in footnote (a) to B158

I cannot determine my existence as that of a self-active being; all that I can do is to represent to myself the spontaneity of my thought . . . But it is owing to this spontaneity that I entitle myself an *intelligence*.

What I am then is a self-active being spontaneous in regard to thought: viz, the source that settles on a thought (from its own nature as an intelligence), that concentrates on it, and holds it. I exist in or as this self-activity.

Let us return for a moment to the purely unsettled state of the chess player. There is as yet in this state no specific or particular thought at all. I can say that this marshaling is not so much the 'I think' as it is the 'I' itself from which a specific thinking has yet to emerge. This marshaling is the inchoate 'I am' (as intelligence) or the sheer thinking subject. In settling on a thought, this still inchoate (and partially resettling) set of unformed thoughts in various degrees of formation remains what I am. There is, then, within the intellectual marshaling, a distinction between the source, concentrator, and holder of a thought (the 'I') and the thought itself as determination of the inchoate 'I.' I am not claiming that this descriptive analysis was ever explicitly given by Kant. It is just meant to fill out how the distinction between a thought and the subject that thinks can be made out

6 Kant's Theory of the Self

internally to marshaling action itself, without any invocation of an entity that such action may in its turn belong to or derive from.

Finally, besides the 'I think' being real (existential), its reality being that of an action (not a self-subsistent substance) and the action being an intellectual marshaling, Kant characterizes the 'I think' as the form of *conscious* thinking. He says at A342, B400 that the 'I think'

 serves only to introduce all our thoughts as belonging to consciousness
and at A346, B404 that the 'I'

 is a bare consciousness that accompanies all concepts.

He says at B246,

 Certainly the representation "I am" which expresses the consciousness that can accompany all thought, immediately includes in itself the existence of a subject,

and at B413,

 the "I" is merely the consciousness of my thought,

and finally at A382,

 This "I" is, however, as little an intuition as it is a concept of any object; it is the mere form of consciousness, which can accompany the two kinds of representation.

In these passages, Kant is equating the 'I,' or the subject, with that by which thoughts are conscious. Note he is not talking of transcendental self-consciousness but, rather, subjective consciousness of thoughts. Nor is he talking of consciousness *per se* (as with sheer animal perceptual consciousness) but of conscious thinking. My task now is to see how my idea of our existing within intellectual marshaling relates to thoughts being conscious.

To begin with, note that intellectual marshaling is not defined purely in a semantic or inferential way in terms of thought content but also in terms of dynamical action. In the marshaling there is *emergence* of thoughts, *coalescing* around thoughts by other thoughts in degrees of readiness to be formed, *holding* thoughts in focus, etcetera. These terms signify, however crudely and figuratively, dynamical notions—not notions of abstract intellectual organization. When a computer plays chess, it calculates moves, goes through options, arranges and grades possibilities for a particular move, and so on, but these terms signify what is functionally specifiable in an abstract flow chart. Though the computer dynamically implements

the structure, it doesn't per se do so in a way that the thoughts are held in focus, coalesced around, etcetera

There is a dynamism within the intellectual marshaling that I have described which has, I suggest, the character of our conscious thinking (or what it is like subjectively for the chess player). In consciously thinking I am not conscious of a thought but of having a thought (of owning it, or of it belonging to me). The thought is conscious by or in this discernment of my having it. This discernment or "sentiment" of my having it is not a conceptual matter of thinking of a determination belonging to me, an entity, but a sentiment of the dynamism by which the thought arises and is held. This dynamism involves both the thought's coming to be formed and that (inchoate) subjectivity out of which or from which it is formed and within which it is held. The latter is the indeterminable factor (not the formed, but the forming). There are different modes of this dynamism. Suppose I come across a momentarily unfamiliar object. The sentiment is of being unsettled or indeterminate as to what to think, until a fixity or settling in comprehension is reached, whether it is verbalized (fully formed linguistically) or not. The fixed comprehension is determined from or out of an unsettled determining factor. On the other hand, if I come across an immediately familiar object, the sentiment is of immediately coalescing around a fixed comprehension. As in the previous case of settling, this coalescing (of other content-related thoughts in varying degrees of readiness) is inchoate and indeterminate. In this case, the thought or comprehension isn't formed from an unsettled determining factor. Rather the comprehension is found within or amorphously encompassed by "inklings" of understanding. The coalescence, however, is still the determining factor in the sense that it is what holds the thought or comprehension in focus or what dislodges it. There are surely many more variations, but the theme can be summarized as follows: The sentiment (the what-it-is-like) of conscious thinking is the sentiment of being the inchoate, indeterminate intellectual action determining a fixed comprehension.

Nothing I have said is meant to "solve" the problem of consciousness by reducing it to purely dynamical notions. The sentiment of being this dynamism leaves it completely open how, from an objective point of view, a dynamism can be such that it is a sentiment of its being. My point is rather that our dynamism characterizes what the sentiment is like (what the structure or aspects are). In this way, it is an answer to my question of how intellectual marshaling action constituting the thinking subject relates to Kant's contention that the 'I' is bare (inchoate, amorphous) consciousness that accompanies all concepts or that the 'I am' expresses the consciousness that can accompany all thought.

Once again I am not claiming that my descriptive analysis of thinking consciousness was ever explicitly given by Kant. He does however seem to grapple with the issue of awareness or consciousness in relation to the 'I think,' and his grapplings for the most part are consistent with, and even support, our

8 *Kant's Theory of the Self*

dynamical characterization. Although for Kant I do not have an intuition of the thinking subject, he does say at A343, B401, that the 'I think'

. . . expresses the perception of the self . . . but one in which no special distinction or empirical determination is given

and again (in footnote (a) to B423)

The "I think" expresses an indeterminate empirical intuition . . . An indeterminate perception here signifies only something real that is given . . . as something which actually exists and which in the proposition "I think" is denoted as such.

All this, though he also says the 'I' is purely intellectual. Kant's terminology is clearly straining here in talking of perception and intuition in regard to the purely intellectual, though his modifications "no special distinction", "indeterminate", etcetera, are helpful. Instead of indeterminate intuition, I have talked of a sentiment of inchoately forming, encompassing, etcetera In the Prolegomena (4: 344) Kant goes so far as to say the 'I'

is nothing more than a feeling of existence.

I have a feeling or sentiment of my existence (my being a thinking subject) as a *presence* which by its nature is and must be inchoate (indeterminate), for otherwise my subject-hood would dissipate or be swallowed up into the formed thought or comprehension. Although my thinking self is not presentable, its being a real encompassing presence explains, I think, Kant's use of terms such as "perception" and "intuition," and the fact that by its nature the subject is and must be inchoate (determining but not focalized) explains Kant's use of the term "indeterminate" in these passages.

Finally, that Kant does have a *dynamical* understanding of being a conscious thinker is expressed in his Refutation of Mendelssohn's Proof (B415), where he says,

For consciousness itself always has a degree, which always allows of diminution and the same must also hold of the faculty of being conscious of the self.

Not only consciousness but self-consciousness, which is clearly intellectual consciousness for Kant, is said to have (dynamical) intensity. This is nothing as complex as the dynamism of intellectual marshaling I have described, but it is enough to show that for Kant thinking consciousness or intellectual consciousness is dynamical.

In sum, my contention is that the thinking subject in the context of the cogito exists, for Kant, within a real action of intellectual marshaling. My

elaboration of this idea is that the intellectual marshaling action in its various modes is always dynamical as either settling on a thought, coalescing about it, or holding it. It is this dynamism which divides the 'I' from the focal thought and constitutes, in its sentiment, the character of being a conscious subject of thinking. The 'I think' then is not something abstract but something real and concrete. It is our very being or existence as intellectual subjects. As Kant says,

. . . in the consciousness of myself in mere thought [in merely thinking] I am the *being itself*. (B429)

Compare Heidegger's characterization of Kant's view:

Hence thinking as acting is what is fundamentally in the manner of "I think." Thinking as such . . . starts 'from itself,' from the self *as* itself . . . The ability character of my actions [thinkings] determines the *mode of being* of the subject. (italics mine)¹

The dynamical action of intellectual marshaling is not an object of thought or intuition but the reality of my intellectual subjective being; it is that-I-am-an-intellect-that-thinks.

Of course the context of the cogito is itself an "abstraction." I am not attending to my surroundings nor thinking about my history. In Kantian terms, I am abstracting from both outer and inner sense. He says at footnote (a) to B159

The "I think" expresses the act of determining my existence. Existence is already given thereby, but the mode in which I am to determine this existence, that is, the manifold [of inner sense] belonging to it, is not thereby given.

Further, in the context of the cogito, I am abstracting from the representative worth or from the content of thoughts. The focus is only on being a thinker of thoughts, not on how thoughts are able to *represent* the world around me in space or my history in time or even whether their representational worth is tied to space and time. Speaking of the 'I think' or 'I exist thinking' Kant says,

Thought taken by itself . . . does not exhibit the subject of consciousness as appearance; and this for the sufficient reason that thought takes no account whatsoever of the mode of intuition, whether it be sensible or intellectual. (B429)

The context of the cogito, which is the context of the first two Paralogisms, abstracts both from my being temporally extended within a spatial world

as well as my representing that I am such a temporal being in a spatial world. Although in this regard intellectual subjectivity is an abstraction, it is nevertheless real (“Existence is already thereby given”), and it continues to be the real subject in my temporal identity as a person and in my existence as a cognizing (representing) being. The abstraction from any context other than merely thinking, that is, does not mean that what is revealed in that context (the ‘I think’) is ontologically abstract.

My characterization of the intellectual marshaling that we are has been dynamical or at least quasi-dynamical (settling, coalescing, holding), rather than structural or functional. Being a dynamical intellectual subjectivity is not the (overall) function of intellectuality but is the realization, indeed the only realization we are familiar with, of intellectual functioning in conscious thinking. The only “function” of this dynamic action is to *be me*.

The last abstraction concerns the ontological ground or basis of this intellectual marshaling. My characterization so far has been neutral over such a ground. Although I have talked of it as the marshaling of the intellectual faculty, this need not be taken as either implying or precluding a real intellectual substrate (whether immaterial, spatial, or whatever). To say it is an intellectual marshaling can be taken simply to characterize what sort of marshaling it is rather than what the source is. The marshaling is of the kind—a particular *thought* in dynamical relation to an inchoate cluster of *thoughts*. As an analogy, consider that a person can be marshaled to balance himself in a variety of ways, with all sorts of postures in all sorts of circumstances. They are all balancing–marshalings not necessarily because they are produced by a faculty in reserve (of possible marshalings) that on each occasion is differently marshaled or engaged but because of the kinds of marshalings they are. Of course I haven’t yet said anywhere what thoughts are which would serve to classify marshalings as intellectual but again, in the context of the cogito, the representative worth and nature of thoughts is not an issue. My notion of intellectual marshaling is not only neutral as to its source or basis but also as to its own dynamical nature as an action (whether it is physical spatial action or nonphysical nonspatial action). The quasi-dynamical terms are only meant to characterize our *being* as the being of (within) activity or action, as opposed to our being a self-subsistent entity which delivers or undergoes the action. In what follows, for example in my discussion of the Second Paralogism, I shall sometimes use models that are tilted towards spatial action, but this is just for intuitive clarity.

Of the English language commentators, it is Richard Aquila who comes closest to the view I have set out. He says,

Kant’s commitment to some kind of inner “subject” is neither the purely formal or logical notion it is frequently taken to be nor equivalent to (although it is compatible with) his commitment to a thinking substance or a noumenal self beyond sensibility altogether.²

and more specifically he characterizes the real (nonformal, nonlogical) nature of the self in its purely intellectual dimension as

... a dimension that can be realized or embodied in any *actual* consciousness only in so far as some instance of intellectual structuring is affected from *within*, as it were, the boundaries of an independently unified medium.³

For Aquila there is some sort of manifold by which an individual intellectual noesis (act) is made. In my view the act of thinking is “from within” the “unified medium” of the inchoate further thoughts, standing in degrees of readiness, from which thinking a specific thought emerges, is coalesced about, and held onto. Aquila says that the manifold by which the noetic act is made is other than intellectual. If he means by this that it is other than intellectual as an abstract functionality then I agree. For me, however, it is not other than intellectual as a concrete or real dynamism.

As I have said, the defense of my interpretation of Kant’s view of the ‘I think’ as intellectual subjectivity in *actus* will be in the exegesis of not only the first two Paralogisms but the Third Paralogism and the Transcendental Deduction as well. Before turning to that, however, I set out in Chapter 2 how this interpretation relates to Kant’s doctrine of transcendental idealism. It is clear that Kant’s rejection of the rational psychologist’s conclusions in the Paralogisms is meant to keep our knowledge from extending into the realm of the noumenal. What is not so often noticed, I believe, is that the Paralogisms also keep Kant’s own transcendental idealism from slipping over into a noumenal subject that is the source of space and time. In Chapter 2, I argue that only if the intellectual subject (pure apperception) is understood as something that exists within action (not something subsistent that produces or undergoes action) can it be that which accompanies space and time (rather than that which is intuited within space and time) while yet not being noumenal. After considering how this interpretation clarifies the text of the first two Paralogisms in Chapters 3 and 4, I then further defend the view (in Chapter 5) by considering how it accounts for our intellectual consciousness being self-conscious. I leave criticisms of competing views of the ‘I think’ to Chapter 6.

2 The Paralogisms and Transcendental Idealism

If the rational psychologist's reasoning about the thinking subject were correct, we would have a metaphysical knowledge of the noumenal (e.g., of a simple substance), which would undercut Kant's restriction of metaphysics to experience in the *Critique*. In the Paralogisms Kant doesn't only negatively reject the psychologist's reasoning, he also positively sets out what can be properly concluded about the thinking self. This positive conclusion is supposedly consistent with his own proscription against knowledge of the noumenal. It is noteworthy then that a recurrent criticism of Kant has been that his conception of the thinking self is not consistent with his doctrine of transcendental idealism, most especially the ideality of time.

So, for example, Sartre says that for Kant,

. . . temporal unity, at the heart of which is revealed the synthetic before-after is conferred on the multiplicity of instants by a being [the "I think"] who himself escapes temporality.¹

If the thinking subject escapes temporality then it would be noumenal, which is exactly the kind of conclusion Kant thinks he is avoiding with his positive conception of the 'I think' in the Paralogisms. Strawson says,

. . . our sensibility (the forms of space and time) is due to the "being that thinks" in us

and concludes that alot can be known therefore about the noumenal self.² For Strawson, as for Sartre, the thinking self (the source of temporality) escapes temporality, and so is noumenal.

The burden of this chapter is to argue that Kant's positive account of the thinking self in the Paralogisms shows, and is designed by Kant to show, that the thinking self is consistent with transcendental idealism without any lapse into the noumenal. More specifically, I contend that transcendental idealism is an ontological doctrine about what the real status of space and time are and that, in the Paralogisms, Kant's positive

account of the ontological status of the thinking self is consistent with this idealism without the thinking self being noumenal. Once the issue of consistency is looked at as an ontological issue there are only two alternatives. Either the thinking self exists temporally according to Kant's own idealistic understanding of temporal existence, or it does not exist temporally at all. In the latter case it is noumenal. What I contend is that although the thinking self is not intuitable and time is merely a form of (inner) intuition, nevertheless the thinking self exists temporally according to Kant's own idealistic understanding of temporal existence. Indeed I will try to show that only my account of the thinking self as an action of intellectual marshaling allows the thinking self to exist temporally according to Kant's sense of temporal existence. On the other hand, if the thinking self were "more than" such action, namely an entity or substance as the rational psychologist holds, it couldn't be temporal in Kantian terms.

If the contention of this chapter is correct, then the overall thrust of the Paralogisms can be characterized as follows. Kant wants to show that from the 'I think' premise (that of rational psychology), what follows ontologically is not that I am a substantial entity but only, rather, that I am intellectual action. What may be the substantial source or basis of this action would be noumenal for Kant, but it is not this source that can be proven by the arguments of the rational psychologist. It is really not until the Third Paralogism that the full force of this connection of the Paralogisms to transcendental idealism comes out, for temporality is not explicitly at issue until then, and it is in the Third Paralogism, I claim, where Kant explicitly attributes temporality to the 'I think' (the intellectual subject). Nevertheless, it is important to see from the outset that this is the thrust of the Paralogisms.

Peter Strawson says, in *Bounds of Sense*,

. . . it is an important point that the force of Kant's exposure of the illusion of rational psychology can be carried out without any reference to these doctrines [of transcendental idealism].³

I believe that in general there is no conveying what Kant is doing in any major section of the *Critique* without reference to transcendental idealism, and in this chapter I hope to show in outline how that is the case for the Paralogisms. My plan of this chapter is to first set out what the ontological doctrine of transcendental idealism is in regard to space and what exists spatially. This will provide a background or ballast for setting out what the doctrine is for time, which is a somewhat more subtle matter. Finally, my goal for this chapter is to set out how the ontological status of the thinking subject as intellectual marshaling is consistent with its being temporal, according to Kant's own idealistic understanding of time.

(I) TRANSCENDENTAL IDEALISM: SPACE

I have discussed in previous works what I take Kant's doctrine of the transcendental ideality of space (and time) to be⁴, so I present here only the essentials required for the discussion that is to follow. Some of the theses proposed are discussed further in Parts III and V.

Space, for Kant, functions as a form of empirical intuition. In an empirical intuition the object is immediately given to us and affects us (A19, B34), and so space is the form of, or that through which, objects can be immediately given to us and affect us. If so, its function as a form cannot be to organize or otherwise "form" sensations of an object, for this would imply the object is already affecting us (with sensations) or is given to us, and so space would not make outer intuition first possible. Rather, space functions to enable us to obtain sensation in the first place. It serves, that is, to first enable us to be affected at all. Now in order to be affected at all I must direct my attention outward. A sheer focusing of attention outward first enables an empirical intuition of what is present. For any other empirical intuition I must first shift or sweep along my (outer directed) attention unto a different consequent focus. This repositioning of the focus of my attention is what enables me to make other objects present and obtain further sensation. Quite simply, to intuit anything I must be able to move my attention so as to get my attention on it. My first suggestion, then, is that space functions as a form of intuition by being that shifting or repositioning of outer-directed attention that enables us to be affected.

Kant says (A27, B43) that if we abstract from the objects that space enables us to empirically intuit, space is a pure intuition. If I am correct, then this pure intuition must be the sheer action or activity of shifting or moving outer attention. Note that such activity can be carried out independently of sensations arising in its course (thus making it pure), and the very activity that space is produced or immediately "given" just in doing it (making it an intuition). Kant in the *Critique* is working at a level that abstracts from the material (impenetrable, bodily) nature of reality including our own bodies. If we relax this abstraction for the moment, we can say that space is any activity or action that shifts our outer attention, which includes activities such as pointing alongside with our fingers stretched out as we move our bodies along. Kant says in footnote (a) to B155,

Motion of an object in space . . . cannot be known *a priori*. Motion, however, considered as the describing of a space is a pure act . . . and belongs . . . even to transcendental philosophy.

At the level of transcendental philosophy (determining what can be known *a priori*) space is the action of shifting attention *per se*, but at a less abstract level we can say space is action or activity (including bodily) that effects

that shifting (or how we as bodily beings effect shifting). I shall call any such activity “spatializing” activity.

Kant’s contention now, famously, is that space is nothing but a pure intuition. His argument for this in the Aesthetic, I believe, is that space is continuous, that continuity is a matter of the whole being prior to its parts (A25, B39), and that this latter is possible only for a flowing construction or action.⁵ Thus the flowing sweep of my attention in drawing a line (“describing” a space) is not done (Zeno-fashion) by producing all the foci or points of attention. Any focus is a limit or cut in the sweep (A25, B39). On the other hand, an objective space (whether relational or absolute) is not a “flow,” but a total whole that is just “all there,” and so must be composed of parts or elements (viz, an objective whole only exists by all its parts or components existing). Note then that already in the Aesthetic Kant rejects the alternative that he supposedly overlooked of space (continuous space) being both a form of intuition and also something objective. In any case, I shall take it for granted that for Kant space is nothing but the activity of shifting outer-directed attention. If so, then all there is to spatial relations of affecting objects is their position as arising in the course of the shift of attention. Equivalently, all there is to their spatial “location” is their position within the movement of our attention. For example, suppose I am focused so as to be affected and then shift or reposition my attention along unto a second focus so as to be again affected. These “affectings” that arise have spatial relation *only* in the following sense: the second being *so far along in the shifting* of attention from the first. Kant says (A26, B42),

Space does not represent any determination that attaches to the objects themselves and remains when abstraction has been made of all the subjective conditions of intuition.

The consequence of space being merely a form of intuition is that there’s no intrinsic reality in space. The entire being of what is empirically intuited is to be thus intuited. Equivalently the entire being of what affects or appears in the course of attention shifting is to affect or appear. In particular there is no intrinsic spatial entity with its own intrinsic features or reality that does the affecting or appearing. If what arises in the course of shifting attention were an entity waiting for the shift of attention to get to it, it would have to be at a position or place that the shift then reaches. But then it would have spatial position on its own apart from and corresponding to the shift of attention, and so space would not merely be (exist in) shifting of outer attention. What there is spatially, then, is just appearances or affectings in the course of attention-movement, not entities presenting themselves by appearing or affecting. Thus Kant can say (A26, B42),

Space is nothing but the form of all appearances [appearings] of outer sense.

Again he says of space and time (A39, B56),

... they apply to objects only in so far as objects are viewed as appearances and do not *present* things as they are in themselves. (italics mine)

I will show that the nonexistence of intrinsic reality carries over to time as well, and this will play a key role in my target of clarifying how the thinking subject, so long as it is not an entity but only an action, can be temporal.

The view I have presented is compatible with there being *nonspatial* intrinsic reality which somehow grounds, or is the basis of, there being appearances arising in the course of spatializing activities. The transcendental ideality of space implies only that if there is intrinsic reality (grounding appearances) it is noumenal, not spatial.

Before applying my results to time, I want to make two points about Kantian appearances (the real in space) to clarify exactly what sort of idealism Kant is holding. First, Kant is no “empirical” (Berkeleyan) idealist. Appearing (unlike sensation) is not something that happens in the subject. Rather, it is the arising of a *transaction* at a stage of the course of spatial shifting

There is no such thing as being outer affected without there being outer affecting: no such thing as being influenced without there being influencing. Kant says of outer sense that it is

... a relation to something actual outside me. (footnote (a) to BxI)

Although appearing doesn't take place within me, nevertheless one cannot factor the transactional phenomenon of appearing into that which influences (does the influencing) on the one hand versus our being influenced on the other, for this would reintroduce bogus intrinsic spatial reality (belonging to the entity that does the influencing). In the just-quoted footnote, Kant also says that though outer sense is a relation to something outside me, nevertheless it is “bound up with my existence.”

Kantian appearances then are neither purely “internal” experiential states, nor relations between such states and distinct intrinsic entities that produce them. They are irreducibly transactional with both an inner (subjective) pole and an outer pole—the same transaction on the one hand passively characterized (being affected) and, on the other, actively characterized (affecting). In Kant's terms, such appearances (appearings) are outside us in the empirical sense but not in the transcendental sense. Kant says that the transcendental idealist considers

matter and even its [relatively] inner possibility to be appearance merely; and appearance if separated from our sensibility is nothing. Matter is with him, therefore only a species of representations (intuitions) which are called external not as standing in relation to *objects in themselves*

external, but because they relate perceptions [perceiving or being affected] to space [to arising in the course of shifting outer attention] in which all things are external to one another, while yet space itself is in us [in the shifting of outer attention].(A370, italics mine)

Recall that intuition for Kant requires that the object be given (requires being outer affected), so the representations he is talking of in this passage are not internal states of the subject but transactional happenings.

Secondly, and equally important in clarifying what sort of idealism Kant is holding, his contention is not that reality outside us exists only in *actual* outer affecting or outer affecting in the course of *actually* shifting attention. He says at A492, B521,

The objects of experience, then, are *never* given *in themselves*, but only in experience, and have no existence outside it. That there may be inhabitants on the moon, although no one has ever perceived them, must certainly be admitted. This, however, only means that in the possible advance of experience we may encounter them.

Experience, as Kant is using the term here, involves intuition and so is a transactional phenomenon (not internal to the subject). Further Kant talks here of the advance of experience, signifying I believe the course or advance of attention shifting (space). He is saying then that what is real are possible encounterings (appearings) in the course of possible spatializing. Further possible, I suggest, as referring to particular “moves” in the advance (such as advancing to a moon-inhabitant encountering) means proper or legitimate. Thus to say it is possible to move a bishop three spaces is to say it is a proper or legitimate move (whether it is actually carried out or not). If so, then for Kant the reality of inhabitants on the moon is just the propriety of shifting attention unto a moon-inhabitant encountering. It is helpful at this point to note that once we relax Kant’s abstraction from material, impenetrable, bodily reality, the spatial activity that effects such shifts of outer attention can include rocket travel. Hence, the reality of moon inhabitants is the propriety of such encountering, say, at a stage of rocket travel.⁶ Of course such an encountering may not be proper (possible), in which case there is no reality to moon inhabitants. Even if such an encountering is legitimate, moon inhabitants are not “given in themselves, but only in experience”; viz, there aren’t entities occupying distal places waiting for us (in our rockets) to reach and be affected by. Their spatiality and their reality is exclusively in the propriety of advancing to an encountering.

(II) TRANSCENDENTAL IDEALISM: TIME

Whereas space is the shifting or sweeping of attention outside or alongside, time is the sheer shifting of attention progressively. This progressiveness

pertains to all shifting of attention whatsoever. In particular, spatial shifting is progressive, with the sheer progressive component of it being time. Kant says (B154) that we represent time

in so far as we attend, in the *drawing* of a straight line . . . merely to the act . . . whereby we successively determine inner sense, and in so doing attend to the succession of this determination in inner sense.

The sheer progressiveness, however, needn't be that of a spatial shifting. Think of imagining a series of drumbeats at intervals that one calls up in one's mind. One's attention progressively "waits" before calling up each beat and then flows on again waiting for the next. In this case the progressiveness is (completely) inner directed, as there is no outer-directed spatial shifting. If we relax Kant's abstraction from our material bodily nature again, we can talk of bodily actions or activities that shift attention purely progressively. For example, suppose I am waiting for a bus to arrive. I stand, slowly and repetitively tapping my feet at intervals. My attention is shifted progressively with this activity without any refocusing or shifting along of my spatial attention. Indeed my attention is not even focally outer directed on my foot tapping but is an inward progressive shifting effected by (kinesthetically) discerning the tapping. Thus, although foot tapping is a bodily activity and my body is spatial, it is an inner-directing activity in that it doesn't direct attention outward at all. Next, suppose I take steps on a path observing the scenery alongside (say, to the right). If I pace the steps according to downbeat gestures I make with my arm held in alongside my body, this latter activity turns my attention away from the scenery towards the progressing of the steps, and it is thus a *temporalizing* activity—only in this case one governing the spatial shifting of attention.

Sheer progressive shifting, or the sheer progressiveness of shifting is a pure intuition. It is pure in that it is not carried out per se in relation to what I sense, either to what I sense outside me or to any sense I have of being in a perceptual state (see A31, B46). It is intuition in that time is produced or immediately "given" just in doing or undergoing the progression. As with space, Kant's contention is that time is nothing but pure intuition and for the same reason. Time is continuous, and continuity is that seamlessness of not being composable, but of a whole being prior to its parts or elements (A31, B47). Only a flowing activity is such that the whole is prior to any part or element. I don't progressively shift attention by (Zeno-like) going through all points or instants. If time were objective, then even though it "flowed," each element or point of it would have to arise for the whole flow to arise.

We turn now to the issue of the existence of what arises in time. Kant says at A34, B50, that time

is the immediate condition of inner appearances (of our souls) and thereby the mediate condition of outer appearances,

and the reason this is so is that

all representations, whether they have for their objects outer things or not, belong in themselves as determinations of the mind to our inner state [which inner state belongs to time].

That time is the mediate condition of outer appearances means simply that temporalizing (sheerly being progressive in one's attention) by itself doesn't pertain to outer appearances at all. This progressiveness must be in, or in regard to, an outer spatial sweep or shift to pertain to outer appearances. That time is the immediate condition of inner appearance means that time by itself (without any mediation of outer attention) governs inner appearance. For now, we restrict inner appearance to states of perceiving or observing which, unlike imaginings, moods, or feelings, involve outer affection. This is in line with what Kant says in regard to inner sense (B67),

the representations of the outer senses constitute the proper material with which we occupy our mind.

To see that time by itself is the immediate condition for such inner states, suppose that I am moving along a path, but my attention is retracted inward (away from *what* I am observing to my observing of it). Although I may still be peripherally aware of my surroundings, I am focusing on my perceiving—how my head orientation is altering from perception to perception, how my eyes are straining and relaxing, etcetera. There is here an inner progressive shifting of attention from one perceiving to another that is not mediated by (as it is exactly retracted from) spatial attention. Time, then, is the immediate form of inner sense (of the various perceivings).

Finally now we come to Kant's difficult claim that time is the mediate form of outer sense *by* being the immediate form of inner sense. For this, let's return to outer sense. I am walking along a path with my attention continually focused outward toward what is perceived or observed. As my attention is sweeping or shifting alongside (spatially), it is also progressing (temporally), whether I am focusing on that or not. The progressive aspect, though peripheral, must still be immediately conditioning my *observing* or *perceiving*, as perceivings (inner states) are temporal and so exist at all only as arising in the course of progressively attending. If time then were not immediately (even though peripherally) conditioning the inner, there would be no *perceiving*. Time, then, together with space would pertain to an outer reality that is not affecting, because we are not

being affected (perceiving). Such a reality, however, being thus “intrinsic” (something apart from affecting us) wouldn’t be appearance, even outer appearance, at all. The key point is that even when my focus is outward, it is an outward focus on a transactional phenomenon that is also, even if only peripherally, a “determination of the mind” (the subjective “pole” of the transaction). If the temporal progressiveness of the spatial attention shift were not also immediately encompassing the inner, there would be no perceiving or observing, and so no transactional phenomenon. Rather, there would only be (nonaffecting) reality on its own, which is transcendently, not empirically, outside us. As such, its reality would not fully be to arise in spatiotemporal attention, and hence it would have to exist in its own right in objective space and time (which is impossible for Kant). Thus time can mediately (with space) govern the entire transaction (affecting or being affected) only by also (without space) peripherally governing the inner aspect.

Our exposition of this difficult claim should not be taken to imply that phenomenologically we first experience or have a sense of inner-time flow (the flow of my perceivings) and then thereby a sense of outer time (the flow in regard to what is perceived). Whether my attention is focused outward (with only peripheral inner attending) or retracted inward (with still peripheral outer attending), in either case my attention is seamlessly unified according to this peripheral-focal dimension (rather than going from one to the other—outer to inner, or inner to outer). Hence, my sense is of time (the progressiveness of my attending) flowing equally within me and outside me.

I have been clarifying Kant’s claim that time, the sheer progressiveness of attending, is an immediate form of inner intuition (focusing on our own states) and a mediate form of outer intuition (focusing on what is observed). How exactly time pertains to inner empirical intuition or inner appearing, however, is not my main concern,⁷ as the thinking subject for Kant is neither empirically intuited nor an appearance. Before turning to what is my main concern, namely the relation of the intellectual subject to the pure intuition that time is, I want to make two points about how Kant understands temporal reality to clarify what sort of idealist he is about such reality.

First, and quite simply, time does apply to outer transactions, and so temporal reality or what is real in time is not internal to the subject (so again Kant is no Berkleian idealist). Kant says at A35, B51,

in respect of all appearances, and therefore of all things which can enter into our [transactional] experience, it [time] is necessarily objective.

Second, as with space, Kant’s idealism is not that outer reality is temporal only in actually arising in actual progressive attending. Kant says, speaking of real things in past time,

they are real in past time only in so far as a . . . regressive series of *possible* perceptions . . . conducts unto a past time series . . . a [time] series however can be represented as actual not in itself, but only in the connection [the connecting by progressive shifting] of a possible experience . . . Accordingly all events which have taken place in the immense periods that have preceded my existence mean nothing but the *possibility* of extending the chain of [transactional] experience back. . . . (A495, B529, italics mine)

Now is not the time to delve into Kant's understanding of representing the past that "preceded my own existence."⁸ It is simply to be noted that temporal reality, for Kant, is not restricted to what actually arises in a course of experience (with its progressive attention shifting); it also extends to what can possibly (properly) arise in the course of possible (proper) experiencing (connected by progressive shifting), extending back even beyond my existence.

(III) TIME AND THE THINKING SUBJECT

In the Third Paralogism Kant says of the "numerically identical self" (the thinking subject),

. . . in the whole time in which I am conscious of myself, I am conscious of this time as belonging to the unity of myself, *and it comes to the same* whether I say this whole time is in me, or that I am to be found as numerically identical in all this time. (A362)

Kant then seems to be saying that my thinking self does exist through time and, indeed, that it does so by time being "in it." It is this remark that we need to understand.

Let us turn first to the instructive example of the identity of myself in counting, which we will then apply to the case of the identity of myself through time. Kant uses the counting example in talking of the synthesis of recognition in a concept. He says of such recognition (A103),

If we were not conscious that what we *think* is the same as what we *thought* a moment before, all reproduction in the synthesis of representations would be useless. For it would in its present state be a new representation which would not in any way belong to the *act*, whereby it was to be gradually generated. (italics mine)

Suppose I initially have the thought to count or recite to twenty. Suppose then I begin to act or generate the numerals. At each stage I am always generating in accord with this one original thought, but at various stages the intellectual grasp in regard to that thought has to transition as being now so

far along. If I just originally had the thought and then started reciting, that original thought might causally produce the act, but it wouldn't constitute a continuing intellectual grasp (a recognition) throughout the act. The latter requires from moment to moment (from numeral to numeral) a varying grasp of how far along I am in acting in accord with the original thought. Put verbally, I must not only say to myself originally "Count to twenty," but at each stage I must also say "Up to. . .in counting to twenty."

This ongoing intellectual grasp is the identity of the self or the identity of apperception. Kant says (A108),

For the mind could never think its identity in the manifoldness of its representations [productions of numerals] . . . if it did not have before its eyes the identity of the act. . . .

Having before my eyes where I am in the original thought of reciting to twenty is having before my eyes the identity of my act, which is the identity of the thinking self throughout the representation.

Let me put this point now in terms of the thinking subject as an intellectual marshaling. Originally I am marshaled around the focal thought to recite to twenty (the marshaling involving marginal related thoughts standing in various degrees of readiness). As I recite my intellectual marshaling (or the intellectual marshaling that I am) remains the same throughout as the focus on the thought to recite to twenty, but this identical marshaling shifts or adjusts with the reciting (keeping tabs on where I am). The original marshaling doesn't give way to a new and different marshaling because being able to so adjust or shift is what it is to be "intellectually constant" in what one is doing. We can say, therefore, that the 'I think' or the intellectual subject (*viz.*, the intellectual marshaling) is constant. It is, as Kant says at A107, "unchangeable consciousness."

Note that there are two unities involved in my case of counting. There is first the unity that belongs to the procedure or activity itself: that is, to the numerals and how they relate to one another. Second, there is the intellectual unity of my thinking self in performing the procedure. The unity of counting, that is, belongs to the nature of counting, whereas the unity of counting as comprehended belongs to the nature of the understanding.

Let us turn now from the case of counting to the case of progressively shifting attention (time). Suppose I think to determine my progression of attention by marking it at unit intervals: say, by intermittently nodding my head or tapping my foot (either actually or in imagination). I might have the initial thought to do this as I am at a bus stop marking time until the bus comes. Suppose finally that I keep tabs of how many such intervals of progression pass by, numbering my nods or taps. My continuing intellectual grasp of what I am doing requires that throughout, at any stage at or in between markings (noddings or tappings), I comprehend how far along or where I am in proceeding with the original thought. Verbally this

might be in the form of a running commentary to myself. I say, for example “Between second and third marking,” “Still between,” “At the third marking,” and so on. My intellectual marshaling (the ‘I think’) that originally focused around the thought of determining a progression of attention remains constant throughout, even though my marshaling (the ‘I think’) continually adjusts for how far I am in the progression. Again that adjustment is just what it means to remain *intellectually* constant in (keeping tabs of) one’s original thought. My marshaling then, in order to be intellectually constant, continually shifts with the flow of progressive attending. Equivalently, my accompanying comprehension “flows” smoothly with the progression of attention. (This comprehension or apperception can only be constant by thus “developing” along with the flow of time.) The ‘I think,’ then, or my intellectual marshaling likewise flows in that it continuously adjusts or accompanies the flow of time (time precisely as nothing but a pure intuition).

As in the counting case there are two unities here: the unity that belongs to the procedure (progressively shifting attention=time) and the ongoing unity of intellectual comprehension in “performing” the procedure. The former unity belongs to time as a pure intuition and the latter to the intellect.⁹

Recall now the passage I quoted from the Third Paralogism at A362,

in the whole time in which I am conscious of myself [progressively attending] . . . it comes to the same whether I say that the whole time is in me, as individual unity, or that I am to be found as numerically identical in all this time.

The whole progression of attention (time) remains intellectually *in* my constant grasp (the whole time is in me) by my grasp constantly shifting with the progression (I am in all this time). My intellectual identity or constancy, rather than being atemporal, stretches along with time.

Note that in my analysis the ‘I think’ (the intellectual marshaling action) is temporal not by arising in time, but by, so to speak, arising with time. Equivalently, it is temporal by actively accompanying progressive attending (actively shifting or adjusting with it), not by passively happening to me within the course of attending. The latter would pertain to the manifold that arises in inner intuition. If, as I walk along a path, my attention is retracted inward, then within the progressive flow of it I may find or discern (be struck by how) my eyes are fluttering, then focusing narrower, then straining, etcetera. These aspects of perceivings are all discerned as what simply comes up within the course of my retracted attention. Again, I consider inner sense, self-affection, etcetera below.¹⁰ For now the point is one of contrast. I don’t find my intellectual marshaling coming up within the course of inner attending—I discern it accompanying or comprehending it. In sum, the ‘I think’ is not temporal by being intuited in time.

If I am correct, then Sartre is mistaken when he says that for Kant

temporal unity . . . is conferred by a being who himself escapes temporality.¹¹

It is closer to the truth to say that the Kantian self or the Kantian intellectual being temporalizes itself by conferring unity on time (on progressive attending). At the end of the last subsection, I characterized the phenomenology of Kantian time as a sense that time flows both in me and outside me. I can now add that it includes a sense of me (the subject) flowing or developing with time.

Note that although our intellectual marshaling is not appearance (intuitable in time), neither is it noumenal because, although nonintuitable, it is still temporal. Recall that Kant says in footnote (a) to B422,

An indeterminate perception signifies only something real that is given . . . not as appearance, nor as thing in itself, but as something which actually exists, and which in the proposition "I think" is denoted as such.

If the reality denoted by the 'I think' is not noumenal (the thing in itself) then it must be temporal, and if it is not appearance then it must not be intuitable in time. Thus it has to be temporal: however not by arising in time but by accompanying time. This is exactly the reality of our (ongoing adjusting, but comprehendingly constant) intellectual marshaling.

Suppose on the other hand that the 'I think' signified not just the action of intellectual marshaling but an entity with its own intrinsic reality that, by that action's deriving or coming from it, intellectually unifies progressive attending. Rather than there just being, that is, the constant intellectual marshaling about a focus that shifts or adjusts, there would be the entity or subject with its own intrinsic nature that this action belongs to or derives from. But then if this subject were temporal it would have to be so by being in a time independent of, or other than, progressive attending. As its entire reality is no longer (as in my view) to accompany and shift with progressive attending, in its further intrinsic reality it would have to be in time that only corresponds to such attending. In other words it would have to be in "objective" time. One might object that the intrinsic reality of the entity can still be temporal by existing "in relation to" progressive attending. But what is this relation? The relation cannot be that the intrinsic reality arises in attending, for then the subject entity would be appearance. Nor can the relation be that it accompanies (develops according to) progressive attending, for admittedly its reality is something more, or other than, that accompanying action. It seems that the relation can only be that the intrinsic reality is temporal by flowing or existing in a time that encompasses both it and progressive attending. But that again is just the objective time that Kant's transcendental idealism denies. I showed in the case of space

that if what arises in the course of outer attending were an entity with its own intrinsic reality beyond that arising, it could only be spatial by being in objective space (a space that only corresponds to outer attending). Similarly, if what accompanies the course of progressive attending were an entity with its own intrinsic reality (beyond that accompanying), it could only be temporal by being in objective time (a time that only corresponds to progressive attending). As such time simply does not exist for Kant, if the 'I think' signified an entity then it couldn't be temporal at all, and so could only signify the noumenal basis of intellectual action.

My contention, recall, is that the Paralogisms turn on the ontological distinction between the thinking subject as an entity (for the rational psychologist) versus the thinking subject as sheer intellectual marshaling action (for Kant). What turns on this is not only avoiding the rational psychologist's claim of noumenal knowledge from the 'I think' but also avoiding Kant's own transcendental idealism from entailing knowledge of the noumenal reality of a thinking subject (as an entity beyond the action that accompanies pure progressive attending). We turn now to see how my ontological distinction fares as an interpretation of the text of the first two Paralogisms.

Part II

The Thinking Subject

3 The First Paralogism

(I) THE TEXT

In discussing the Paralogisms, I focus on the A edition text and use the B edition for clarification and support. The major premise of the First Paralogism defines substance. A substance is that which in judgments is always represented as subject and never as determination of something else. This premise pertains to that which is judged about or that which is an object of thought or judgment. If what is thought or judged about can only be thought or judged about as what determinations belong to, but not as itself a determination belonging to anything, then the object of thought is a substance or an entity in its own right. The major premise is neutral as to whether or not this object of judgment can also be an object of intuition; the definition of substance applies in either case. Kant says in footnote (a) to B411,

Thought is taken in the two premises in totally different senses; in the major as relating to an object [of judgment] in general and therefore [also] to an object as it may be given in intuition.

A nonintuitable object of judgment, representable only as subject, is a noumenal substance, whereas if it is intuitable it is a Kantian (phenomenal) substance.

The minor premise purportedly brings me as a thinking being under the definition, which would then enable the conclusion that “I, as thinking being, am substance.” However, in the minor premise no object of judgment is signified at all (whether intuitable or not). Again at footnote (a) to B411 Kant says,

. . . in the minor premise [thought is taken] only as it consists in relation to self-consciousness. In the latter sense, *no object whatsoever is being thought*. (italics mine)

The minor does not pertain to myself as an object of thought or judgment at all. It signifies that in my very subjective being (as revealed in the cogito) I am that to which all thoughts or judgments belong. Kant says (B429),

. . . in the consciousness of myself in mere thought [in merely thinking or having thoughts] I am the *being itself*, although nothing in myself is thereby given for thought.

The minor, that is, pertains to my very being or existence as a conscious thinking subject in regard to the being or existence of thoughts. In the sense of the minor premise, it is not that I discern myself as subject and never determination by having a thought about myself (with or without intuiting myself). I discern myself as subject simply by being the conscious thinker or subject of thoughts (including any thoughts about myself, as particular cases). Kant says in footnote (a) to B411,

In thinking my existence, I cannot *employ* myself, save as subject of the judgment [that is had].

In other words, in having a thought (even a thought about myself as an object of judgment) I cannot but be (“employ myself” as being) the thinker. It is this latter fact, not how I enter as an object of judgment, which is the (proper) sense of the minor premise.

Kant says the cogito or the ‘I think’ is “the sole text of rational psychology” (A343, B401). My understanding of the minor premise, I believe, is consistent with how Kant thinks the cogito is properly understood. In the cogito I am not revealed to myself as an instance of a judgment about thinking beings. I do not apply any general concept of subject-of-thought to myself. He says in footnote (a) to B423,

The “I think” is, as already stated, an empirical proposition and contains within itself the proposition ‘I exist.’ But I cannot say [generally] “Everything which thinks exists” . . . my [subjectively revealed] existence therefore cannot be regarded as an inference from the proposition “I think” . . . [cannot be regarded as an application of the thought of a thinker to me as instance].

Indeed, for Kant there is no independent general concept of a subjective thinking being to apply to my case. As he says,

It is obvious that if I wish to represent to myself a thinking being, I must put myself in his place, and thus substitute as it were my own subject [my own subjectivity discerned in the cogito] for the object. (A353)

Any general concept of a thinking being (to employ in a judgment and so to make myself an object of thought) presupposes what is revealed in the cogito, and so being an object of thought for myself is not what is going on in the cogito.

As the minor premise does not signify an object of thought at all (but rather my subjectively discerned being), it doesn't bring my subjectivity or existence as a thinker under the major premise, and so the conclusion that I exist as a substantial entity doesn't follow. It is not really crucial to locate the ambiguity between the major and minor premises in a single term or phrase. In the footnote to B411 Kant locates it in the term 'thought': "Thought is taken in the premises in totally different senses". In the A edition formulation of the paralogism it can be located with the same ambiguity in the term 'subject.' Either way, the ambiguity is between always being a subject of thought in the sense of a subject thought about (in the major premise) and being always a subject of thought in the sense of a subject having thoughts (in the minor). It has seemed to some¹ that such an ambiguity is blatant and easily avoidable: hardly the kind of ambiguity that rational psychology as a whole could turn on. I argue in subsection (ii) that once the details of what is revealed in the cogito are filled in, it is no blatant ambiguity, but a deep one, and one difficult to avoid.

I turn now to the four paragraphs of Kant's critique of this Paralogism in the A edition. The overall structure of his critique is as follows. The first paragraph sets out the sense in which the minor premise is true, which is the sense that can be established by, or based on, the cogito. The second and third paragraphs set out the sense in which the minor premise doesn't follow from the cogito, which is also the sense that would be needed to bring it under the major premise. In the fourth paragraph, Kant allows that although the argument doesn't establish that we are self-subsistent entities, nevertheless there could be a noumenal substratum to the 'I think.'

In the first paragraph (A349), Kant reminds us of the merely logical sense of substance: viz, being what is thought by the subject term of a judgment. This is a trivial sense, as anything can be thus thought of. What would be nontrivial (as in regard to the major premise) is that which can only thus be thought of as subject. Kant allows that in all our thinking (having thoughts) the 'I' is the subject in which thinking inheres, "and this 'I' cannot be employed as the determination of another thing." In my thinking (as revealed in the cogito) I am not a determination of anything; there is just me (the thinker) and my thoughts (the determinations). In my subjective being, then, I must regard myself as "substance" (not as determination). Kant ends by saying everyone must regard himself as substance "and thought as [consisting] only in accidents of his *being*, determinations of his *state*" (italics mine). Note that Kant doesn't say that in the cogito (in our thinking) one must regard thoughts as determinations of the entity that one is. So far as the cogito is concerned, all I know is that thoughts are determinations of my *state*. Kant doesn't clarify at this point exactly what this means: a clarification I make later.

He says in the second paragraph that this sense in which I am substance is useless for the rational psychologist. As far as the cogito goes, and as

admitted by Descartes, I may be a momentary existent. Suppose that all that exists in reality is me and the evil demon. Not only would I be always subject of thinking (in the cogito), but I would always absolutely be subject and not a determination of anything, because there is only me and the evil demon. This would bring me under what he calls in the next paragraph “the pure category of substance” (that which is subject and never determination), but it would still be such an absolute subject existing only within a *state* (the occurrence of the cogito). As an analogy, suppose that all that existed in reality was a thundering (with determinations of being a crashing, rolling thundering). It would be a substance only in an empty sense (according to the pure category). The important point to take from this paragraph is how seriously Kant takes determining the exact limits of what is revealed in the cogito.

In the third paragraph, Kant contends that the subject of thinking is not intuited (presented as an object) in the cogito. If it could be intuited, perhaps its permanence could be “demonstrated” in experience, as is the case for Kant in regard to what is spatially intuited outside us. This would give a “serviceable” concept of substance as that which is subject and never predicate through all change. This Kantian way of bringing myself under the major premise, however, is precluded because we don’t intuit ourselves. One shouldn’t conclude from these remarks that Kant thinks there is no subject revealed in the cogito, only that the subject is not determinable in intuition. It is, rather, the determining subject, or as he says in footnote (a) to B158,

The “I think” expresses the act of determining my existence.

I return to this important point below.

Having shown that from the cogito we get no notion of a substantial being, either in terms of the pure category (second paragraph) or the schematized category (third paragraph) that would bring the minor premise under the major, in the fourth paragraph Kant allows nevertheless that there may be a substratum (a substantial being) that underlies the ‘I.’ Kant reiterates what he takes to be the truth that can be revealed in the cogito,

Consciousness [intellectual consciousness] is indeed that which makes all representations to be thoughts, and in it, therefore as transcendental subject all our perceptions must be found.

He is saying here (as does Descartes) that I am the conscious subject not only of all thinking but also (thereby) of all perceiving. Being the subject of perceiving for Kant requires more than being an intellectual subject; it requires intellectually encompassing inner attention and inner sense. I deal with these issues in Part IV, Chapter 9. For now, such a subject is still within the scope of the cogito, and the import is that even with inner

intuition, I am the determining (thinking) subject by which I grasp the perceiving as mine; I am not as such an object intuited.

Kant continues,

but beyond this logical meaning of the ‘I’ we have no knowledge of the subject in itself which, as substratum, underlies this ‘I’ as it [the ‘I’] does all thoughts.

To begin with Kant is not claiming the ‘I’ has only a logical meaning in any sense in which that is opposed to its being real (to its having ontological status). He said in the first paragraph,

I can say of any and everything that it is a substance, in the sense that I distinguish it from mere predicates and determinations of things.

In other words, a subject in the logical sense is just what can be sometimes subject (distinguished from predicates). Compare B420 where Kant says of the ‘I’ as subject,

it has not been determined whether I can be thought as subject *only* and not also as predicate of another being, and accordingly the concept of a subject is taken here in a *merely logical sense*. (italics mine)

This sense of logical doesn’t mean that what is thus subject has no reality at all, only that, as far as this goes, it is not a substance (entity). That this is what Kant has in mind here is clear, for he goes on to say that the ‘I’ (which, in my being as a thinker as revealed in the cogito, is always subject) may nevertheless be a determination of an underlying substratum (a self-subsistent reality) and so a subject only in the logical sense. Unless the ‘I’ had some ontologically real status, it would be hard to understand how it could be a *determination* of an underlying substratum, whether we have knowledge of the substratum or not.

He goes on to say,

The proposition “The soul is substance” may, however, quite well be allowed to stand . . . if, that is to say, we recognize that this concept signifies a substance only in idea, not in reality.

As I am reading this last sentence, it is the noumenal substratum which is a substance (for us) only in idea. Kant is not saying that the ‘I’ exists as subject only in idea not in reality. The point of the fourth paragraph is that when Kant denies that the cogito reveals the ‘I’ as a substantial reality, he is not thereby denying his own view that there may be a noumenal basis to my existence (to me, the thinking subject) which is indeed substantial.

The critique of the Paralogism is fairly sparse in relation to exactly what the ontological status of the subject is positively for Kant. I turn now to filling this in with the help of the B edition. What we do know from the

A paragraph is that there is a real subject of thinking that exists (even momentarily) in the state of the cogito. At footnote (a) to B158 Kant says,

The “I think” expresses the *act* of determining my existence. Existence is already given thereby (*italics mine*),

just as in the fourth paragraph of the A edition First Paralogism “determining my existence” refers to being the subject of perceivings (or pertains to perceivings belonging to me). But for Kant, in this ‘I think’ existence or reality is already given. One may say, therefore, that existence or reality as a subject of perceptions is an act or action. In a footnote highly similar to this (footnote (a) to B423) Kant says,

the ‘I’ is purely intellectual . . . without some empirical representation [say, inner attending to perceiving] to supply the material for thought the *actus* “I think” [as determining my existence] would not indeed take place.

Once again, being a subject of perception is said to be an action and indeed an intellectual action. He continues in this footnote,

but the empirical is only the condition of the *employment* of the pure intellectual faculty. (*italics mine*)

The ‘I think’ then is an intellectual action by being the marshaling or activation (*employment*) of the intellectual faculty. It is not just thinking a perception that is said to be an action, but my being the intellectually conscious subject of the perception that is said to be an action. In Chapter 1, I suggested that this makes (phenomenological) sense if we consider the marshaling as a distribution of inchoately forming thoughts (ready in the wings) coalescing about a focal thought (say a thought of perceiving as I inner attend). Then what I am (and what I discern as my existence) is this active reservoir of potencies to comprehend which is not swallowed up by a thought, but which the thought, rather, is a determination of.

This view of what I am agrees with all Kant says in the A edition First Paralogism. For anyone being thus intellectually marshaled thought consists “only [in] accidents of his being, determinations of his state” (first paragraph, A349). I exist as such a subject within the limits of the cogito (*viz*, momentarily) apart from any issue of persisting (second paragraph). I do not intuit the ‘I,’ the inchoate, indeterminate, unformed thoughts (third paragraph), and that real action I am, though in my very being never a determination, may have an underlying noumenal self-subsistent ground or basis (fourth paragraph). The marshaling action is not a noumenal substance, nor is it a Kantian intuitable substance, and so it doesn’t come under the major premise, whether interpreted purely conceptually (by the rational psychologist) or

empirically (by Kant, as subject of all change). Further, it is plausibly taken as all that is revealed or discerned in (and so all the follows from) the momentary act of the Cartesian cogito.

I want to consider now one last issue that I believe my interpretation of the reality of the thinking subject clarifies. Kant says in the Third Paralogism (A365), talking of the ‘I’ (not the noumenon),

Meanwhile we may still retain the concept of personality, just as we have retained the concept of substance and of the simple.

Because a real action (the ‘I’) is precisely not a self-subsistent entity, either intuitable or not, how is it that Kant can retain the concept of substance for it? I don’t think he means to retain it in the trivial logical sense in which anything at all can be a subject of judgment. For this he wouldn’t have to rely on any revelation of the cogito at all. Rather, what I claim is that he means it in the sense of the pure category (that which is subject and never predicate). He says in the Second Paralogism (in the context of what can be retained)

The proposition “I am substance” signifies, as we have found, nothing but the pure category. (A356)

My question is how he can retain the concept of substance in this sense? I shall argue when I get to the Third Paralogism in Part IV that intellectual marshaling action remains for Kant the ultimate non-noumenal subject. In particular, a person is not a subject (entity) underlying this intellectual marshaling (the ‘I think’); rather a person is just a temporal extension and material embodiment of this marshaling. Roughly, the very thinking being I am as revealed in the cogito is (as temporally extended and embodied) the very person I am, not an accident or determination of that person. Suppose for now this is true for Kant. Then, *in regard to non-noumenal reality*, this intellectual marshaling is always subject and never determination of any entity (whether material or, Strawson-wise, material-and-mental). Restricted to non-noumenal reality, then, we can retain the concept of substance in the sense of the major premise. This is far more than the trivial logical sense in which anything can be subject; it is the sense (restricted to the non-noumenal) of the pure category: viz, that which is subject and never determination.

(II) THE COGITO: KANT VS. THE RATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST

In my interpretation both Kant and the rational psychologist agree that the cogito establishes that in *our being as subjects of thought* we are never determinations of anything else. For the rational psychologist, but not for

Kant, it follows that *as objects of thought* we are always subject and never predicate and hence self-subsistent substances. Simply, as just stated, the psychologist's conclusion doesn't follow because of the ambiguity between being subjects of thought (subjects having thoughts) versus always being subjects when thought about (objects of thought). Furthermore, this ambiguity does seem to be, as Jonathan Bennett suggests, one that is blatant and easily avoidable. Karl Ameriks seems to make a similar point. He says, as an objection to Kant's First Paralogism,

To know that all our thoughts inhere in a thinking subject is not yet to know that it in turn does not inhere in something else; for all we know a psychological subject need not be an "absolute" metaphysical subject.²

Ameriks's objection to Kant is exactly what we have taken to be Kant's objection to the rational psychologist. For now, however, I am concerned with his apparent implication that the "ambiguity" between a psychological and a metaphysical subject is obvious and easily avoidable. In this subsection I want to show the ambiguity is not trivial or obvious at all. Of course, as stated, it clearly is a fallacy of ambiguity. It really doesn't matter a great deal, however, whether we even call it an ambiguity or not. What really is at issue is whether the transition from always being a subject in thinking (Ameriks's psychological subject) to being a substance or entity (Ameriks's metaphysical subject) is blatantly fallacious. My contention is that once we fill in what the cogito signifies for both Kant and the rational psychologist, the transition by the psychologist is no trading on a blatant ambiguity. What I attempt to do now is fill in the rational psychologist's transition from psychological to metaphysical subject. Then, armed with that, I will return to Kant's criticism.

For Kant, as for the rational psychologist, the cogito immediately reveals that I am the subject of thoughts or what thoughts belong to (Ameriks's psychological subject). In particular Kant would reject the idea that it reveals no subject at all but only a thinking. Further, the subject revealed is no mere logical (grammatical) subject. Kant would reject the idea, that is, that the 'I' in 'I think' is a placeholder similar to the subject in 'It is raining.' The cogito then reveals not just the act or activity of thinking but a real subject that the act or activity belongs to or is a determination of. Finally now for Kant, as for Descartes, what is revealed in the cogito is not an aspect of being a subject or the wherewithal by which something is a subject. Rather the cogito reveals my being as a complete sufficient psychological subject. Nothing else is needed, so to speak, than what is revealed in the cogito, for being a subject that thoughts belong to. As Descartes might put this last point, I clearly and distinctly perceive that nothing beyond what is revealed in the cogito is required for me to be the real subject that thinks. Of course one might criticize Kant (and Descartes) for what they hold to be revealed in the cogito, but that is not to the point, as Kant's dispute with the rational

psychologist is over what follows from this shared conception of what is revealed in the cogito.

The question now is what is this real psychological subject? It can't apparently be an activity or action, because the cogito reveals not just thinking (acting) but that which thinks (acts).

It can only then be either a substance or a state inhering in a substance. But if the psychological subject inheres in something else, then what it inheres in would be the psychological as well as the metaphysical subject, as the inherence would only be that by which that (metaphysical) subject was the (psychological) subject of thinking. Thus, for example, it isn't a person's present state that thinks of the sky's being blue but the person who so thinks by being in that state (by that state inhering in him). The inhering state is not then the subject of thinking. But because, supposedly, the complete psychological subject is revealed in the cogito, it cannot be that what is revealed is merely a state or determination of something else, and hence it must be a metaphysical subject (a substance). Whether this argument is cogent or not, it doesn't seem to trade on any easily avoidable ambiguity as suggested by Bennett and Ameriks. Indeed, in terms of this argument, the minor premise of the paralogism does come under the major premise so that the supposed ambiguity is only a surface ambiguity that exists only in the argument's enthymematic form.

Let us reconsider now how Kant avoids the conclusion. First, for Kant the complete psychological subject is an action or activity: namely, the intellectual marshaling to which the thinking belongs. Thus although what is revealed in the cogito is more than the mere activity of thinking, it is not more than activity (with an internal dynamics of subject and thoughts belonging to it). Furthermore, at least non-noumenally, this activity is not a determination of any entity. When I come to Kant's conception of a person in the Third Paralogism (Part IV, Chapter 10), I show that the activity is not a state or condition inhering in a substantial person. Rather, a person for Kant is the temporal extension and material embodiment of this very activity so that as this activity I exist now (and whenever I do exist) as the person I am. Hence this activity (revealed in the cogito) is not that by which an entity is the subject of thoughts but the complete psychological subject. Finally, although the activity of being a subject of thought can be noumenally grounded in an entity, that entity is not thereby the "real" subject of thought. Supposedly the noumenal grounding would be some activity (perhaps even a free activity) of the entity, which activity constitutes or is the basis of the activity revealed in the cogito. But then it is this noumenal activity of the entity (not the entity) which is the "true" identity of the psychological subject. This point, I believe, allows us to make sense of Kant's agnosticism about the transcendental or noumenal ground of thinking subjects. This agnosticism allows, for example, that each thinking subject is grounded by the activity of distinct entities (as per Leibnizian monads); but it also allows that all thinking subjects have their ground in the activity

(various activities) of a single entity (as per Spinoza's God). If it were the grounding entity (substance) that was the true psychological subject, then in the Spinozistic case only God would be a psychological subject, which violates what we know from the cogito. On the other hand, if distinct actions belong to the single substance, each could be the true nature or identity of distinct psychological subjects. Hence the uniqueness of noumenal substance would be compatible with the existence of multiple real subjects of thought. Thus although Spinoza can say that God is the only substance, still God thinks through us (viz, through activities grounding ourselves as genuine thinking subjects, although not thinking substances). But if activities were only that by which an entity is a thinking subject, then God would be the only thinking subject.

If I am correct, then the real dispute between Kant and the rational psychologist is over whether the complete psychological subject revealed in the cogito is, ontologically, an entity (substance) or the activity of intellectual marshaling. It is this fundamental distinction which would enable Kant to hold that the "surface" ambiguity in the paralogism between being a psychological and being a metaphysical subject is a real ambiguity. Without this ontological distinction there is no ambiguity, and the rationalist's argument goes through, given the understanding he shares with Kant that what is revealed in the cogito is a complete psychological subject.

4 The Second Paralogism

(I) THE TEXT

As with the First Paralogism, I will focus on the text of the A edition, using the B edition when helpful. Even so, I consider only the first nine paragraphs (up to A356, ending with the sentence “We will test the supposed usefulness of the proposition by an experiment”). The reason is that the rest of the text deals with the issue of materialism which topically goes with the Fourth Paralogism. Following the lead of the First Paralogism, the major premise defines the simplicity of a thing or substance (the German is “*Dasjenige Ding*”), whereas the minor premise apparently brings the thinking ‘I’ under the definition. Kant doesn’t quite say in the minor premise that the thinking ‘I’ is such a *thing*. Somewhat less determinately he says it is such a being (*ein solches*). In any case, it is clear from the body of the text that for Kant the proper understanding of the minor that in fact follows from the cogito is that the thinking ‘I’ is not a simple *thing* (even if “its action can never be regarded as the concurrence of several things acting”). My contention is that the text supports that the simplicity of the ‘I’ is instead simplicity (in a sense to be discussed) of the action I am. Kant says at B413,

And with the objective reality of substance [vanishing], the allied concept of simplicity vanishes; it is transformed into a merely logical qualitative unity of self-consciousness.

The ambiguity is between the self as a simple entity (in the major premise) versus the self as a kind of simplicity or unity of action (in the minor premise). In line with the First Paralogism, the simplicity of the very intellectual consciousness that I am in having thoughts is not the simplicity of an entity (an object of thought, with or without being intuited). Indeed it is in the Second Paralogism that the ontological distinction between entity and action takes center stage.

The overall structure of the nine paragraphs of the Second Paralogism doesn’t follow the order of the First, but they cover the same main topics. The second paragraph elaborates the rational psychologist’s argument for the minor premise (understood as coming under the major in concluding

to a simple entity). The third paragraph refutes this argument for a simple, purely conceptual, entity, and the fourth denies there is any intuitively discernible simple entity. Having thus shown that the minor premise does not come under the major in either the sense of a purely rational or an intuitible simple entity, the fifth through seventh paragraphs delineate the sense in which the minor is true (as simplicity of the “subjective ‘I’” or “apperception”). Finally, the eighth paragraph allows a noumenal ground to the non-self-subsistent simple subject I am, and the ninth paragraph allows the retaining of a nonentitative sense of being a simple substance (i.e., it draws the proper conclusion of the paralogistic syllogism).

In the first paragraph, Kant introduces the issue of simplicity as being the rational psychologist’s strongest suit but also its “Achilles heel.” In the *Monadology*, Leibniz understands apperception (intellectual consciousness or self-consciousness) as the action of simple substances, and the “reduction” of reality to simple entities plays a key role in Leibniz’s entire noumenal metaphysics.¹ Because of this central role, it is the point at which the rational psychologist (in the guise of Leibniz) is most vulnerable, and so is his Achilles heel.

In the second paragraph, the rational psychologist’s argument for the minor premise is presented. Although the example of single words of a verse being distributed among different beings is mentioned, it is mentioned only to illustrate the idea that the case of thinking is different than the case of motion. A unified action (effect) can arise from several substances in the case of motion because

this effect is external only. But with thoughts as *internal* accidents belonging to a thinking being it is different.

Before I explicate this point, note that in the third paragraph Kant accepts the verse illustration but then goes on to *ignore* the external–internal distinction by flat out stating that the case of thinking is no different than the case of motion. He says in the third paragraph,

For the unity of the thought . . . may relate just as well to the collective unity of different substances acting together (as the motion of a body is the composite motion of all its parts) as to the absolute unity of the subject.

Kant must think, then, that though the verse example is true, the external versus internal distinction is completely irrelevant to what it illustrates.

Let us consider the psychologist’s external–internal distinction. In the case of a body (a composite substance) moving, each part of the body that moves is related spatially to every other part that moves, and the total spread out motion is thereby the effect of each part moving. With internal (nonspatial) action, each element of a composite would have

its accidents or actions, *and the elements would not be related to one another* (except as co-occurring). In effect, the various accidents that belong to the elements are isolated from one another except as co-occurring. One may think here of Leibniz's windowless, merely harmonious, monads. But then there is *no real whole* effect, beyond the accidents of each co-occurring on their own. If so, then all of the elements taken together would not constitute a whole internal accident of anything. Since what it would mean for a composite to think is that it is a collection of substances each with their own accidents or actions, therefore there would be no whole internal accident or action at all—and so no entire thought (no whole verse) as effect.

Why does Kant reject the relevance of this argument to the verse example? He says in the third paragraph,

as far as mere concepts can show [the whole thought] may relate just as well to the collective unity of different substances acting together.

In other words, it is not an analytic truth that sheer co-occurrence, or sheer harmonious occurrence, can't be the thinking of the whole thought. Because the psychologist's internal-external distinction applies to thinking in general (not specifically to what is revealed to me in the cogito), his point should hold in considering (as an object of thought) a subject different than me or in impersonally considering (as an object of thought) my own subject. *When considered this way* why shouldn't the co-occurrence be the thinking of the whole thought? Where is the contradiction? One might say that the whole thought is not an internal accident of any entity, but why isn't it internal to the collection? It surely "belongs" to the composite or the collection, and so why doesn't the collection "own" the whole thought? Note I am not talking now of how it is with me in the cogito but of how it is when I consider in general (as an object of thought) the concept of a whole thinking subject. As such, even in thinking of myself as one case among others, there is no contradiction in my being the merely harmonious co-occurrence of several substances each thinking parts of the thought. Suppose right now there were "homunculi" in me each thinking a part. Would that mean I wasn't thinking (I wasn't the homunculi collection)? Suppose even that several persons were each thinking a word of a verse, as in the William James example. Would it follow that nothing was thinking the whole verse? Of course none of the persons were, but where is the contradiction in saying there is a group subject (composed of these persons) thinking the whole verse? All that matters, *when we think impersonally*, is that the whole thought pertain or belong to something (even a group), not that it be a whole accident or action that is more than co-occurrence of component actions.

What I am getting at is that for Kant the rational psychologist is confusing the perfectly "impersonal" notion of thought as an *internal*

action, with personally, or *from the inside*, having a thought. The rational psychologist, in using the verse example to illustrate and support his claim, is trading on this confusion. He is inviting us, by the verse example, to be that subject “from the inside” and so to convince ourselves that we are not (from the inside) several subjects. For Kant there is truth to this, but rather than supporting the psychologist, this truth exactly collapses when we think of ourselves (and others) as objects of thought (entities or substances acting) as the psychologist requires for his conclusion (for his understanding of the minor premise) that we can't be several substances acting.

In Paragraph Four, after quickly denying that we are simple as objects of intuition (so that the minor premise is not true in this regard either), Kant asks,

Whence then are we to derive the proposition [the minor premise as properly true] upon which the whole psychological syllogism depends?

Paragraphs Five through Seven answer this question as well as giving the sense in which the minor premise is true. Kant says,

. . . if I wish to represent to myself a thinking being, I must put myself in his place, and thus substitute, as it were, my own subject for the object I am seeking to consider.

This is exactly the distinction I made above between personal versus impersonal consideration of the subject. Kant says that when we understand this fact (of how to represent a thinking subject) then (but only then) we can demand absolute unity of the subject (any subject) of thought. As this absolute unity (in a sense yet to be considered) of my subjectivity is revealed in the cogito, and my only idea of other thinking subjectivities is a projection or transference of my own, I can and automatically do attribute absolute unity to them. Let us go back to the William James case now, and suppose this time I think *by projecting my own subjectivity* that each person is thinking a word. I simply cannot further project my subjectivity at the same time onto the whole group (the composite) as thinking the whole verse, because in my own case my subjectivity in regard to the verse cannot be *revealed* as composed of several subjectivities each encompassing a single word (see section (ii)). But I do not find in my own case that the thought or verse is an internal accident of the simple entity I am, and so the transference is useless for establishing the rational psychologist's conclusion that subjects of thoughts are simple entities. It is now finally seen why in the third paragraph Kant accepts the verse example but denies that it is any support for the rational psychologist.

What do we find then in the cogito? Kant says in Paragraph Five,

For although the whole of the thought could [for all that is revealed in the cogito] be divided and distributed among many subjects [entities], the subjective “I” can never be thus divided and distributed.

What then is this subjective ‘I,’ and in what sense is it undivided and undistributed in the cogito (or in the ‘I think’)?

Recall first that Kant has already implied that the ‘I’ can be the concurrence of several things acting. This in turn seems to imply that the ‘I’ is indeed an action. Paragraph Six lays out what that action is. In Paragraph Six, talking of the cogito as a whole, Kant says it is

the form of apperception which belongs to and precedes any experience

and that it is the “formula” of our consciousness as an intelligent being. The cogito then is that by which every experience (inner or outer) belongs to our intellectual consciousness. Talking again of this form of apperception or “determining self” at A402, he says the fallacy of the Second Paralogism is

to regard the unity in the synthesis of thoughts [the determining subject] as a perceived unity in the subject [the substance or entity] of these thoughts.

The determining subject, then, is a “synthesis of thoughts.” I don’t believe Kant means by this either a synthesis of concepts into a judgment (which would be a thought, not thoughts), nor a synthesis of intuitions under thought (which again would be a synthesis of reciting, say, under a thought, not thoughts). The ‘I’ then is a synthesis of thoughts (*viz*, a combination of thoughts of various degrees of readiness) of our intellectual capacity. This is just my view that the ‘I’ is an intellectual marshaling action, not an entity or a substance.

Having said what the subjective ‘I’ is in Paragraph Six, Kant now turns in the next paragraph to what its “simplicity” is. He says that it signifies

absolute (although merely logical) unity.

In a similar vein he says in the B edition that simplicity is

a merely logical qualitative unity of self-consciousness in thought in general.

In accord with his remark in Paragraph Five, this simplicity consists in the fact that the action of the ‘I’ in thinking is not distributed or divided in regard to what is thought. Likewise he says at B408,

The “I” in every act of thought is one and cannot be resolved (divided) into a plurality.

Simplicity then is a qualitative (overall) unity (indivisibility) of ourselves in the cogito. This unity is further characterized in the first sentence of Paragraph Eight as governing

only the verb in relation to a person.

Kant has in mind here the cogito (the representation 'I think'), and he is saying the qualitative unity pertains to how the 'I' (or the person) relates to thinking (the verb). In sum, the simplicity is the indivisibility of the action of intellectual marshaling in regard to the formed thought that emerges (which it coalesces about and holds). Roughly, then, the encompassing of a formed thought within or by the intellectual marshaling that I am is not divisible or distributable. I try to clarify exactly what this comes to in the next subsection.

Having thus stated in Paragraphs Five through Seven the sense in which the minor premise is true (corroborated in the cogito), in Paragraph Eight Kant turns to the noumenal basis of the subjective 'I.' He says,

It is obvious that in attaching "I" to our thoughts, we designate the *subject of inherence* only transcendently. (italics mine)

Within the cogito (which in footnote (a) to B432 Kant says is expressed by the *empirical* proposition 'I think'), we attach the 'I' to our thoughts by being the marshaling action that encompasses them. Any *transcendental* designation of a subject of inherence (an entity or substance) is well beyond the (empirical) cogito and refers to Kant's own noumenal ground or basis. The representation of this noumenal reality is simple, not in the psychologist's sense of its being a representation of what is noncomposite, but in the trivial sense of being a completely indeterminate representation (a "something in general"). Kant says,

Nothing indeed can be represented that is simpler than that which is represented through the concept of a mere something. (see also A400)

Note that in going beyond the cogito to represent a ground or basis of our subjective being, we are again thinking impersonally (even as to the ground of ourselves) of a reality that we, or any other subjectively thinking being, might "substantially" be. The 'I' taken to thus impersonally designate such reality Kant says,

is an expression which I can apply to every thinking subject,

just as the rational psychologist requires, but is simple only in being empty.

Finally, in the ninth paragraph Kant lets stand the truth of the conclusion of the syllogism, “I am simple substance” but only in the sense in which it follows from the minor premise as corroborated by the cogito: not the minor as it is bogusly argued for by the rational psychologist nor the minor as in any way supportable by experience or intuition.

I turn now to an attempt to elaborate on Kant’s idea of the unity or indivisibility of the subjective “I” (or of the encompassing of a thought by the intellectual marshaling action that we are).

(II) THE INDIVISIBILITY OF CONSCIOUS THINKING

The key point of the simplicity of the ‘I’ as revealed in the cogito is that the marshaling (that I am) that encompasses a focal thought or comprehension does so only as a whole. In such a state no “parts” of the marshaling encompass the parts of the thought in the same sense. No portion of the discerned marshaling, that is, that constitutes intellectual awareness focused with a particular thought, is itself an intellectual awareness of anything at all. This is just the indivisibility of the subjective ‘I.’ One may think it is obvious that I am not several subjective ‘I’s, or several subjectivities, but exactly how is it obvious? If one means “obvious when I think about myself that I can’t be several,” then one is thinking of oneself impersonally (as an object of thought), and I showed from Kant’s Second Paralogism that it is not obvious (analytic) in that regard at all. If one means “obvious that when I look inside myself I can’t find several,” one is attempting to intuit oneself (to be an object of intuition to oneself), and again Kant shows that it is not obvious in that regard (not obvious what intuiting oneself is supposed to mean).

What is really meant, I suggest, is that I can’t go ahead and “divide” myself subjectively. I can’t, that is, separate a part of the state I presently am into being a *subsequent* whole or entire state that I am in: nor, reverse-wise, can I incorporate the whole state I presently am into being a part of a second state. I consider first this indivisibility with regard to a single thought. For this case, I consider specifically the impossibility in the second direction: viz, the impossibility of incorporating a first state as part into a second state. (The discussion applies equally well to dividing part of a first state into a second whole state.)

I am considering, then, the idea of incorporating an intellectual marshaling in regard to a word or a phrase into a second state of being intellectually marshaled in regard to a sentence containing the word or phrase. Suppose then that I hear you say “The sky” and then you are interrupted. After a pause you finish your sentence by continuing “is blue.” Isn’t my initial state of intellectual marshaling or comprehension (of the words “The sky”) incorporated in me as part of my subsequent state of marshaling or

comprehension (of the sentence “The sky is blue”)? If so, my latter intellectual subjectivity is composed of a part that, on its own (as shown by my previous state), is also an intellectual subjectivity, and so that marshaling (or the subjective ‘I’) is not indivisible. Let us compare, however, the clustering of other inchoate thoughts that are always involved in intellectual marshaling. On initially comprehending “The sky” there is unsettledness as to what also to think (unsettledness as to thinking it’s blue, it’s dreary, and unsettledness also as to thinking “The sun,” “The stars,” etc.) Recall that my intellectual subjectivity is not sheerly in hearing the words but comprehending them in regard to my intellectual capacity. It is the inchoate clustering of such further thought (in degrees or readiness to form) that constitutes my subjectivity (keeps me as something other than the thought itself). Once we recall this aspect of intellectual marshaling, the first state is no longer incorporable into being a part of the second state, as the encompassing thought-unsettledness alters. In the second state I am no longer discerning any unsettledness as to also thinking it’s blue, it’s dreary, etcetera; and a different distribution of inchoate thoughts instead becomes my subjectivity (thoughts of looking at the sky, being able to go on a picnic, etc.). I cannot, without this variation, enter into the second state, and so I am not able to incorporate my first state as a part of a second whole state. Looking at things from the second state backwards to the first, my thinking the whole thought (“The sky is blue”) is not composed of my thinking the part (“The sky”). Thus, as revealed in the transition of my *being* an intellectual subject, my subjectivity in regard to a whole thought is not composed of any subjectivity in regard to parts of the thought. This analysis also explains why, when transferring my subjectivity to a group of people, each “comprehending” a word I cannot think of *any subject at all* having the whole thought (with those subjectivities as parts).

Kant, recall, characterizes the simplicity of the self not only in terms of indivisibility but also as a qualitative unity. I believe these come to the same thing. My contention regarding indivisibility implies that the awareness of (the subjective marshaling in regard to) the parts in the whole is not the awareness (there is) of the parts in isolation. The awareness of the whole of the parts, that is, is subjectively unified.

Nothing in the analysis that I have just given implies that beyond what is revealed in the subjective transition there isn’t an incorporation of a subject (entity) into a pair of subjects (entities). If one is a dualist like Kant, for whom only the noumenal underlies the subjective, it is consistent with my analysis that the “monad,” say, that is the source of the first intellectual marshaling action (the “The sky” comprehending monad) adjusts harmoniously in its inchoate clustering of thoughts with a second monad (the “is blue” comprehending monad) so that the whole second state is the harmonious actions of two monads. As these actions adjust without any influence, they are each “internal” accidents of monads, showing again that the rational psychologist’s characterization of thoughts as internal accidents

in the second paragraph is irrelevant to the unity or indivisibility of action revealed in the cogito. This again is a case of Kant's general point against the rational psychologist that when I think of myself as an object (entity) the indivisibility of the 'I' collapses. Likewise, if one is a materialist, it may be that the underlying source that acts to yield my first state adjusts in its action to a second different source (even located somewhere else in the brain) so that it is both sources acting together which underly or constitute my second whole state.

Let us turn now to the different case of the indivisibility of being a subject of *more than one* thought. For this case I'll consider the impossibility of separating out part of an initial such state into a second whole state of having just one of the thoughts. (The discussion applies equally well reverse-wise to incorporating a first state as part into a second state.) Suppose that as you tell me the sky is blue, my attention is caught by and focuses on someone I know entering the room. I am talking here of intellectual consciousness so that I am peripherally comprehending your statement while focally comprehending who it is that entered. This will be our initial state of more than one thought. Here there is surely a complexity to my intellectual marshaling, but it is one that I will argue is such that neither of its parts is divisible into a second whole state. In the initial state there is a focal thought about which other inchoate thoughts coalesce (I am glad to see him come in the room, etc.) and a peripheral thought with its own cluster of different inchoate thoughts. Let us now try to divide this complexity by focusing just on the thought of what you said. This might happen if, as I was peripherally comprehending you, your statement turned out to be surprising or strange to me. The subsequent state then is one of just comprehending your statement (a single focal thought). I may presume the thought with its surrounding inchoate cluster is exactly what was part of the first state. Nevertheless this second state was not part of the first because I (in my subjectivity) am now concentrated (focused intensely) on the thought, and this is a subjectively discernible difference in my marshaling that is inseparable from being in that second state (there can't be a thought with its inchoate encompassing that lacked degree of focus-periphery). I can make the point as follows: Content-wise my subsequent whole state was part of my first state, but subjective comprehension (intellectual consciousness) is not a matter of sheer content. Hence my subsequent subjective comprehension (intellectual marshaling) was not part of my first state (my original intellectual marshaling). To divide my first state I would have to enter a second state where there is only the comprehension of what you said (no other comprehension), and yet this comprehension was still (as in the first state) discernibly peripheral and distracted, which is impossible. We can say that intellectual marshaling involves thoughts but with various degrees of intensity according to the degree of concentration (intellectual focus). Hence, in the second state my comprehension of what you say (together

with the inchoate thoughts coalescing about it) has a greater degree of intensity than in my first state. It is this factor of degree of intensity that “makes” the marshaling conscious (one that is felt or discerned) and precludes, as I have shown, dividing the state.

In light of this discussion, we can characterize intellectual marshaling action in regard to thoughts as follows. There is always a structure of clustering or coalescing of inchoate thoughts about any thought in “peak” condition (of being fully formed as a specific comprehension). There may be one or several such clusters depending on whether my marshaling is in regard to having a single thought or several different thoughts. It is such a structure to the marshaling that gives a distinction between the thoughts and the subject that is settled on them, holding them, etcetera. Although such clusters can “divide” and enter into subsequent marshalings, they can only do so by altering their degree or intensity (how strong the settling is, how intense the hold is).

As the subject’s being an intellectually *conscious being* is inseparable from the degree or intensity of settling, the conscious subject cannot, according to this mode of action, be divided. In this characterization of the action of intellectual marshaling, no one case of such marshaling can be part of any other such case.

I can give a model of such action as follows. Suppose that an intellectual marshaling is a traveling wave pattern (however long it lasts) with one or more nonoverlapping pulses to the pattern (depending on how many thoughts). The orientation of a transversal pulse relative to the direction of travel represents which thought (as to content) is being had. The peak height of a pulse corresponds to the degree of focus on the thought. The shape of a pulse represents the inchoate thoughts coalescing about a thought as follows. The full range of possible thoughts has a metric as to content so that thoughts closer in content are closer in distance. Each inchoate thought then is at a certain distance from the peak of the pulse thought it coalesces about, and the height of the pulse at that distance is determined by the degree of readiness of the inchoate thought. These two factors determine the shape of a pulse. When a focus shifts, for example, from peripheral to concentrated, the pulse representing that thought increases in amplitude, and when the inchoate thoughts about a thought shift in content or degree of readiness, the shape of the pulse representing the thought shifts. These characterizations define the possible equilibrium states allowable to the underlying dynamical system which induces the waves, and being intellectually conscious in regard to particular thoughts is modeled as being in one of these equilibrium states. If I add now that no pulse can remain the same in all its dimensions when any other pulse is altered or added or subtracted, then I have a system which is indivisible in its resulting wave patterns, representing the indivisibility of intellectual marshaling. If I take the frequency of all these wave patterns to be the same, then in effect I am modifying Crick’s background oscillation frequency by requiring some wave pattern

to be traveling at that frequency (the frequency then represents being conscious as opposed to unconscious, and the wave pattern represents what “state” of consciousness it is—though note, each such state is a state of a *subject* consciously thinking so-and-so).

Clearly my discussion in this subsection goes well beyond what Kant says. First, Kant doesn’t explicate indivisibility by talking of the impossibility of dividing a part of a state into a whole *subsequent* state. Note however that my way of explicating the idea does follow Kant in a methodological sense. Recall he says in the Second Paralogism,

... if I wish to represent myself as a thinking being, I must put myself in his place, and thus substitute, as it were, my own subject for the object I am seeking to consider. (A353)

What I have done is to apply this personal mode of thinking, only not from our subjective state to that of another subject, but from our own subjective state to a purported subsequent state of ourselves. I have explicated indivisibility, that is, by trying to put ourselves in the place of a subsequent subjective state, rather than thinking about or intuiting the state we are in.

Second, Kant doesn’t talk of having thoughts focally or peripherally, of inchoate thoughts with degrees of readiness clustering about, and he certainly wouldn’t accept the spatial aspect of my modeling. Leaving that model aside, Kant does explicitly hold, at least, that our simple subjectivity is an intensive dynamical action. In the Anticipations of Perception, he says there can be a graduated transition in consciousness down to degree zero (B208), suggesting that consciousness is some sort of intensive action. In the Anticipations he is concerned with perceptual consciousness (not intellectual consciousness *per se*), but in the Refutation of Mendelssohn’s Proof in the B edition Paralogisms, he explicitly connects intellectual consciousness to degree of intensity. He says (B414),

... we cannot deny to it [the soul], any more than to any other existence intensive quantity, that is, a degree of reality *in respect of all its faculties*. (italics mine)

He goes on to say,

For consciousness itself has always a degree, which always allows of diminution, and the same must hold also of the faculty of being conscious of the self [viz, intellectual or thinking consciousness]. (B415)

In the footnote to this paragraph he connects degree of consciousness to clear versus obscure representations, which is at least akin to my distinction between focal and peripheral comprehension and also seems to involve what other thoughts go with a thought and to what degree (in how clear a thought

is). In these remarks Kant is talking of the soul having these capacities, but that is for the sake of refuting Mendelssohn. If I remove this aspect, then Kant is saying here that the thinking 'I' is an intensive dynamic action. Thus, my discussion in this section, apart from the spatiality of my model, has been within Kantian parameters both methodologically and ontologically.

I turn now to a purported exception to the indivisibility of the subjective 'I.' Thomas Nagel² discusses cases of patients whose corpus callosum connecting the left and right hemispheres of their brain has been cut. The left hemisphere is the seat of language use. When the experimenter arranges input so as to preclude compensatory exchange of information between hemispheres, the patient can behave quite intelligently in certain ways controlled by the right hemisphere, though he insists that he is not doing so. In my terminology, his intellectual marshaling seems bifurcated or divided, as if there were two subjective 'I's. Compare such cases to David Armstrong's case of a person focused on his thoughts (say, as an inner monologue) while driving intelligently for many miles. In the Armstrong case my intellectual marshaling is concentrated intensely on my thoughts and only very peripherally on comprehending the road (what to do, how to turn, etc.). This is just like the state described above of my hearing what you say peripherally while I am focused on who is coming into the room; only the Armstrong case lasts a long time. This, by itself, is not a case of divided consciousness. When asked what he is doing, the driver can easily refocus on his driving and so verbally report that he is driving on the highway. The only difference from the patient in the experimental situation seems to be simply that he can't thus refocus in a way so as to be able to report what he is doing. But why think inability to refocus enough for verbal report (the inability to enter into that subsequent state) implies that in the original first state there was a divided intellectual consciousness? According to the discussion of the present subsection the real issue for divisibility is whether subtracting the unreportable comprehension leaves the reportable component intact or alters it in a discernible (even if not reportable) way. In the Armstrong case, an end to the driving (parking at one's destination, say) would not, I believe, leave one's being focused on an internal monologue exactly as it was even if one continued driving. All I am suggesting is that there may very well not be a divisible subjectivity in the experimental arrangement, and if there is, it is not evidenced simply by the inability to report (even if asked) on some of what the patient is comprehendingly marshaled for. I return to this case at the end of the next chapter, after considering the relation between reporting and (full) self-consciousness. How other more extreme, but fanciful, cases (fission cases) relate to divisibility and to personal identity over time is discussed in Part IV, Chapter 10.

5 Transcendental Self-Consciousness

So far I have been considering Kant's account of being a thinking subject. I now turn to what it is for me to be conscious of the thinking subject I am. Kant says in footnote (a) to A118 that transcendental consciousness is

the consciousness of myself as original apperception [which] precedes all special experience.

It is the consciousness of myself, then, purely as intellectual subject or subject of thinking, apart from what I am thinking of (apart, that is, from thinking any manifold of inner or outer sense). The term 'transcendental' in this context is not an ontological term but merely signifies that such self-consciousness plays a role in establishing a priori knowledge (B135). Indeed the justification of the categories is supposed to be that they are conditions of bringing experience to such consciousness. In this chapter, I am not interested in the transcendental role of intellectual self-consciousness but with its ontological status.

I have argued so far that being a thinking subject is just an intellectual marshaling action (not being an entity or a substance) and that this is central to the consistency of the thinking self with the ideality of time. If so, then consciousness of myself as a thinking subject must be some sort of "reflectivity" within intellectual marshaling, not involving in any way an intuition or thought of myself as an entity. The burden of this chapter is to show that transcendental self-consciousness exists fully within intellectual marshaling action.¹

Although self-consciousness has something to do with the semantic ability to make first-person reports (see B132), I want to argue that defining it or reducing it somehow to that semantic ability is neither Kantian nor correct. First, however, a point of clarification about first-person reports. The report 'I think that the sky is blue' is not precisely an expression of mere self-consciousness, because it indicates something of an endorsement. A better expression would be 'I am thinking of the sky's being blue.' Thus if I were thinking of unicorns being green and reporting that I wouldn't say that I think that unicorns are green (which I don't) but, rather, that I

am thinking of unicorns being green. In what follows I always understand reports in the latter way as merely indicative of what I am thinking.

Simply uttering 'I am thinking so-and-so', even if true, is not sufficient for self-consciousness, as I may utter it without meaning it or comprehending what I am saying. This applies as well even if the utterance is silent or to myself. Without the understanding, my utterance doesn't even express that I am a thinking being let alone a self-conscious one. If I add now the semantic understanding of the utterance (so that I have the thought that I am thinking so-and-so), it is still the case that you as well have the same thought in regard to my utterance because semantic understanding is public. Clearly, however, your understanding of my report doesn't express your self-consciousness but, rather, a thought of my self-consciousness. Hence, my self-consciousness is an object of your thought. But then my own understanding of my report (as it is the same as yours) must express my self-consciousness in just the same way, and so my self-consciousness would be an object of thought for me as well. But this is exactly the kind of impersonal thinking of an instance of a subject of thought in general (as an object) that Kant rejected in the Second Paralogism. For Kant, I am not a thinking subject, or conscious of myself as such, by being for myself one instance among others. Rather I am self-conscious and represent others as such only by transferring or projecting myself onto others.

Any disparity between you and me over knowing who the self-conscious subject is would also be irrelevant for Kant, because in his view neither you nor I are intuitively aware of that subject. Furthermore, that would only be a disparity in who is self-conscious, so that self-consciousness would still be a general concept (object of thought) even if asymmetrically applicable. For Kant, just as the thinking subject pertains to my being (that I am) not to a thought or intuition, so too self-consciousness pertains to "what goes on" in my being.

Not only is a semantic analysis of self-consciousness foreign to Kant, but it seems wrong in itself. To see this consider the following example, where all the semantic conditions of understanding the report are met, but the subject is not self-conscious (conscious of itself as a subject of thought). I have been given a posthypnotic suggestion to say 'I am thinking of the sky's being blue' when a bell rings. After I leave the hypnotic state, the hypnotist talks to me about the sky being blue. I understand him, and so I am thinking or having the thought of the sky's being blue. As this is happening, he rings a bell, and I duly say 'I am thinking of the sky's being blue.' The utterance is true of me as I am having the thought of the sky's being blue, I understand semantically what I am saying (I have the thought of what I am saying as I say it), and yet it is not an expression of being conscious of myself as the subject of the thought I was having. The reason is my report is "dissociated" in its subjective being from the thought reported on. We need some sort of further real connection between the thought and the report.

In my example, the thought of the sky's being blue (as I listen to the hypnotist talk about it) doesn't cause the report—the ringing bell does. But if having that thought is not sufficient for self-consciousness, why would adding an effect (the report and the semantic comprehension of it) make it self-conscious? Like the person in the example, I would just be the subject of two semantically related thoughts, only now these thoughts would be causally related.

Additionally, in my example, the person fails to apply his semantic understanding of such reports to the thought of the sky's being blue that makes the report true. It just so happens by coincidence that he understands the truth condition, and the condition obtains. So suppose I make the report by focusing on, noticing, or otherwise mentally “pointing” to my having the thought of the sky's being blue. This is surely un-Kantian because it either makes myself an object of noticing or intuiting (thus confusing apperception with inner sense), or it makes myself an object of immediate intellectual discernment (thus giving me an intellectual intuition). This suggestion indeed is just the subject–object model of self-consciousness, according to which to be conscious of myself as a thinking subject is to make myself (intuitively or otherwise) an object to myself. Although surely un-Kantian, what exactly is wrong with such a model? How can we make it subjectively apparent that this is not our being or reality when we are self-conscious?

One answer, I suggest, comes from my discussion of indivisibility in Chapter 4. Although intellectual consciousness can be in part peripheral, self-consciousness is always focal. I can't be peripherally self-conscious of what I am thinking, nor can I be self-conscious of what I am peripherally thinking. If so, then on the subject–object model I would have to be concentrated focally on two distinct thoughts (the thought of the sky's being blue and the reporting thought which directs me to notice or otherwise discern the first thought). But then, contrary to Chapter 4, the state of thinking focally of the sky's being blue could transition into a part of the self-conscious state, and my subjectivity would not be indivisible. The subject–object model then is inconsistent with the indivisibility of my subjective being.

How then are we to understand the real (more than semantic content) connection between thought and the report of the thought without dividing our subjective being? How, that is, can consciousness of myself be an indivisible subjective state?

Suppose I am thinking to myself of the sky's being blue but that the thought is not quite brought to formation as a silent verbal utterance. My thinking is part of a train of thought about blue things; a train that left to its own skips from the thought of one blue thing to another without any thought forming verbally. Now suppose you interrupt my concentration by asking “What are you thinking?” My answer to you (the report ‘I am thinking of the sky's being blue’) requires that my concentrating backs off away from the thinking (because the answering is directed out towards you), but it also remains with the thinking (to *formulate* the unformed thought for

the answer). The act of answering, so to speak, takes me back away from the thinking (to take a wider vantage point onto you), and the forming of the answer keeps me towards remaining with the thinking. It is not that I am settled or concentrated or focused on opposing *thoughts* (the thought to answer and the thought of what the answer is). Rather there is a certain dynamical shearing or tension that “couples” my subjectivity so that it is only focused on answering (making the report) *by* being focused on what the answer is. My settling, then, has me being back off away from formulating the thought but also being with formulating the thought. Now in this process the main thrust is to give an answer. The forming of the thought is in service to this giving of an answer or is encompassed overall within it. Predominantly then, or overall, I am not with forming the thought but back away from it (with answering). My subjectivity then is predominantly in being back away from the thought but nevertheless encompassing (in its service) still *being subjectively with* forming the thought. Note that what is encompassed is not the thought (of the sky’s being blue), as it is not yet formed, but being a source of (forming) the thought which (in line with my interpretation of the First Paralogism) is being the subject of the thought. Hence my subjectivity encompasses within it my being the subject of the thought, and this I claim constitutes being conscious of oneself as a thinking subject. Transcendental self-consciousness, in this way, is a dynamical structuring within intellectual marshaling in coming to make the report.

Although Kant never gives this or any other detailed account of awareness of myself as intellectual subject, certain things he says at least point to it. He says,

Now since I do not have another self-intuition which gives the determining [that is expressed by the ‘I think’] in me (I am conscious only of the spontaneity of it), . . . I cannot determine my existence as that of a self-active being; *all that I can do is to represent to myself the spontaneity of my thought*. . . . (footnote (a) to B158, p. 169, italics mine; see also B278)

In my account, what is “represented” to myself in self-consciousness is not the formed thought (the sky is blue) but the forming of the thought; viz, what is “represented” is the spontaneity in producing or being a source of the formed thought (for reporting). In another somewhat cryptic passage Kant says of pure apperception,

it is that self-consciousness which while *generating* the representation ‘I think’ . . . cannot itself be accompanied by any further representation. (B132, italics mine)

Note that Kant doesn’t say the ‘I think’ describes or represents self-consciousness. He says it is generated by it. In my account, self-consciousness

exists precisely in the dynamics of generating or producing the report. Once the report is made, what is described or represented is simply the specific thought that comprehends the report, which is no different than being a subject having any other focal thought (not specifically self-conscious).

My account is distinct from the subject–object account in that there is no discerning, whether intuitive or intellectual, of any accomplished object thought (of the sky’s being blue). There is only subjectively being with the accomplishing of the thought encompassed by being “back off” from the accomplishing in being with the overall answering (reporting) project.

Furthermore, unlike the subject–object account, my account preserves the indivisibility of the subjective ‘I.’ The complex self-conscious state cannot be entered into from a partial component of it. Suppose I am just formulating my thought (as of the sky’s being blue) without any project of reporting it—just to formulate it for myself to get clear about it, etcetera. It is not this state of formulating the thought that is part of the more complex self-conscious state, because the formulating in that complex state is qualitatively different in the inseparable dynamic shearing or straining to keep to that formulating in the face of the overall predominant backing off. In my analysis there are not two focal, and so separable, thoughts but a single focal concentrating with two components dynamically coupled.

Although I presented my example with an initial interrogator asking “What are you thinking?” and a final public report to them “I am thinking of the sky’s being blue,” my analysis works just the same without the external input or output. Thus, suppose that within my train of semi-formed thoughts of blue things, I stop to silently report what I am thinking, either by asking the question of myself, or by somehow just finding myself reporting. Note the report is still other-directed, even though only I will “hear” it, because a report by its very nature is for whoever might hear it. The forming of the content of the report (“The sky is blue”) together with the encompassing by being other-directed contains all the elements of self-consciousness according to my analysis.

It is instructive I believe to compare my account to a different case that does not involve verbalization. It is fairly common to claim that primates are self-conscious based on how they behave in front of mirrors. Suppose a primate is standing in front of a mirror and that he goes through several actions or gestures as he looks to see what happens in the mirror. Having learned or noticed a connection, he then slowly and in an exaggerated manner lifts his hand towards his head, but before finishing he quickly brings his hand back down to the side. He is now producing behavior in order to reflect or project it away into the mirror. This is analogous to my case, where we are verbally formulating a thought to project or “reflect” it away onto a report.

The primate’s focus on producing action or gestures is encompassed within his predominant focus on producing a reflection. That predominant focus is away from or back off from the focus on action but still encompasses it or surrounds it (he has to widen the scope of his attention to reach

out towards the mirror). It is the focus then within which the focus on forming his action occurs. All this again is analogous to my case. Of course, the primate's subjectivity, or the primate's being a subject of acting, is not a marshaling of "intellectual" resources, but a marshaling of intelligent action resources. In an intellectual marshaling, recall, there is both the particular thought and its emergence from further proclivities for thoughts which coalesce about it and hold it, so that our intellectual subjectivity (the marshaling) is not swallowed up by the particular thought. This provides the being of a subject of thought within the marshaling. So too, the primate's marshaling of action resources in intelligently producing behavior contains certain proclivities with degrees of readiness for other behavior. It is from these proclivities that producing particular behavior emerges and it is such proclivities which coalesce about and hold on to (or remove) that behaving. Within the marshaling, then, there is the distinction between being the subject and the producing of behavior that belongs to it. We can presume as well that marshaling of action resources includes in an integrated way marshaling of perceptual and other resources for gearing one's behavior in the light of one's desires. The latter are exactly the resources marshaled in the primate for attending to the mirror to see if he is successfully producing a reflection. We may now say that the primate's overall predominant subjectivity (marshaling of action resources for producing a reflection) encompasses within it a subjectivity (marshaling of resources) for producing or forming the behavior of lifting his hand toward his head, etcetera. Thus the primate is conscious of being the subject of acting (of being with the forming of the act of lifting its hand toward its head). The primate, that is, is acting self-consciously. Of course the primate, not being an intellect, isn't conscious of being an intellectual subject, but it is conscious of being the *subject* of acting that it is.

Note that the primate is not behaving self-consciously by "reflecting" on or otherwise noticing its behavior as it happens (as an ongoing and then accomplished occurrence). Rather it is self-conscious in the overall "reflecting" of its forming of the behavior onto the mirror. Similarly, we are thinking self-consciously not by reflecting on our thinking (not by noticing, either intuitively or conceptually, our thinking of the sky's being blue). Rather we are self-conscious in the overall process of "reflecting" that thought ("mirroring" it onto the verbal report): a process that involves forming or formulating the thought of the sky's being blue, not noticing it as an occurrence happening. Self-consciousness then involves a "representation of spontaneity," not an inner noticing, which is at the heart of Kant's distinction between apperception and inner sense. The somewhat standard idea that self-conscious thinking is reflective thinking is true but not in the subject-object sense of one thought reflecting on (noticing, semantically pertaining to, etc.) another.

Sartre, in *Being and Nothingness*, characterizes self-consciousness as follows—

It is not the appearance of a new consciousness directed on the for-itself, but an intra-structural modification which the for-itself realizes in itself. . . .²

If we take Sartre's "for-itself" to signify our notion of subjectivity, then in our account, self-consciousness is indeed an *intra*structural modification, which subjectivity realizes within itself, because our overall or predominant subjectivity (producing a report) is or realizes within itself the structure of encompassing a subjectivity (verbally forming the thought). The passage from Sartre continues,

. . . in a word it [self-consciousness] is the for-itself which makes itself exist in the mode reflective-reflected on.

The intrastructural modification thus is characterized by Sartre as "reflective-reflected on." By this, however, Sartre doesn't mean that the "for-itself" notices itself or takes a point of view on itself. He says,

the consciousness reflected-on is not presented *yet* as something outside reflection—that is, as a being on which one can take a point of view in relation to which one can realize a withdrawal.³ (*italics mine*)

In our account, in self-consciousness the "reflected-on" (*viz*, the thought of the sky's being blue) is not *yet* an accomplished verbally formed thought that we notice or discern and so can separate (*withdraw*) our being or subjectivity from. Rather the "reflected-on" is the forming or formulating of the thought; *viz*, what is encompassed is subjectivity (*being-the-source-of* the thought). Finally Sartre says,

Reflection . . . is a stage intermediate between the pure and simple existence of the for-itself and existence for-others.⁴

In our account, self-consciousness exists not in just forming a thought (pure and "simple" subjectivity) nor in an accomplished report to others ('I am thinking of the sky's being blue') but in the reflecting of the forming onto the report. Note this intermediate stage is not a silent report (which is already, even if silently, existing "for-others") but the forming of the report (the process intermediate between the pure "for-itself" existence and existence for others). If my account (and Sartre's) is correct, then Dieter Henrich is mistaken when he says,

Thus, it is necessary to assume both of these: that self-consciousness is internally complex, and that the complex structure cannot be . . . understood in its internal constitution.⁵

Let us return now to Kant's contention at B132 that apperception is self-consciousness that *generates* (*hervorbringt*) the representation 'I think.' If this is a claim about the kind of judgment 'I think' is (viz, one that must be generated in a certain way for its sense), then I believe we can connect Kant's understanding of judgments of self-consciousness to his later distinction in the Introduction to the *Critique of Judgment* between determinant versus reflective judgments. In my account, the truth-conditions of the judgment or report "I am (self-consciously) thinking of the sky's being blue" are not that it corresponds to any intuited or conceptualized object or state (not even a purely inner one) but, rather, that it is generated in the right way (as a reflecting into a report of the forming of my thought of the sky's being blue). In this regard the judgment is not one that applies a universal or general concept (being a subject thinking a thought) to an instance (to my state as a particular case). The judgment, that is, does not go from the universal to the particular (which is Kant's characterization of determinant judgment). Rather, the judgment exists or has its sense in how it is generated by the mind, and only as such does it then have any general or universal sense in being generally make-able. The judgment, that is, goes from the particular to the universal (which is Kant's characterization of the reflective judgment).

Consider for a moment the aesthetic judgment of beauty. For Kant this isn't determinant of how an object, say a painting, is. Rather for Kant the outer observing of the painting involves a dynamic harmony of our faculties (the imagination being apt, but not quite determinately, for the understanding) which, discerned (as pleasure), produces the judgment. The judgment is then a universally make-able one (has then a universal sense) in that I demand that others do or can produce it that way, the way I do. Similarly, in a judgment of self-consciousness (an 'I think' report) the judgment isn't determinant of how an inner object or state (the having of a thought) is. Rather the having of a specific thought involves a dynamic formulating for a report which produces (is) the judgment. The judgment is then a universally make-able one (has then a universal sense) by the "demand" that such a report be producible only that way, in the way I produce it (which way I project onto you in understanding your report). The difference is that the subjective "reflecting" in the aesthetic judgment is upon, or pertains to, an outer observing, whereas in the 'I think' report the "reflecting" is upon, or pertains to, being in a subjective state of thinking a verbally unformed thought.

Although my analogy between judgments of beauty and judgments of self-consciousness is by no means perfect, it does serve to highlight that for Kant there are judgments (reflective judgments) having perfectly universal or public sense that don't require some intuitable or conceptualizable object as their truth-conditions. Kant's claim then that we are not objects of intuition or thought (judgment) to ourselves does not imply there are no 'I think' judgments (reports of self-consciousness). Nothing in all this should be taken to imply that we can't make general or abstract

judgments about self-conscious subjects as objects of the judgments (as the philosopher does when he characterizes states of self-consciousness), only that any instances (singular judgments of self-consciousness as in ‘I reports’) are nondeterminant.

Kant’s conception of reflective judgment is also helpful in relation to his contention in the Paralogisms that my conception of others as subjects is constituted by transferring or “substituting” my own subject for them. Even if all concepts, including the concept of being a thinking subject, must have a range of (potentially multiple) instances⁶ this doesn’t imply that all concepts go from the general to the particular (as with Kant’s determinant judgments). Other instances of a thinking subject may be whatever I substitute my own subject for or project onto (a reflective judgment). Indeed for Kant the rational psychologist, who thinks impersonally or “problematically” about the cogito, in effect makes determinant judgments about instances of thinking subjects (of which I am one among many), and thus thinks of the subject as an object (instance), rather than as the subject (of all thoughts (even the thought of a subject)).

It should be obvious from my discussion that not all thinking consciousness is self-consciousness, because it is not true that whenever I am thinking, I am generating a report, even a silent report, even if my thinking is verbal. Kant says at B132,

As my representations (even if I am not conscious of them as such . . . [it must be only that] they can stand together in . . . self-consciousness.

I think Kant is saying here that if a former representation is anything to me now, I must be capable of now having it self-consciously (as in generating a report). In other words, he is saying that I could have thought of the sky’s being blue non-self-consciously, but it signifies anything to the subject I am now only if I *could* now think it self-consciously (could now think of the sky’s being blue in generating the report ‘I thought of the sky’s being blue’). We’ll consider why Kant holds this in Part IV. For now what is important for us is that it implies that being a subject of a thought doesn’t require being then or ever after self-conscious of that thought. There is this same implication when in talking of “consciousness of myself as original apperception” Kant says,

Whether this consciousness *ever actually occurs* does not here concern us. But the possibility of the logical form of all knowledge is necessarily conditioned [by] relation to this apperception [self-consciousness] *as a faculty* [as a capability]. (italics mine, footnote (a) to A117)

With this in mind let us return to the cases Nagel discusses of patients whose corpus callosum has been cut. A patient’s inability to report, even when prompted by the experimenter, shows at most that his thoughtful or

comprehending marshaling to behave is not then and cannot then be made self-conscious. It doesn't imply that his overall marshaling is divisible, only that it isn't overall self-conscious and can't then be refocused so as to become self-conscious in regard to his intelligent behavior. Furthermore, he might later come to believe the experimenter who tells him he was so behaving, and so later the patient reports "I was successfully behaving so-and-so." That he only self-consciously attributes his having thus behaved to himself on indirect evidence doesn't mean he is not fully self-consciously thinking of his having so behaved. In Kant's terminology, his previous behavioral representations (thoughts) now stand within his self-consciousness. As far as mere failure of reportability at the time shows, not only can the patient's thoughts of behaving be his (part of his indivisible subjectivity) but they are retainable as part of his own identity in thinking back.

6 Other Interpretations of the Paralogisms

In my interpretation, the fundamental issue of the Paralogisms is an ontological one. We are not self-subsistent simple entities or substances. Rather we are actions of intellectual marshaling within which there indivisibly exists the subject (that to which a thought belongs) as well as his thought (with the thought emerging from the subject, the subject converging or coalescing about the thought, holding onto it, or leaving it). I have claimed that for Kant this is the positive conclusion that is revealed in the cogito. Any substantial reality we are is noumenal (in the negative sense) and no part of the positive conclusion of the Paralogisms, as it is no part of what is revealed in the cogito. I argued in Chapter 2 that this ontological claim is crucial for the consistency of the ‘I think’ with Kant’s doctrine of the ideality of space and time. If we were indeed self-subsistent entities to which thoughts belong, we as thinking subjects would have to be atemporal noumenal beings since time exists only in (intellectual accompanying and unifying) pure intuition. An entity with its own intrinsic nature beyond such action could only be temporal by being itself intuited within such action (which we aren’t for Kant) or by being in a time that corresponds to, and so is other than, pure intuition. The latter time simply doesn’t exist for Kant, and so the entity would have to be atemporal. In my interpretation the Paralogisms precisely make clear how the thinking subject whose intuiting constitutes time is not an atemporal noumenal entity. It makes clear, that is, that the subject which is the source of time and to which everything appears is not noumenal. Nor, however, is the subject appearance, as it is not intuited. It is, rather that intellectual action that accompanies or conceptually unifies intuiting (analogous to intellectual action accompanying counting), temporal only in that it shifts with the progression of pure intuition. The thinking subject then is neither appearance (intuited) nor thing in itself (atemporal). That it has such a third ontological status is stated by Kant as shown in footnote (a) to B423 where the ‘I think’

signifies only something real that is given . . . not as appearance, nor as thing in itself (noumenon) but as something that *actually exists*, and

which in the proposition “I think” is denoted as such. (*italics mine*; see also B157)

I believe that in part it is ignoring, or at least failing to come to grips with, this third ontological status that leads to all the interpretations according to which the positive doctrine of the Paralogisms is that the thinking subject is somehow not fully and concretely real at all.

These interpretations can be grouped as follows: first what can be called the Logical-Formal-Abstract interpretations; second the Intentionalist-Representationalist interpretations; and third the Functionalist-Sub-Personal interpretations. All three interpretations in somewhat different ways contrast with the view that the thinking subject as revealed in the cogito is ontologically real. I discuss these interpretations in turn. My aim in this chapter is not to give a survey of commentators who have held these interpretations nor to do justice to all the perceptive ways these interpretations have been developed. My aim is simply to argue that these interpretations, though interesting in their own right and not without *prima facie* textual support, nevertheless all are going down the wrong path in locating Kant's positive doctrine of the thinking subject in the Paralogisms as something that contrasts with the subject's being flat-out real. I argue in Part IV that these interpretations are particularly obfuscating in regard to Kant's account of persons in the Third Paralogism.

(I) LOGICAL-FORMAL-ABSTRACT INTERPRETATIONS

I begin with the interpretation that Kant's positive claim in the Paralogisms is that the ‘I’ is a simple subject only in a logical sense. Thiel says,

An analytic truth about the I as subject of thoughts is illicitly used to extend our synthetic knowledge about the I as an object.¹

The implication seems to be that what is true for Kant is that the ‘I’ being a subject is a merely logical (analytic) truth as opposed to its being a real subject. Rosefeldt holds Kant's positive view to be that the ‘I’ is always the subject *term* of judgments I make and the same subject *term* in all such judgments but that it is a singular “referring” term only in this “logical” sense.²

If this were Kant's positive doctrine then the mistake of the rational psychologist would be what Graham Bird holds it to be—

The primary objection to the paralogistic argument rests on the belief that merely from the logical or grammatical point that a logical subject of judging cannot be a predicate, we cannot infer that such a subject is a real substance.³

Kant's positive point then would be that the 'I' considered logically or as an object of mere thought in general is a subject (perhaps always subject), simple, etcetera and that this is the whole truth about it. This account can seem irresistible in the light of what Kant says, for example, at B409,

The logical exposition of thought in general has been mistaken for a metaphysical determination of the object.

I return to this and other such passages in subsection (ii). For now, I want to argue that this interpretation cannot be sustained.

As against this interpretation note first that in the Second Paralogism Kant denies that simplicity applies to the subject of thinking *at all* when we think of it generally (as an object of thought).⁴ He says,

The proposition "A thought can only be the effect of the absolute unity of the thinking being" cannot be treated as analytic. (A353)

It is only as revealed subjectively in the cogito that there is *any* conclusion to simplicity. For Kant the simplicity of the 'I' is not derivable directly (independently of the cogito) by thinking of subjects of thought generally, and so it is not an analytic or logical truth in this straightforward way. Nor can a merely logical truth be derived with the help of the cogito. This would be to take what is revealed in the cogito (say, simplicity or indivisibility) as merely an instance of a general truth for all thinking subjects. But this generalization, which the rational psychologist makes, is a mistake for Kant. To take the cogito as a mere instance is to try to think of myself in the cogito merely as one case of a general concept of a thinking subject. It is, so to speak, to think impersonally about myself in the cogito. Kant says of the 'I think' (the cogito), which is "the sole ground to which rational psychology can appeal" that

We have no right to transform it into a . . . *concept* of a thinking being in general. For we are not in a position to represent such being to ourselves save by putting ourselves, with the formula of our consciousness, in the place of every other intelligent being. (A354)

Rather than my being merely an instance, I represent other intelligent beings by transferring my own subject (what is revealed in the cogito) onto them. As that is my only representation of other beings, one could say it is a "logical" truth that I must represent all subjects as simple, but this is not a sense of logically true that contrasts with the simplicity or indivisibility being something real (as revealed in the cogito).

In regard to the First Paralogism, what is revealed in the cogito is that I am always subject of thoughts and not (insofar as it can be revealed in the cogito) ever a determination of anything else. From this, of course,

I cannot determine that I am a self-subsistent entity, as there may be a noumenal ground of my being as subject of thoughts of which I am then a determination. It remains, however, that the 'I' for Kant is always subject of any non-noumenal judgments I can make, and so I can call myself substance (subject and never predicate of such judgments) but only in this logical sense, as I may be noumenally determined. That I am only a *substance* in this logical sense, however, doesn't imply that I am only a subject of thoughts in a logical sense, for in the cogito Kant says, "I am the *being itself*" (B429). Once again the sense in which it is a "logical" truth that I am a substance is not a sense that contrasts with my being a real subject as revealed in the cogito.

In neither of the first two Paralogisms, then, is Kant's positive doctrine that I am only a simple subject of thought in merely a logical sense that contrasts with being a simple subject (a unified, indivisible subjectivity) in a real sense. Roughly, the logical interpretation confuses merely logical with Kant's sense of logical (which doesn't exclude being real) and neglects the cogito and what is revealed as real in it.

I turn next to the interpretation that Kant's positive doctrine in the Paralogisms is that the 'I' is a simple subject only in a formal sense. Graham Bird says,

Kant is not talking here of some occurrence in experience . . . any more than he is in the Deduction's account of transcendental apperception. Rather he is here repeating the formal, abstract, transcendental reference in his own philosophy to a certain fundamental condition for experience, and trying to show it would only be a misconception of that account to construe it as a foundation for substantial knowledge in psychology.⁵

In this view the 'I think' and its simplicity are merely formal conditions of representation, thought, experience, etcetera; not real occurrences. Now it may be in the Deduction that Kant is mainly concerned with formal conditions of representation, but that doesn't mean the simple subject of thinking, as such a condition, is not also real. I return to this point in Part III. For now, Kant does characterize his positive view in the Paralogisms in terms of formality. He says at A361 that the rational psychologist cannot extend our knowledge to the merely conceptual (the intelligible) "by means of the merely subjective form of all our concepts, consciousness."

It seems clear, however, that this sense of subjective form equated with consciousness is not a sense that contrasts with being real. If anything, it is closer to Descartes's sense of the formal being the actual reality of a thinking in contrast to the representative reality within a thought. Further, what is revealed in the cogito is not an abstract condition of experience but my being as a subject. Kant does say the proposition 'I think' is a formal one, but he goes on to clarify it as "the formula of our consciousness" (A354).

I believe Kant has in mind by “form” here the Aristotelian idea of what is constant and invariable (and real) in all specimens of a kind. What Kant is saying is that what is revealed in the cogito is what is constant or invariable (and real) in all intellectual consciousness (constant because “we are not in a position to represent such [thinking] being to ourselves save by putting ourselves with the formula of our consciousness, in the place of every other intelligent being”). The “form” (vehicle) of all our concepts is no more unreal for being a form than the forms of intuition (what is constant in all empirical intuiting) are unreal for being forms. It is true that the forms of intuition are not substantial, but that doesn’t make them simply abstract conditions with no reality. The shifting along of outer attention or the sheer progressiveness of all attention are not abstract.

Similarly, the form of all consciousness, all thinking, all representation (the simple thinking subject) is not substantial for Kant, but that doesn’t make it merely an abstract condition with no reality. Its reality is what is revealed in the intellectual marshaling that is the cogito. Kant says at A402,

. . . there is nothing more natural and more misleading than the illusion which leads us to regard the unity in the synthesis of thoughts as a perceived unity in the subject of these thoughts. We might call this the subreption of hypostatized consciousness (*apperceptionis substantiale*).

The hypostatization here is not of what is formal into something real but, rather, of a conscious “unity in the synthesis of thoughts” (viz, the real unified thinking subject) into a self-subsistent entity. Note that Kant talks here not of the synthesis of intuitions under a thought but of the synthesis of thoughts in intellectual consciousness. As with the logical interpretation, this interpretation confuses merely formal with Kant’s sense of formal, which doesn’t exclude being real, and neglects the cogito and what is revealed as real in it.

The Abstract interpretation is stated by Quassim Cassam. He says that for Kant,

when one talks of the “I” of apperception, one is abstracting from any reference to individual thinkers in different “I think” instances.⁶

So for Kant, in this view the ‘I think’ by itself is wholly abstract (having no concrete reality). This is clearly not Kant’s view in the Paralogisms. The cogito is not abstract; it is my being as a thinker. Of course what is revealed in the cogito pertains to all individual thinkers, but again for Kant this is because my representation of other thinkers is by transferring the concrete “instance” I am onto them. Cassam goes on to argue against the view he attributes to Kant,

If one has no conception of the subject of “I think” instances as objects among others in the world, one will not have a proper understanding of how such instances are indexed.⁷

As far as the first two Paralogisms are concerned, Kant denies that what is revealed in the cogito is an instance involving a general conception of thinking subjects. This would be to think of myself in the cogito impersonally. Any further issue of *persons* in the world will have to wait for the Third Paralogism. Even then I argue that for Kant I do not understand myself as a temporally extended embodied person in the way Cassam suggests. Kant's notion of a person is an “extension” (temporal and material) of the ‘I think,’ not the notion of a self-subsistent entity (object). All interpretations in this first group fail to take seriously Kant's view that a “complete” real simple subject (a real indivisible intellectual subjectivity) is revealed in the cogito.

(II) THE LOGICAL INTERPRETATION AND THE B EDITION PARALOGISMS

The major textual support for the logical interpretation I believe comes from the first part of the B edition Paralogisms up to the Refutation of Mendelssohn's Proof. Kant says that the ‘I’ can always be regarded as subject is an identical proposition (B407), that the ‘I’ is one and not a plurality is an analytic proposition (B407), and that I am identical in all the manifold of which I am conscious is “implied in the concepts themselves, and is therefore an analytic proposition” (B408). But this first part I claim is not Kant's positive doctrine. Rather, it is all the rational psychologist is entitled to if he takes the ‘I think’ *problematically*; if he takes himself in the cogito, that is, as an object of thought or an instance of a general concept of thinking. Indeed Kant introduces this first part by talking of the properties of the “I think’ taken problematically (B406). But this is a bogus way of taking the cogito if one is to derive any real results from it. In the cogito I am not an instance or object of thought but, rather, the being itself (that thinks). The second part of the Paralogisms that follows the discussion of Mendelssohn's proof begins

If, on the other hand, we should proceed analytically starting from the proposition “I think” as a proposition that *already in itself includes an existence as given*. . . . (italics mine; B418)

Kant is not in this second part just rearranging in a new order of presentation what he has already done in the first part. He is setting out what can be concluded when the cogito is taken existentially rather than

problematically. It is this and this alone I claim that constitutes Kant's positive doctrine.

What he says in the second part is that the 'I think' is real, and it is real in or as determining my existence. He says the 'I think' as real (as an *actus*) is the "application or the employment of the pure intellectual faculty" (footnote (a) to B423). My thinking being (my being as a thinking subject) is then an intellectual marshaling for determining myself as a temporal being by "accompanying" the progressiveness of attention. I explore this claim in Part IV. For now the point is that my existence as such a being is no mere logical "function" but a real action.

One way indeed of differentiating the cogito as already involving existence from the cogito taken problematically is to emphasize that in the cogito what is revealed is not a possible thinking by a subject but that I am *now or presently* a thinking subject. To abstract from this temporal factor is to convert the cogito into a mere possibility. Kant makes exactly this point when he says the cogito existentially understood

can determine my existence only in relation to my representations in time. (B420)

Whereas Descartes clearly and distinctly perceives (based on the cogito?) that his whole essence is to think, for Kant what is revealed is that I am a present thinker or a temporal thinker. The just-quoted passage continues with what is clearly a reference to the B edition Refutation of Idealism which argues that to be a present thinker is inseparable from outer intuition (and so being, besides a thinker, a materially affected subject). I shall consider this in detail in Part V. Again, for now, the point is that my whole essence as a *temporal* thinker is not just to think. If Descartes were correct, then the distinction between intellectual marshaling (the 'I think' as revealed in the cogito) and existence as an entity or substance would not be significant (as pertains to my separate existence as a thinker from matter). The fact, according to Kant, that my intellectual action (via being tied to time as accompanying it) is tied to material affection shows the distinction between action and that (self-subsistence) which underlies it is a significant one (as pertains to my possible separate existence atemporally).

In sum, the B edition Paralogisms only seem to lend support to the logical interpretation if the first part of the Paralogisms is taken to include Kant's positive doctrine rather than only the paltry "logical" (even grammatical?) conclusions that can be had by the psychologist who takes the cogito problematically. Kant's own positive conclusions come in the second part. Otherwise I believe it is unclear why, after the Mendelssohn refutation, Kant should present the four Paralogisms again, emphasizing the existential nature of the cogito.

(III) INTENTIONAL-REPRESENTATIONAL INTERPRETATIONS

According to Intentional or Representational interpretations, Kant's positive doctrine in the Paralogisms is that the subject of thinking (the 'I') exists as something intentional within representations or thoughts (as part of their content or representative reality). The contrast in the Paralogisms then is between the 'I' being real extra-representationally versus being real only in or as a representation. Andrew Brook's version is that the subject for Kant is a global representation⁸ containing other representations, that the global representation and the subject of experience are the same thing.⁹ Another version of the view is expressed by Pierre Keller, who characterizes the fallacy of ambiguity in the paralogistic syllogism as one between a *de dicto* necessity of how things must be described (represented) by us and a *de re* necessity about the way things themselves must be.¹⁰ This implies that for Kant the simple subject "exists" only within our descriptions or representations.

Kant does often talk in ways that suggest this view especially in the B edition Paralogisms. He says, for example, at B407.

That the "I", the "I" that thinks can be *regarded* always as subject and as something which does not belong to thought as a mere predicate must be granted. (*italics mine*)

He goes on to say that it follows that I am substance. We must ask, however, why for Kant I can be regarded always as subject and never predicate in regard to thoughts (judgments). The answer is that it is revealed in the cogito that I am the real thinking subject of thoughts as my determinations and therefore for Kant, other than in judgments of the noumenal, I am subject and never predicate of judgments. It is because then I am a real subject (as revealed in the cogito) that I am thus a logical subject in judgments about thinking (*viz.*, always subject and never predicate). Of course I am not therefore a substance, but this is not because I am not a real subject at all (but only a regarded one) but, rather, because in the very act of the cogito is revealed a distinction between thoughts and that (action) which is their source (that action which coalesces about a thought, etc.) even though no self-subsistent ground of such action is revealed.

In the intentionalist view, even if it is a logical truth (a necessity *de dicto*) that I must regard or characterize myself as a subject of thoughts, it is nevertheless false that I really am. This would turn me (in the 'I think') into an illusion, a view Kant rejects.¹¹ One might think that what prevents illusion is that I may indeed be a noumenal subject. But for Kant the 'I think' doesn't even purport to represent the noumenal. He says of the indeterminate empirical intuition expressed by the 'I think' that

something real is given . . . not as appearance, nor as thing in itself (noumenon) but as something which actually exists, and which in the proposition "I think" is denoted as such. (footnote (a) to B423)

The intentionalist interpretations, like the logical ones, neglect the role of the cogito in Kant's positive account.

Brook's view in making the subject a global representation ('its' thoughts being contained representations) makes the distinction between the subject and its thoughts one of containment of representative content. In some ways, this is akin to the functionalist views I consider in the next subsection. For now my claim is that it neglects that aspect of the cogito that Kant characterizes when he says the 'I think' is the "formula of our consciousness" (A354) that the 'I' is "merely the consciousness of my thought" (B413), that it is the "form of consciousness which can accompany" representations (A382), and that it "serves to introduce all our thoughts as belonging to consciousness" (A341). The distinction between a subject and its thoughts is not a relation of content between representations; it is that the subject accompanies representations and is that to which they belong in consciousness. In my view, in the intellectual marshaling there is not a "contentful" relation but one where thoughts emerge, are coalesced about and held, which as dynamical is discerned.

A particularly interesting intentionalist account of the 'I' is given by David Rosenthal, although rather than attributing this view to Kant he criticizes Kant for going beyond it. I believe that his criticism is instructive. In Rosenthal's view¹² any mental unity is to be explained not by a transcendental self, but in terms of 'I' thoughts, which we can take to be mental analogues of 'I' statements. Thus, as I understand Rosenthal, there are 'I-perceive-x' thoughts, 'I-am-thinking-I-perceive-x' thoughts, 'I-am-thinking-I-perceive-x-and-I-perceived-y' thoughts, etcetera. The fact that some of these 'I' thoughts contain others make this view akin to Brook's global representation account. Rosenthal holds that it is these thoughts and how they relate that gives us the sense of a single conscious subject,¹³ but the only real subject is the ordinary person (the entity that has such thoughts). According to Rosenthal, then, the idea that a complete thinking subject is revealed simply in the cogito is an illusion, and he says of Kant's "posit" of such a subject,

... it's unclear how any such transcendental posit could explain the appearance of conscious mental unity, since that appearance itself is an empirical occurrence.¹⁴

First for Kant mental unity is not an appearance to be explained but a flat-out reality revealed in the cogito. He says (B429),

... the self is no mere appearance in so far as I think; in the consciousness of myself in mere thought I am the *being itself*.

So far we just have a dispute as to whether a real complete subject is revealed in the cogito. More instructive is what I believe the motive to be for holding that such a subject is not revealed. The idea, I believe, is that there would

be “one too many” subjects of thought—the sheer ‘I’ and the person. To avoid this, the sheer ‘I think’ has to be made a determination (state, predicate). The person only seems to itself to have any other unity than being a real object or entity in the world. The issues involved here can only be dealt with when I come to Kant’s Third Paralogism discussion of what a person is.¹⁵ For now I simply state that in Kant’s view a complete subject is revealed in the cogito, and that a person is not a subject distinct from this, but a temporal extension (and embodiment) of it. In this view a person is not an entity (substance, object) but an ongoing intellectual marshaling action that is also action for being outer affected. This conception of a person, I argue, is central to Kant’s transcendental idealism, and it is a sophisticated and plausible alternative to the Strawson-like conception of a person as an entity. For now I simply say that it does seem plausible to hold with Kant that what is revealed in the cogito is the being itself that I am (not any mere illusory “sense” of mental unity) and that Kant’s conception of a person introduces no dualism of subjects.

(IV) FUNCTIONALIST-SUB-PERSONAL INTERPRETATIONS

According to functionalist interpretations, Kant’s positive doctrine in the Paralogisms is that there is only a unity of various (mental) functions, or an integration of such functions which operates to produce representations of the organism. Thus, for Patricia Kitcher¹⁶ simplicity is, for Kant, just this integration of functions, and the subject or the ‘I’ is the organism (person). This interpretation is sub-personal in a double sense. Not only aren’t these functions and their cooperation the subject itself who thinks, but they don’t even belong to that subject as its conscious thinking (as its conscious representations). These are sub-functions which happen within the subject and which process and integrate to produce representations for the subject.

To begin with, I believe this view confuses Kant’s key idea in the Transcendental Deduction that thoughts (concepts, judgments) unify or synthesize intuitions, with the quite different idea that thoughts are had by a simple subject. The former pertains to the cognitive or representative content of thoughts, while the latter pertains to the actual occurrences of thinking by a subject. It is the latter which is the sole concern of the Paralogisms, and I have already argued against the intentionalist that the thinking subject is not “sub-personal” for Kant. I believe that even in regard to the Transcendental Deduction, the functionalist view is misleading, since sense, imagination, etcetera are not sub-personal factors which by integration produce a representative thought. Rather they are literally representative components of a thought as had by the subject. A defense of this view will have to await the discussion in Part III of what Kant’s view is of how thoughts have representative content. For now, if I am correct, then Kant’s

view is not subpersonal in either of the senses of the functionalist interpretation, either in the Paralogisms or in the Transcendental Deduction.

The functionalist interpretation seems to completely bypass the role of the cogito in the Paralogisms. If, as Kant says (A343, B401),

The “I think” is the sole text of rational psychology and from it the whole of its teaching has to be developed,

then Kant’s positive doctrine has to be what can be properly concluded from the cogito (and only from it). Causal processing integrating sub-functions is simply not the sort of thing revealed in the cogito. What is revealed I claim is that the subject and its thinking exist within a dynamical unity of thoughts emerging, thoughts being coalesced about and held, etcetera. The only “function” of this unity is *to be me* (the thinking subject).

Of the commentators I am familiar with, Richard Aquila alone has what I believe to be the correct account of Kant’s thinking subject. Let me repeat what he says,

Kant’s commitment to some kind of “inner” subject is neither the purely formal or logical notion it is frequently taken to be nor equivalent to (although it is compatible with) his commitment to a thinking substance or a noumenal self beyond sensibility altogether.¹⁷

As Aquila points out, the formal or logical interpretations provide no sense to Kant’s commitment to a noumenal ground or basis of the thinking subject. In these views, the noumenal would have to be some sort of concrete “realization” of the merely abstract (turning Kant’s view on its head, as for Kant it is the noumenal that is abstract). I can add to Aquila’s point that in the intentionalist and functionalist interpretations it is the person (a substantial entity) that is the subject, and it is not clear why an already substantial entity allows any commitment to a noumenal ground or basis. Kant’s subject then must be real and nonsubstantial (as in my interpretation and Aquila’s) if Kant’s commitment to a noumenal ground or basis is to make sense. The opposed interpretations then, beyond any specific ways they each misrepresent Kant’s positive doctrine in the Paralogisms, all misrepresent what Kant takes to be revealed in the cogito, and how what is revealed (paraphrasing Aquila now), though not being equivalent to Kant’s commitment to a noumenal self, is nevertheless compatible with it.

Part III

The Cognizing Subject

7 Empirical Apperception

So far I have not investigated the nature of thoughts themselves but only how they relate to the subject they belong to. In my examples, thoughts were comprehensions of statements or comprehensions of what is perceived, but there was no specific account of the reality of such comprehension nor of how it relates to what is comprehended. Using Descartes's terminology, I have not discussed either the formal or the representative reality of thoughts themselves. As far as the first two Paralogisms go, such a discussion is unnecessary, as neither Kant's refutation of the arguments of the rational psychologist nor his own positive conclusions turned on anything but the relations of thoughts (whatever they are and however they represent) to the subject. What was at issue was exclusively whether they belong to a simple self-subsistent entity or to an indivisible spontaneity (intellectual marshaling action). In the Third Paralogism, Kant considers the subject as it is or exists through time. Although one could present the negative argument of the Third Paralogism at the level of abstraction of the first two, Kant's positive account can hardly be grasped without an understanding of what Kant's account is of the nature of thinking.

My basic project in Part III is not only to prepare for the Third Paralogism but also to show that Kant's conception of the ontological status of the cognizing subject in the Transcendental Deduction is exactly the one I have interpreted him as holding in the first two Paralogisms. The subject is an action of intellectual marshaling, only now it is marshaled for thoughts that are genuine cognitions: thoughts, that is, that pertain to what is given from elsewhere (see B145). My concern in this Part III then is with the cognizing subject, not with the thinking subject *per se*, independent of how the subject by thinking cognizes reality. In this chapter, I consider the subject only as empirically cognizing or what Kant calls mere empirical apperception. I defer until Chapter 8 the subject as purely cognizing or what Kant calls pure apperception.

Empirical apperception does apply to cognizing one's own inner states for Kant but not exclusively so. It pertains as well to cognizing what is given by outer sense. In either case, it is thinking or cognizing as it operates through an experiential episode (whether my attention is focused outward through the episode on what is perceived or retracted inward through the episode on my perceiving). Throughout Part III, I am concerned with apperception as it pertains to outer sense or to what is perceived. I reserve the subject's cognition of

its own states for Chapter 9 in Part IV. It turns out (Chapter 8) that pure apperception can (and must) be involved in cognizing an experiential episode. The difference is that pure apperception is cognizing what is perceived in an episode by explicitly cognizing space and time themselves, whereas mere empirical apperception is cognizing what is perceived in an episode simply according to empirical concepts, without any pure cognition of space and time.

Kant says of the three sources of knowledge—sense, imagination, and apperception,

Each of these can be viewed as empirical, namely in its relation [merely] to given *appearances* . . . apperception [represents appearances] in the empirical consciousness of the identity of the reproduced representations with the *appearances* whereby they were given, that is, in recognition. (italics mine; A115)

Empirical apperception then proceeds by (or exists in) connecting the appearances themselves that arise in an extended experiential episode, and the thoughtfulness of the subject through the episode is according to concepts of the connections of appearances, or empirical concepts. I consider the exact connection between empirical and pure apperception in Chapter 8. In this chapter, I first consider what empirical concepts are for Kant by which empirical apperception is effected. I argue in subsection (i) that they are rules and in subsection (ii) that they are schematizable rules. In subsection (iii), I apply these results to empirical *judgments*, and finally in subsection (iv) I carry out the main project of this chapter: namely, to show that the cognizing subject (the subject whose thoughts are rules) in empirical apperception is exactly the subject as intellectual marshaling action, not an entity.

(I) THOUGHTS AS RULES

Concepts for Kant are rules. Indeed all thoughts for Kant are rules (empirical concepts, pure concepts, judgments, etc.). He says,

But a concept is always as regards its form something universal which serves as a rule (A106),

and he says of the understanding, already characterized as the faculty of thought or the faculty of concepts and judgments,

We may now characterize it as the *faculty of rules*. This distinguishing mark is more fruitful and approximates more closely to its essential nature. (A126)

To see what a rule is for Kant I consider his discussion of the three-fold empirical synthesis that ends with empirical apperception (which is

the intellectual unity of an extended or synthesized apprehension in accord with a rule). The discussion appears at A98–104.

That Kant has in mind an extended episode is clear, as he says,

each representation, in so far as it is contained in a single moment, can never be anything but absolute unity.

How I am bombarded at a single moment is complex, but Kant attributes this complexity to a synopsis (A97) in contrast to any synthesis. The synthesis of apprehension, then, is my “running through” an actual extended experiential episode. Take the example of perceiving a dog. I can momentarily have a complex sensory “glimpse” and “feel” as I simultaneously look and touch. To apprehend, however, is to survey it in various dimensions: to look around it, to feel it at different parts, etcetera, to see what the result is of different ways of engaging it. The synthesis of apprehension is a “run through” that probes for what it is. This is perhaps clearer in the case of an unfamiliar object or scene that I come upon. The extended exploration of it is a synthesis of apprehension. This is more like a skillful knowing how to go about and obtain information than some sort of intellectually guided activity. This skill requires two things for Kant. First, I must remember or encode what I have achieved, and second I must have some sense of how to proceed further and of what I am looking for to result from this proceeding. The former is attributed by Kant to the “reproductive faculty of imagination” (A121) and the latter to empirical association, which Kant also attributes to the (empirical) imagination (A115). In a sense, association can be regarded as a case of long-term reproduction; viz, how things have gone together in the past as now “reproduced” gives me a proclivity to proceed in apprehension in certain ways to obtain certain results. The holistic knowing how to proceed and what uptake to proceed for (the synthesis of apprehension) involves then for Kant a synthesis of (a holistic proceeding for results according to) imagination. Otherwise I would be randomly attaining sense-impingement after sense-impingement (glimpsing the dog, reaching to feel the couch, feeling my lips, etc.) which would not be generating a whole but a mere accidental collocation. This function of the imagination, in guiding the generation of a whole by guiding how to proceed or operate in a holistic manner, I call the synthesizing function of imagination. This synthesizing function exists within the synthesis of apprehension as a proneness or potency to continue to operate or apprehend in a certain way as one retains previous results of operating. It thus guides putting elements together to form an extended experiential episode.

Kant says at A77, B103,

By synthesis in its most general sense, I understand the act of putting different representations together. . . .

This synthesis or ability to operate in a holistic fashion, Kant says,

is the mere result of the power of imagination, a blind but indispensable function of the soul . . . of which we are scarcely ever conscious. (A78, B103)

For my purposes the important point is that the synthesizing imagination is blind in the sense that it is not an intellectual or conceptual guidance of our proceeding but a skillful guidance. This doesn't mean that we are not sensitive to how much we have done and to what our tendency is to do next. It only means we haven't grasped any of it in thought. There is as yet, that is, no intellectual consciousness of how we are proceeding so that, so far, none of this is anything to the thinking subjects that we are.

Kant's way of putting this point is to say there is as yet no unity of the synthesis for the thinking subject. This unity (the synthesis of recognition in a concept or empirical apperception) is, for Kant, a unity according to a rule, where a rule is what introduces necessity into the synthesis. He says,

But this unity is impossible if the intuition cannot be generated in accordance with a rule, by means of such a function of synthesis as makes the reproduction of the manifold *a priori* necessary, and renders possible a concept in which it is united. Thus we think a triangle as an object in that we are conscious of the combination of three straight lines according to a rule. (A105)

Likewise he says the unity of a synthesis of appearances is

according to concepts that is, according to rules which . . . make them *necessarily* reproducible (A108),

and he says that our counting is a synthesis according to concepts and

in terms of this concept, the unity of the synthesis of the manifold is rendered necessary. (A78, B104)

Concepts then for Kant are rules, and rules unify syntheses by bringing them under (or introducing into them) necessity. Whether one is proceeding holistically to construct a triangle, to count, or to perceive a dog, one does it according to a rule if, as Kant says, each stage of one's performance (synthesis) belongs

to the act whereby it [the synthesis or performance] *was* to be gradually generated. (italics mine; A103)

The synthesis is unified, that is, if one is cognizant throughout the extended synthesis or performance of that according to which one is acting: if one is cognizant throughout, that is, of what one has set oneself to do. This

cognizance throughout the synthesis is the unity of the (otherwise “blind”) performance for the thinking subject and serves as the rule or standard in regard to the performance. Thus, in the case of a synthesis of apprehension as in apprehending a dog, the thought or concept of a dog would be that according to which one proceeds in the apprehending or perceiving as the standard of one’s proceeding.

If, as Kant seems to be saying, a thought or a concept is literally a rule, then thoughts, whatever their content, must have rule force; that is, they must function dynamically as standardizing or regulating one’s proceeding. Kant is no Platonist with regard to rules. This doesn’t mean that in the context of thinking abstractly and generally (how concepts relate to one another analytically, etc.) concepts or rules must have regulatory force. It means rather that the pertinence of thoughts to reality (the synthetic nature of thinking) in any particular cases involves those thoughts having the force of rules. A concept, for example, is not applicable by matching to features of reality. Rather it is applicable by directing procedures of perceiving or apprehension to go a certain way. Of course the procedure may not be able to go that way, as not everything about a synthesis of apprehension is up to me; in poking the dog-like figure it might dissolve into dust. If so, the concept is not applicable.

As all thoughts for Kant are rules (have the force of directing how to go), a thought, whatever its content, is a proneness or potency to standardize or regulate. It is this proneness throughout a performance (such as in a synthesis of apprehension) that constitutes the comprehension of the synthesis or the performance or constitutes that by which the synthesis is something to the thinking subject. It is the focal, but (as I show in subsection (ii)) the not as yet formed comprehension or thought that accompanies the performance. Just as, ordinarily speaking, I can have a focused comprehension (thought) of who came into the room without forming or formulating the thought to myself or others, so too I can have a comprehension or thought focused on what I am doing (on the synthesis of apprehension) without its being formed or formulated. My point now is simply that this focused comprehension throughout on what I am doing (on what whole I am generating) is literally the proneness throughout to regulate what I am doing according to how it is *supposed* to be going.

Before turning to the issue of how thoughts understood as (having the force of) rules are formulable and self-consciously had, I consider for a moment some concrete ways this proneness to standardize can be operative (something, so far as I know, Kant doesn’t explicitly consider). As I am following your performance, I might *correct* it (if it doesn’t fit how it is supposed to be going), I might *assess* it positively or negatively (according to whether it is or isn’t going as it is supposed to) or I might *guide* it (if you fail to know what to do next) by taking it up and continuing as it is supposed to be continued. In all these ways I am prone to regulate your behavior, and they all exhibit my holistic comprehension (my comprehension throughout

any stage) of your behavior. In my own case too I may correct mistakes or assess my performance. Note that in each of these cases there is a certain “separation” of the cognizance by rule from the performance itself. The proneness to regulate, that is, is not so much an ingredient in the performance as rather that which accompanies it. This is not the case simply in skillfully performing according to the reproductive and associative tendencies of imagination.

(II) SCHEMATA: THOUGHTS AS FORMULABLE RULES

In the discussion of the three-fold synthesis which culminates in recognition of a concept Kant nowhere talks of schemata. However, when considering empirical concepts in the Schematism section, he seems to suggest that schemata are involved in all concepts, including the empirical concept of a dog (A141, B180). He further attributes schemata of even sensible concepts (including the concept of a dog at least as regards its shape or form) to the pure, not the reproductive, imagination. I believe this is an essential addition required to complete Kant's account of empirical apperception and of what a thought or an empirical concept or judgment is.

Kant says the schema of a concept is the

representation of a universal *procedure* of imagination in *providing* an image for a concept. (A140; italics mine)

An “image” was Kant's term for what is achieved in a synthesis of apprehension (A120). I think the visual connotation of this term is misleading, as more is involved in an apprehending procedure that tests for a dog than visual results. A better term for what is achieved would simply be a whole of perceptual information. Note now that Kant characterizes the schema as a product of imagination; that is, it is something imaginatively performed. This doesn't mean it has to be performed merely in the head; it can be performed along with bodily gestures. Imagination for Kant is the faculty of representing what is absent in a “sensible” form (B151); not doing so only in the head. The procedure, Kant says, is for providing an image. Now the synthesis of apprehension is how we go about perceiving so as to yield the result we are looking for (what we look for, how we probe for it, etc.). If so, this synthesis actually provides the “image” (the result). The schema then is this same how-to-go-about but not tied to actually achieving an image (or achieving perceptual information). The schema, that is, does not sensibly portray the result of the synthesis of apprehension, but the perceptual performance of apprehending, and it portrays it apart from any actual sensory upshot.

I believe one simple way to characterize what Kant is getting at here is that a schema is a rehearsal or a going-through-the-motions of the synthesis of apprehension, of what goes on in apprehending a dog, say.

This coheres with Kant's contention that a schema is general, not restricted to a particular case (A141), and that it is a

monogram *through which and in accordance with which* images themselves first become possible. (italics mine, A142)

A rehearsal of a procedure through which and in accordance with which a holistic result is achieved is like a monogram or blueprint for achieving that result (the image). It is sensible in that it literally portrays the motions one goes through to achieve the result. The schema of the concept of a dog then is not imaginatively outlining a picture of a dog in general as Kant's language at A142, B181 might seem to suggest. Rather it is the portrayal (in a mental or bodily pantomime) of how to go about and dog-perceive, the vantage points or perspectives to be taken up to differentiate a dog from a two-dimensional replica, etcetera.

Our question now is what is the relation between a concept or a thought as being a rule (a proneness to regulate a synthesis of apprehension) and the schema (which is the rehearsal or schematic portrayal of that synthesis)? My claim is that for Kant both together constitute the thought or the concept, insofar as it unifies appearances. This is obscured by the fact that Kant's initial use of the term "schema" is as a mediating representation between concepts and appearances. However, what it mediates between is concepts in their abstract or logical employment and appearances. One element of having a concept is its general inferential employment, how it relates to other concepts. This is the merely logical employment of the understanding (See A68, B93, and A76, B102), which abstracts from issues of applicability or how concepts unify syntheses of apprehension. What mediates between concepts understood thus as abstract and appearance is not just a rehearsal or monogram of a synthesis of apprehension, but, rather, a rehearsal in relation to, or at the service of, regulating the synthesis. It is because Kant sometimes uses the term 'schema' for all that mediates between concepts abstractly understood and appearances (not just for imaginative portrayal) that he says the intellect or thought is involved in the schema. Thus he says the schema

must in one respect be intellectual (A138, B177),

and

The schema of a triangle can exist nowhere but in thought . . . It is a *rule* of synthesis of the imagination. (A141, B180)

Other times he reserves the term "schema" for just the portrayal or rehearsal itself as when he says

The schema itself is always a product of the imagination. (A140, B179)

Despite this unfortunate terminological shift, one thing I believe is clear. It is both the rule-aspect and the portrayal aspect together that constitute synthetic thought (conceptual thinking in applicability to instances or appearances). In particular it isn't the concept or thought as a rule that is mediated by the rehearsal (the imaginative schema) to be applicable. The relation between rule and schema, then, is not one of mediation for Kant. They are two inseparable components of having a thought in regard to its real use or applicability.

A thought then for Kant is not just a proneness to regulate a synthesis of apprehension, or something merely with the force of a rule, but a proneness to thus regulate tied to the imaginative production of a rehearsal or a monogram. He says at B154 that

We cannot think a line without drawing it in thought, or a circle without describing it.

It is the "drawing it" in thought which I am calling the rehearsal. One way to understand the tie is to say that the sheer regulatory force in regard to syntheses of apprehension is the unformed or unformulated thought or comprehension, whereas the portrayal in a rehearsal is the formulation of the thought. The portrayal formulates for oneself or others according to what standard or exemplar (monogram) one is prone to regulate the synthesis of apprehension. If so, then for Kant thoughts in total are not just rules but formulable rules. This I believe was the factor missing in his discussion of the three-fold synthesis, but it is a factor that is essential if thoughts are to be had self-consciously.

It is usual to think of language as what basically formulates thoughts. However, a plausible case can be made for Kantian schemata as formulations that underlie the formulation in language. If a child is to acquire the concept of a dog he has to be shown how to dog-perceive. As he is guided (corrected, assessed, led on, etc.) in how to engage in dog-perceiving, the word 'dog' accompanies the gesturings (the public schemata) by which he is thus guided or led on. The sound 'dog,' so to speak, rides piggyback on schematic gesturing, which gets him to correctly dog-perceive so that the sound is applicable. The child's comprehension of dogs is then formulated for others by his being able to show them what to do. When, as competent adults, we glimpse a dog and formulate our comprehension with the term 'dog,' it is plausible to contend that it is the whole schema that the term rides on that is the formulation, only it is called up so quickly and effortlessly that only the term is explicit.

In the view I am attributing to Kant of schemata being the formulations of regulatory force for apprehending, the regulatory force doesn't derive from the portrayal or rehearsal. This would be subject to all the objections Wittgenstein raises against the idea of a formula being a rule (or being adequate for its own applicability as a guide for how to proceed). The

regulatory force, rather, belongs to the unformed thought—it is indeed the unformed thought itself. We have a real power or potency to regulate (to correct or assess) a synthesis of apprehension. The imaginative portrayal may or may not be a component of how it is we have that power. It may or may not be, that is, that I am able to correct or assess by comparing what I do with an imaginative template. Even if it were, the regulation would still be my proneness to use the template to regulate. It seems that such conscious forming of a template anyway is not always required to regulate. What it is always required for is to give the thought (as a rule or a proneness to regulate) a form. It is required, that is, in having a formulable thought.

In the terminology I prefer, thoughts for Kant are formulable rules, and such thoughts, as involving a schematic component, can be called schematized thoughts. Pure thoughts (thoughts employed purely in inferential thinking) have only inferential power that is not per se tied to rule-force or schematization. As a further bit of terminology, I contrast the schematizing imagination with the synthesizing imagination. The latter is involved in the mere (skillful) proneness to apprehend holistically, and as Kant has said is “blind” (A78, B103). The schematizing imagination is involved in the formulability of the proneness to regulate apprehension. Though it may, as Kant says, “be an art concealed in the depths of the human soul” (A141, B180), it is not blind but a conscious portrayal of a template according to which we regulate apprehension. The schematizing imagination is a component of the thinking self, whereas the synthesizing imagination operates to produce (synthesize) a holistic apprehending, but it does not at all regulate it or bring it to concepts. I show in Chapter 8 that this distinction is not quite the distinction between the empirical reproductive imagination and the pure imagination. That distinction for the most part pertains to whether the holistic operating (the synthesis) is a perceptual apprehending or a pure spatiotemporal shifting (synthesis). Hence it is a distinction within synthesizing. Kant says at A77–78, B103–104 that even pure synthesis (of the manifold of space and time) is a blind function of the imagination. I return to the pure synthesis in Chapter 8.

Again, of the commentators I am familiar with, it is Richard Aquila whose views are closest to mine. According to Aquila

it is reasonable to suppose one’s apprehension to be effected . . . through dispositions and tendencies of various sorts.¹

Aquila identifies these dispositions with anticipations. If one includes anticipations of how next to proceed as well as anticipations of what the upshot of so proceeding will be, this would correspond to my account of reproductive-associative imagination as involved in pronenesses to proceed (synthesize or put together one’s performance) in certain ways. Aquila later ² goes on to say that recognition consists not in these first-order anticipations,

but in anticipating the set of anticipations themselves. This I believe corresponds to how schematization works as one is going through a synthesis of apprehension. Suppose I produce a rehearsal as to how I am going to perform (apprehend). At each stage of apprehending, with the rehearsal still in mind, I will be anticipating the whole set of future steps (which when they arise will do so by the first order tendencies of synthesizing imagination). I think Aquila underemphasizes the regulatory force involved in intellectual recognition of what I am doing. The schema by itself might be a guide or prediction of what I will do, but it is not by itself a rule. What he does recognize clearly and importantly³ is that thoughts for Kant can be actually operative in regard to a synthesis of apprehension.

(III) THOUGHTS AND JUDGMENTS

What I want to consider next is what it is to have a thought for Kant even if it is not operating to unify a synthesis of apprehension. To begin with, I stick to concepts and then turn to judgments. I said that a concept was a proneness to regulate a synthesis (a whole extended way of operating), whether the synthesis be one of apprehension, one of counting, or one of constructing a triangle, etcetera. Now one can be in a state of being prone to regulate a synthesis without being prone to carry out the synthesis. I gave as one kind of proneness to regulate the case of being prone to correct another. Here I am not myself prone to perform but only to correct another's performance. Even when I am prone to perform, the proneness to regulate "accompanies" the proneness to perform; it is not "part" of it. Thus the proneness to regulate a dog-wise synthesis of apprehension may exist in me even if no dog-glimpse (nothing suitable for such an apprehension) is around (so that I am clearly not prone to apprehend dog-wise). This is what it is to have or entertain a thought of a dog (for the concept of dog to be realized in my state). It is the very same state that, on an occasion when I am prone to apprehend dog-wise, operates to give necessary unity to that synthesis of apprehension. A dog-thought then for Kant is not a linguistic term or a linguistic formula or an image or just a node in inferential patterns. Rather it is a real power to regulate (how to go about) perceiving. Finally, a thought is a formulable rule for Kant, with the schema (the rehearsal or portrayal of the holistic operation) being the formulation.

I said that for Kant not only are concepts rules, judgments are rules too. He says in the *Prolegomena*,

Judgments, in so far as they are regarded merely as the condition for the unification of given representations in a consciousness [as opposed to their logical-inferential function] are rules.⁴ (4:306)

I restrict myself in this chapter to empirical judgments about what is going on around us (judgments of the kind ‘That is a dog’). In section 19 of the B edition Deduction, Kant contrasts judgments from relations “according to laws of reproductive imagination.” Just as in the three-fold synthesis discussion he had contrasted recognition in a concept with reproductive imagination, so now he contrasts judgment with such imagination. He says the relation of representations in a judgment is that

they belong to one another *in virtue of the necessary unity of apperception* in the synthesis of intuitions. (B142)

I have shown that what gives a synthesis necessary unity is the proneness to regulate. Suppose that I come across what, at a glance, gives me a dog-like glimpse. Even if I am prone upon coming across what gives me that glimpse to apprehend dog-wise, that may be just my associative imagination working. After all, I might be prone to apprehend maltese-wise because the glimpse makes me think of my maltese (even if I am glancing at a great dane), or I may be prone to apprehend giraffe-wise. If I don’t think the object glimpsed is a maltese, however, I will so to speak reject this proneness (*viz*, I won’t go ahead to apprehend maltese-wise). I will, that is, negatively assess this proneness. On the other hand if I do think (judge) the object to be a dog, I may not be prone to actually go ahead and operate (perform that synthesis of apprehension), but I am prone to positively evaluate or assess that proneness. Positively assessing, I suggested, was another kind of regulating that could accompany a synthesis (but could also be such that I am prone to regulate that way without being prone to perform the synthesis). This I suggest is the relation of representations (the intuition of that before me, and the concept dog) in a judgment.

A judgment, that is, is my proneness to necessitate apprehending a certain way with regard to that which is presented to me, with the necessitation (the regulatory force) specifically being positive assessment.

A judgment is the kind of thought that is expressed verbally by a claim or an assertion and may of course be false. A judgment is simply what I think to be true. I believe Kant’s view can be made more plausible by looking for a moment at what sort of verbal claim might express a Kantian judgment. If I am prone to positively assess, that signifies that I think that is the proper way to go. If I am prone to positively assess apprehending dog-wise in regard to that before me, this can be expressed as “It is proper to apprehend that before me dog-wise.” This isn’t the claim “That is necessarily a dog”; *viz*, the claim doesn’t assert that

these representations *necessarily belong to one another* in the empirical intuition (B142),

and it isn't the claim "I am prone to apprehend that before me dog-wise"; viz, my claim doesn't

state that these two representations have always been conjoined in my perception. (B142)

One last point—if my proneness to positively assess is indeed to be a judgment (a thought of what is true), then I must also be prepared or prone to withdraw that positive assessing proneness if it turns out that in actually apprehending one cannot achieve the result (it turns out to be a cardboard dog). It is this I believe that makes the proneness to positively assess "responsible" to the object (to what is so), which Kant puts as follows:

. . . what we are asserting is that they are combined *in the object*, no matter what the state of the subject may be. (B142)

In sum, then, judgments as well as concepts are pronenesses to regulate syntheses or rules for regulating holistic ways of proceeding. In the next chapter, I argue that this conception extends to all judgments, not just judgments in regard to what is around us (judgments in regard to given appearance). I further argue that it is only this conception of judgment that is consistent with the transcendental ideality of space and time.

(IV) THE COGNIZING SUBJECT IN EMPIRICAL APPERCEPTION

I have been considering thought in relation to given appearances or actual intuition, either as a thought operates to regulate a synthesis of apprehension, or as it is a mere proneness to so regulate whether it in fact goes on to operate or not. In either case, the formal reality of a thought (in Descartes's sense) is its nature as a rule (a proneness to regulate), and its representative reality or content is what procedure or holistic way of operating it is regulatory for. I now return to the relation of the nature of thoughts, so understood, to the thinking subject. Recall that in the First and Second Paralogisms I abstracted from issues of exactly what thoughts were and exactly how they had content. With these elements now in place, I can talk of the thinking subject who has thoughts, so understood as rules, as the cognizing subject. My task now is to see that Kant's conception of the cognizing subject in the Transcendental Deduction (at least as far as it is restricted to merely empirical apperception) is consonant with his account of the thinking subject in the first two Paralogisms.

In regard to a synthesis of apprehension, the unity of a rule is that each component of the synthesis of apprehension belongs, as Kant says,

to the act whereby it was to be gradually generated. (A103)

A proneness to regulate which accompanies the synthesis of apprehension exists already initially as a whole grasp of what to do. In this way thoughts, as rules, collectively unify the components of a synthesis of apprehension. The question now is what does this collective unity of a thought effect in regard to the synthesis of apprehension? Kant's answer is that it enables the 'I think' to accompany the synthesis; that is, it enables the synthesis to belong to the identical self-conscious thinking being that I am throughout the synthesis.

First of all, the unity of the synthesis under a rule is a formal unity of thinking throughout the synthesis (it is an ongoing or enduring unity of thinking accompanying the synthesis). As Kant puts it,

the formal unity of consciousness in the synthesis . . . is impossible if the intuitions cannot be generated in accordance with a rule. (A105)

Originally I am prone to regulate with a grasp (via the schematic, but entire rehearsal) of the entire performance. As the performance or synthesis proceeds, this same proneness to regulate continues to accompany the performance. At each stage of the performance I again grasp the entire performance or how far I have successfully gone and what next and then yet has to be done (via a schematic quick summarizing followed by the rehearsal of the performance from that stage). This unfolding adjustment of the proneness is part of what it means to have a proneness to regulate at all. It is this ongoing adjusting proneness, I believe, that Kant calls the "formal unity of consciousness." It is, roughly, the operative unfolding of an initial thought.

But of course I am not just a thought (or a thought unfolding). Kant says,

There must be . . . a transcendental ground of the unity of the synthesis of the manifold. (A106)

and that this ground

is no other than transcendental apperception. (A107)

Roughly the rule or thought "comes from" the thinking subject that I am. Kant says that transcendental consciousness is what makes collective unity of the synthesis possible, and he identifies it as the bare representation 'I.' He says in footnote (a) to A117,

the bare representation "I" in relation to all other representations (the collective unity of which it makes possible) is transcendental consciousness.

The reality that underlies formal collective unity is that I am the source of the rule and am (or at least can be) aware of myself as the source of the

rule. Although Kant talks here of what the condition is of there being a rule, we can also look at it reverse-wise as what my being is, in being thus the condition (source) of the rule, and indeed that is the way Kant looks at it at B133 where he says,

For the empirical consciousness which accompanies different representations [in a mere synthesis of apprehension] is in itself diverse and without relation to the identity of the subject. That relation comes about . . . only in so far as I *conjoin* one representation with another and am conscious of the synthesis of them. Only in so far therefore as I can unite a manifold of different representations *in one consciousness* is it possible for me to represent the identity of the consciousness in [i.e., throughout] these representations.

In other words, the collective unity of a rule (unfolding throughout the synthesis) is what constitutes my *identity* (as a source of the rule) *throughout* the synthesis. If that identity were that of an entity this would not make sense, because the ongoingness of the unfolding of a proneness (or power to regulate collectively) doesn't constitute the identity of an entity. An entity, it seems, can quite well be identical without holding to a thought. If, on the other hand, what I am is the mere action of being the source of rules (the spontaneity from which a rule emerges), then the ongoingness of the rule is just the ongoingness (constancy, abidingness) of the action I am as source of the rule. Of course a person can be identical without holding to a thought. Whether this implies that the identity of a person (unlike the identity of a subject) is the identity of an entity or substance is the issue of the Third Paralogism, which I consider in Chapter 10.

Return for a moment to the idea that I am an intellectual marshaling action, this time with that action just being what a *rule* emerges from, is coalesced about, and is held onto. Then the ongoing unfolding of the rule (of the proneness to regulate) throughout the synthesis of apprehension *is* the identity or constancy of the intellectual marshaling action that I am throughout the synthesis. I am identical throughout the synthesis, that is, by being the constant and the abiding source of the unfolding rule. In a word, it is because I, as transcendental consciousness, am *nothing but* intellectual action (the source of a thought or a rule) that the constancy of such action can constitute my identity, and indeed Kant characterizes my identity as

the *abiding* and *unchanging* "I." (A123)

Notice Kant does not say the rule makes my cognizance abiding, as he would if he were thinking of me as the entity who has such cognizance or to whom the cognizance belongs.

So far my contention has been that the “formal unity of consciousness” (in generating the synthesis of apprehension in accord with a rule) can be equated by Kant to my identity throughout the synthesis only if he thinks that what I am is not an entity, but a spontaneity or a source of a rule that holds steady to the rule throughout, being thereby a constant and abiding intellectual action for keeping the rule in focus. This conception, I believe, is consonant with the view of the thinking self I attributed to Kant in the first two Paralogisms, only now the same view of the self as intellectual marshaling action is applied to thoughts being rules (pronenesses to regulate performance—whether perceptual, figure-constructing, counting, etc.). The only difference is that intellectual marshaling action now also has a real focal potency in regard to what is “beyond” the intellect (perceiving, constructing, etc.) because of the rule or regulatory nature of thinking that emerges from it (that it coalesces about, etc.). It was this (discursive) nature of thinking that was abstracted from in the first two Paralogisms, which were only concerned with the relation of thinking to a subject (not the relation thereby of a thinking subject to what is given from elsewhere in episodes of perceptual apprehension, figure construction, etc.).

A similar contention regarding the nonentitative status of the self applies to Kant’s further characterization of what the unity of a rule effects, namely the identity of self-consciousness. He says at A108,

The original and necessary consciousness of the identity of the self is at the same time an equally necessary unity of the synthesis of all appearances according to concepts, that is, according to rules which . . . make them [appearances] necessarily reproducible.

Once again I suggest that it is the unfolding of a rule which is “at the same time” consciousness of the identity of the self; only this time we need to focus on the schema (the rehearsal or monogram for synthesizing) that constitutes the formulation of a rule. To connect to my discussion of transcendental self-consciousness in Chapter 5, consider as the specific kind of regulation my guiding or showing another what must (what is supposed to) be done. As the other’s performance proceeds, I am all along prone to guide. This proneness to guide or regulate will have to be formulated if they slip up or don’t know what to do next. In this case, my showing involves publicly gesturing or presenting (going through the motions of) what is to be done. At this stage of his performance, I quickly go through motions of what has been done (summarize) and then the motions, more slowly, of what is yet to be done. At any stage, stepping in with the schematic gestures involves a concentration on forming the proneness (the unformed thought), encompassed however within my wider focus of reflecting it out onto a public showing. This exactly fits my analysis of transcendental self-consciousness (consciousness of our being the subject of a thought) in Chapter 5, only now that analysis is applied to thoughts as rules formulated in a

schema rather than verbally and with the encompassing other-directedness being showing or guiding rather than reporting. Indeed the case of the primate in the mirror was already a case of self-consciousness via schematic rehearsal rather than verbalization. The primate attempting to see how its motions are reflected in the mirror can be assumed to only rehearse touching its lips (it starts to and then stops quickly, etc.). I can conclude then that governing the other's performance as it proceeds by a proneness to guide is "at the same time" (being capable of) consciousness of oneself throughout as the subject (of the rule).

As in Chapter 5, an other-directed showing carried out in my head (merely imaginatively) works just as well for consciousness of myself as subject of the proneness. A similar analysis works for guiding my own performance. Thus, if I am carrying out a holistic operation (a synthesis of apprehension, a construction of a triangle, a counting), I can at each stage formulate a showing to "stand out" from me as a guide (what to follow) in order to proceed. (This might be the case, for example, if I get distracted and need to show myself where I am in the synthesis.) Again, my formulating of the thought or rule (producing the schema) is encompassed by a wider scope of focus (to reflect it to stand out from me), which fits my analysis of being conscious of myself as the source of the thought or rule. Regulating my own performance throughout by a proneness to guide it then is "at the same time" (being capable of) consciousness of oneself throughout as the subject of the rule.

Finally, as my self-identity through the holistic operation is just the constancy or abidingness of holding onto the proneness, if I continually schematize in an other-directed or wider-directed way, I will be conscious throughout of the self-same subject. The schematic reflecting of my ongoing or abiding intellectual marshaling as source of an unfolding rule (which marshaling is the *necessary* unity of what I am doing) is thus at the same time a consciousness of the identity (abidingness) of the self (the intellectual marshaling I am). In other words a formulated rule governing a synthesis of apprehension throughout its unfolding constitutes consciousness of the identical self (as subject of that rule) throughout the apprehension.

Kant says in footnote (a) to A117,

The synthetic proposition, that all the variety of *empirical* consciousness must be combined in one single self-consciousness is the *absolutely* first and synthetic principle of our thought in general . . . Whether this representation is clear . . . or obscure, or even whether it ever actually occurs does not concern us.

In my account, the accompaniment of a synthesis of apprehension by "one single self-consciousness" can be "obscure" in the following way. The schematic rehearsal might only be barely formed as one regulates. At each stage, that is, it may be that what arises is just the initiating of the template

for proceeding (not the entire template). This is enough for obscure self-consciousness as it still involves (though only barely) encompassing the forming of the rule within a wider focus on guiding. Thus, as I watch you behave I would throughout have a bare inkling of what is required to do constituting my comprehension throughout of your performance. This inkling now, in my analysis, would also be the (obscure) consciousness throughout of myself as the abiding subject of the rule (the comprehension). If my own performing is anything more than sheerly automatic (if I am even only barely guiding myself by a rule barely formulated), there will be some inkling constituting the comprehension throughout of my performance, which is at the same time an “obscure” self-consciousness. I think this is evidenced phenomenologically when, in the course of performing automatically, I “step back” for a moment to comprehend (think about) what I am doing. This “thinking about” is barely formulating (merely beginning to formulate) a blueprint for performing according to a thought or concept that originally was prone to regulate the performance but which has been “abandoned” to automatically performing.

Kant says in footnote (a) that the self-consciousness might not ever occur at all. I don't think he means it might not ever occur at any time in our lives but, rather, that it might not ever occur in a particular synthesis of apprehension. The performance, that is, may run automatically all the way through. As a matter of fact, for a great deal of our lives we are not explicitly (in the head or publicly) schematizing. What becomes of our identity as self-conscious thinking subjects (as intellectual marshalings for formulable rules) when we are not “thinking” is one of the main topics of the Third Paralogism.

My account of how transcendental consciousness takes place, though employing Kantian elements of rule, schema, etcetera, is never given by Kant. Nevertheless it seems clear to me that his claim that consciousness of the identical self is coeval with (is “at the same time”) the unfolding of a rule shows that he thought of the identity of the conscious self as an ongoing intellectual action, not an entity. His equation simply makes no sense if consciousness of the identical self is conceived of as consciousness of an entity that is identical throughout an apprehension. Why that latter at the same time should be a unity of the apprehending according to a rule would be completely mysterious. It is only because transcendental self-consciousness is a further structuring within intellectual action that Kant's connection of it to what is admittedly intellectual action (formulated rule-governing) is at all plausible. Hence again the notion of the self as existing within intellectual action (not an entity the action belongs to) that was my interpretation of Kant's positive doctrine in the first two Paralogisms makes sense as well of Kant's claims regarding empirical apperception (the identity of self-consciousness in accompanying a synthesis of apprehension by empirical rules). I believe then that I can reject Andrew Brook's claim—

In particular and most surprisingly Kant never seems to have connected the integration of competencies [the unity of the understanding and its unity with imagination] to the unity of consciousness.⁵

If my account is correct, the “integration of competencies” is the bringing of the synthesis of apprehension under formulable (schematizable) rules, and this “integration” is exactly the reality of being an identical self-conscious thinker throughout the synthesis.

Along with rejecting Brook’s claim, I can now reject abstract, formal, functionalist, and intentionalist interpretations of the Transcendental Deduction. It is true that for Kant a thought (rule) is a comprehension: viz, a holding or grasping together of a whole episode. This much is the function of unity that thought effects. But this “formal” or “abstract” unity exists, as anything actual or real, in the subject the thought belongs to. That subject is not abstract, formal, etcetera; it has for Kant a real identity (constancy or abidingness) throughout the episode exactly by keeping coalesced about the thought. In a word, what all these interpretations leave out is Kant’s equation of this function of unity with my identity throughout the episode. This is an equation, I have argued, that only makes sense if my identity is the abidingness or constancy of the (intellectual marshaling) action I am in the thought emerging from me being held steady by me throughout the synthesis of apprehension. The thought per se may be something abstract or formal characterized as being a function of unity, but the holding of the thought throughout makes the subject a real abiding action.

In this chapter I have tried to understand a complex of notions that Kant believes go together in a synthesis of apprehension (such as a probing dog-wise perceiving episode). These notions include having a concept in mind of the performance, making a judgment of how it will be proper for the performance to turn out, and being an identical self-conscious subject throughout the performance. The connection, I have argued, is that each of these notions can be understood in terms of having a formulable (schematizable) proneness to regulate (having a formulable rule). The overall point of this discussion on Kant’s part, I believe, is to set out what it is to be a thinking subject when that thinking is to pertain to something outside (=other than) thought. Our understanding or capacity for thought is discursive for Kant in that its

whole power consists in thought, consists, that is, in the act whereby it brings the synthesis of a manifold *given to it from elsewhere* to the unity of apperception. (B145; italics mine)

Thinking pertains to what is “given to it from elsewhere” by unifying what is given under a rule. The synthesis it pertains to is either a synthesis of empirical apprehension or a pure synthesis as in counting or in constructing a triangle. These syntheses are extended performances either for obtaining

empirical information or producing pure elements. The overall point of Kant's discussion, I believe, is thus to set out what it is to be a discursively thinking subject (a thinking subject that cognizes by its thinking what is given to it from elsewhere or, in short, a cognizing subject).

In the sections of the *Critique* that I have been discussing, Kant includes one more notion to the complex of notions that I haven't discussed: namely, the notion of an object. I suggest that what he means by 'object' in this connection is simply whatever, given from elsewhere, is an object for thought. By this I don't mean that it is an intentional object but, rather, that it is something real (given to thought from elsewhere) that a thought pertains to, that is judged about, that is something to the thinker that I am, etcetera. In particular, it has no specific connection to being an external object in space independent of the subject's experience. That Kant, immediately after introducing the notion of an object, gives the example of thinking a triangle as an object (A105) should make this clear. Even in regard to an empirical synthesis of apprehension, judging (as opposed to the subjective validity of reproductive-associative imagination) is simply a matter of claiming how the apprehension (following, say, a glimpse that is given to me) is *supposed* to go, where how it is supposed to go is "the element of necessity . . . which prevents our modes of knowledge from being haphazard or arbitrary" (A104). The Kantian idea of an external object is, rather, the idea of substance which is a particular category. But at this stage Kant is not yet even concerned with categories, let alone the specific category of substance. His result, that to be a discursive cognizing subject is to be a subject whose thoughts (concepts, judgments, etc.) are schematizable rules, is what he will "carry over" to the case of pure apperception of appearances, and only then do the categories come into play. Thinking of an object, then, does not mean, in this context of first setting out what a subject of discursive thought is, thinking of substances (external objects). He is not here saying anything like being a subject of discursive thought in regard to what is actually given to thought from elsewhere is at the same time being a subject who thinks of external objects (substances).

8 Pure Apperception

At A115–118 Kant contrasts empirical sources of cognition (perception, association, and “empirical consciousness” or empirical apperception) with pure sources. He says that pure apperception (representations belonging with all others in one consciousness) presupposes a pure synthesis of imagination, as opposed to a reproductive synthesis that rests on empirical conditions. The synthesis, or putting together, of an extended episode, then, is not governed by empirical connections of perception. At B152 the pure imagination (figurative synthesis) is said

to determine sense a priori in respect of its *form*. (italics mine)

Thus the synthesis that constitutes an extended episode is the synthesis of the manifold of space and time, and it is this synthesis that, governed by the unity of the understanding, constitutes pure apperception. As I showed in Chapter 7, empirical apperception is the identity or constancy of the self in keeping to a rule for unifying an associative synthesis of perceptions. As empirical perception is contrasted by Kant at A115 with pure intuition (time) and association with the pure synthesis of the imagination (which concerns the form of intuition, or time), it is plausible to conclude that pure apperception (representations belonging with all others in one consciousness) is the identity or constancy of the self in keeping to a rule unifying a pure (productive) synthesis of the manifold of time. Pure apperception, then, is that identity effected by bringing time (and space) under rules.

I claim that for Kant pure apperception, like merely empirical apperception, enables us to be identical self-conscious subjects through extended experiential episodes. Indeed my basic contention is that pure apperception doesn't pertain to a different kind of subject or a different aspect of being a subject than empirical apperception. Rather it is a different way of bringing syntheses of apprehension under rules and so a different way of effecting our identity as self-conscious beings through episodes (the very same self-conscious identity effected by empirical rules in merely empirical apperception). I argued in Chapter 7 that it is only the subject's being an intellectual marshaling action that makes plausible Kant's claim that the identity of the subject through apprehension is constituted by

accompanying apprehension by empirical rules. If pure apperception then is just accompanying apprehension by pure rules to effect the same identity of the subject, then I will have shown that Kant's conception of pure apperception and what it effects is not only consistent with but demands the same conception of the subject as intellectual marshaling action.

Although pure apperception is a way of being an identical subject through an episode by accompanying it with rules governing space and time, it is not just another optional alternative to merely empirical apperception. Kant says at A115–116 that each of the three syntheses

can be viewed empirically, namely in its relation to given appearances

but that empirical consciousness (empirical apperception) is *grounded in*

pure apperception, that is, the thoroughgoing identity of the self in all *possible* representations. (italics mine)

Thus Kant holds there is some sort of grounding relation which makes effecting the identity of the subject by pure rules more fundamental than by empirical rules. At A124–125 he says,

empirical employment (in recognition, reproduction, association, apprehension) in connection with the appearances

is thanks to

formal unity in the [transcendental] synthesis of imagination.

If the latter is the unity of the pure manifold of space and time under rules, then again Kant is claiming that effecting the identity of the self by pure rules is somehow more basic or fundamental. My discussion in Chapter 7 made it seem as if empirical rules by themselves could effect the identity of the subject through extended experiential episodes, without any need of pure rules. In this indeed I followed Kant's own mode of presentation. I have to see in this chapter, then, what was taken for granted in that discussion that makes pure apperception (rules governing space and time) necessary for identity of the self. My only concerns regarding pure apperception are what exactly rules governing space and time are, how such rules accompanying extended apprehension effect the identity of the subject, and what the relation is between such rules and merely empirical rules in regard to effecting that identity. These are the concerns that are important to my basic contention that the cognizing subject of the *Transcendental Deduction* is an intellectual marshaling action, not an entity. In particular, I am not concerned with the relation of bringing space and time under rules to the deduction of the categories.¹

In consequence, neither am I concerned with the relation of being an identical subject through experience with the categories. These are difficult and complex issues.² My concern is with the “ontology” of pure apperception (the ontology of the subject whose identity is effected by pure rules), not with the role pure apperception plays in relation to the categories.

Although Kant’s focus in the *Transcendental Deduction* is on time rather than space, it will be advantageous to first consider space in subsection (i) before discussing time in subsection (ii).

(I) PURE APPERCEPTION AND SPACE

Space for Kant, recall, is the outer-directed shifting along of attention by which we obtain affection or get affected. My question now is how we cognize this spatial shifting of attention or bring such shifting to apperception (to the thinking beings that we are). In the case of empirical apperception (bringing perceptual episodes to apperception), what was involved was not the sheer proneness to operate holistically (which is the “blind” synthesis of the empirical-associative imagination), but the proneness to regulate such operating (the rule-unity of the synthesis). Likewise for Kant, even in regard to spatial shifting, there is a “blind” synthesis of the imagination which constitutes our proneness to spatially shift holistically (and operates as that proneness is realized in actually shifting). Kant says at A77, B103,

By *synthesis*, in its most general sense, I understand the act of putting different representations together, and of grasping what is manifold in them in one [act of] knowledge. Such a synthesis is *pure* if the manifold is not empirical, but is given *a priori*, as is the manifold in space and time [the spatio-temporal manifold itself].

He goes on to distinguish the “putting together” from the “grasping in one [act of] knowledge” attributing the former to

the mere result of the power of imagination, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. (A78, B103)

The sheer proneness to “put together” an extended shift of attention is “blind” just in the sense that as I keep shifting along linearly, circuitously, etcetera in conformity with this proneness, I have no grasp of the act by which, as Kant says, it was to be generated or no grasp of the act as a whole. Being able to shift and refocus outer attention (linearly, etc.) is a skill. I believe Kant attributes this skill to the imagination simply because it is a skill to operate holistically (not a skill to act at the moment), and the “blind” imagination, in general for Kant, is the faculty of operating holistically. In any, case I call this blind imagination the pure *synthesizing*

imagination: pure because it operates in regard to spatial shifting and synthesizing because it functions (skill-wise) to yield a holistic operation of such shifting. In this case, what is “given from elsewhere” for our discursive understanding to grasp or cognize is the very producing of an attention shift (not what we receive perceptually). This shifting of attention, of course, is the form of empirical intuition or that by which we obtain affection. But, as Kant says,

the mere form of outer sensible intuition, space, is not as yet [by itself] knowledge; it supplies only the manifold of *a priori* intuition for a possible knowledge [for a possible cognition that grasps it as a whole]. (B137)

What is required for knowledge, or for a shifting to be an object of thought, is that I do it in accord with a concept. If, that is, the shift is done in accord with an “act” by which it is *to be done* (generated), then the ongoing accompaniment of the thought of this act (being so far along) is the holistic grasp throughout the shifting, which is also the unity of consciousness throughout the shifting. Kant says,

To know anything in space (for instance a line) I must *draw* it, and thus synthetically bring into being a determinate combination of the given [of the pure manifold given in the drawing] so that the unity of act is at the same time the unity of consciousness (as in the concept of a line). (B138)

A concept is a rule for Kant, and so he is saying that only as I am prone to regulate a shift of attention (according to being, say, a linear shift of seven units) is the shifting unified for my thinking consciousness. As I shift, at any stage I am prone to regulate my shifting in accord with being so far along (say, between the first and second unit). The unity of the act then accompanies the shifting and constitutes my unity of consciousness throughout the shifting. The intellectual constancy of the regulation throughout is the identity of my intellectual consciousness throughout the shift. This is nothing new, as we have seen it before in regard to empirical synthesis of apprehension. Kant is just applying that analysis (of unity and identity) to a pure synthesis of producing a shift of attention.

But now at B151, Kant says of the synthesis of imagination,

its synthesis is an *expression of spontaneity which is determinative . . .* and which is therefore able to *determine* sense *a priori* in respect of its form in accordance with the unity of apperception,

and he goes on to say (B152)

This synthesis is an action of the *understanding* on the sensibility.

To begin with, it would be odd for Kant to call the blind (even if pure) synthesis of imagination (involved in pure holistic operating) an “expression of spontaneity” or “an act of the understanding.” Next, his language in this passage parallels his talk in the *Schematism* chapter (the imagination in part “belonging to sensibility” and yet also in part being spontaneous). I suggest, then, that Kant has in mind the *schematizing* imagination, not the blind synthesizing imagination (viz, the imagination as involved in regulating, not the imagination as involved in sheer performing or operating). What he would be saying then is that the action of the understanding (the faculty of rules) on sensibility includes the “figurative” synthesis of producing a schema or monogram or blueprint of the action (the shift of attention) to be regulated. This indeed would belong to the regulating and would be, as Kant says, an “*expression of spontaneity*” (what I have called the *formulation* of the rule or proneness to regulate).

Kant similarly says (B154) that the figurative synthesis is the

determination [regulative determination?] of the manifold by the transcendental act of imagination

and goes on to say

This we can always perceive in ourselves. We cannot think a line without *drawing* it in thought, or a circle without describing it.

The schematizing imagination that it belongs not to actually drawing a line but to “drawing it in thought” (as a rehearsal or a template).

What I suggest is that the schematizing imagination, or the figurative synthesis, is part of, or a component of, regulating (of the rule), not the blind synthesis that governs the operating. If so, then pure apperception (apperception in regard to a pure synthesis in spatial shifting) would be the accompaniment of the shifting by a schematizable rule.

Just as in the case of empirical apperception, the schema (the “drawing it in thought”) is the formulation of the rule (of the proneness to regulate) or is that which, as Kant says, “is an expression of spontaneity” (an expression of the understanding acting as the rule). In sum, my identity throughout a pure spatial shift of attending is just the intellectual marshaling that I am being constantly or abidingly a focus on regulating the shift in a formulable way. I demonstrate my identity as a self-conscious thinker throughout the shifting by originally being prone to regulate shifting so-and-so and formulating the proneness by a schematic presentation: and at any stage by being prone to regulate being so far along in performing the whole shift and formulating that proneness

by a presentation or delineation of being so far along in what is to be done.

I now want to elaborate a bit on Kant's view to make it more intuitive as to the issue of representing or judging in regard to what arises within the scope of space. Shifting attention as a form of intuition may ensue in being affected a certain way. The rule then might be in regard to shifting attention so as to be affected, say, dog-wise. I suggest again that we take as the species of regulation appropriate for judgment positive assessment withdrawable in the face of not being able to proceed in the way the rule prescribes. If the rule is to shift seven units so as to be affected dog-wise then, because of the empirical component, the positive assessment may have to be withdrawn in acting in accord with the rule. The rule then originally is the proneness to positively assess shifting seven units and being affected thereupon dog-wise. This I claim is the judgment that pertains to a dog-wise (empirical synthesis of) apprehension even prior to that synthesis being (here) applicable. I believe it is fair to linguistically symbolize this rule as follows: "It is proper to shift seven units and be affected dog-wise." This linguistic formulation, it seems to me, is a claim that formulates a judgment as to how things are seven units from me (how things are upon shifting seven units). Kant's discussions abstract almost completely from language. Relaxing this abstraction I believe can lend clarity and plausibility to Kant's view.

I said in Chapter 2 that for Kant what is real is not per se what is in the course of actual spatial attention shifting but what arises in the course of possible experience (possible transactions) or, equivalently, what arises in the course of possible spatial shifting. He talked in Section 6 of the *Antinomies* recall of inhabitants on the moon as a possible appearance existing (only) in the course or advance of possible experience. Now a rule for spatial shifting is a proneness to regulate. This proneness may exist in me prior to the shifting, and it may exist in me even if I am not prone to actually go ahead and shift. In this case the rule, expressed as "It is proper to shift seven units and be affected dog-wise" is the thought of how it is possible to be affected in the course of possible shifting. With suitable elaboration, one can have a similar sort of rule for (possible) inhabitants-on-the-moon transactions. Kant's idea that what is real are possible transactions in the course of possible shiftings can now be understood as just the idea that what is real is any way it is *proper* to be affected within the course or advance of any *proper* spatial shifting. Note then that Kant's notion of possible experience is not how things might have gone instead of how they in fact go but, rather, how things in fact are, though not actually experienced.

Finally, I want to again relax the abstraction Kant makes from the fact that we spatially shift our attention by moving our bodies, and get affected by impenetrable reality. As in Chapter 2, I shall say that a bodily activity that shifts spatial attention is a spatializing activity. Thus if I move linearly for twenty units (twenty steps), this linearly shifts my

spatial attention (so long as I am outer attending). I can say, then, that a Kantian judgmental thought pertaining to the existence of a dog at a certain place is a proneness to positively assess taking twenty steps linearly and being dog-wise affected. Again this is linguistically symbolized by the claim that "It is proper to take twenty steps linearly and be affected dog-wise." Once I add the body with its orienting and moving as spatializing activities (activities that shift spatial attention), Kantian schemata become formulations of rules for such activities. Kant's examples of figurative synthesis (or schemata) are not restricted to drawing a straight line in thought. He says (B154)

We cannot think a line without *drawing* it in thought, or a circle without *describing* it. We cannot represent the three dimensions of space save by *setting* three lines at right angles to one another from the same point.

If these are taken as rehearsals functioning in relation to regulating what is to be done, then, for example, a rule for switching direction by rotating one's body before one proceeds to shift attention linearly will have as a component of its schema a partial describing of a circle. Similarly a rule for shifting the direction of one's body upward before proceeding to continue linearly (whether we can carry this out with the aid of a rocket ship or not) will have as part of its schema the setting of a line at right angles to both shifting forward and shifting sideward. In this manner, I believe Kantian rules can be thoughts of how it is proper to shift attention so as to be moon-inhabitant-affected. Indeed, Kantian cognitions of the full scope of reality in space (*viz.*, Kantian rules governing spatial shifting) don't depict entities having objective spatial positions (whether relational or absolute) but are rather cognitions regulating how it is proper to spatially move so as to obtain affection. In other words, Kant's conception of cognitions as rules is compatible with the transcendental ideality of space.³

Let us turn now to how our capacity to have rules for spatial shifting relates to being identical self-conscious subjects in regard to experiential episodes. One might think the relation is obvious as space is a form of the outer perceiving that goes into a synthesis of apprehension such as apprehending dog-wise. Although this is true, the way spatial shifting would function in a dog-wise synthesis of apprehension is *associatively*.

By association there are different "perspectives" in dog-perceiving that go with different uptakes and so, in this sense, ways of spatial shifting are tied empirically to how to dog-perceive. These ways may not go with apprehending images in a lake or apprehending a rotating disk. These are not governed by rules, then, of *pure* spatial shifting.

In any case, that space is involved in apprehending is not the reason Kant gives for claiming that the unity of experiential episodes requires pure apperception. Rather, his reason is

Unity of synthesis according to empirical concepts would be altogether *accidental* if these latter were not based on a transcendental [pure] ground of unity. (A111)

Empirical apperception involves rules tied to empirical association, such as rules to perceive dog-wise. Kant is suggesting that such association is accidental, and so such rules (and hence the identity of consciousness they effect) may not be applicable. Let me give an example that captures what I believe Kant has in mind. I walk into a room that is a buzzing, bumbling confusion to me. I holistically apprehend what is going on in the room (I walk around the room probing by touch, looking, etc.). This experiential episode has no associative rule. Nor are episodes with no associative rule rare or unusual. For much of our lives we walk about noticing things haphazardly—looking up at the sky, then turning to see a friend, then touching a flower, etcetera. Here there is no associative connection between the stages of the apprehension. It isn't true that seeing a friend is the next step to take (by empirical association) after seeing the sky.

Because of such episodes, with only association to go on for rules,

it would be entirely accidental that appearances should fit into a connected whole . . . for even though we should have the power of associating perceptions, it would remain entirely undetermined and accidental whether they would themselves be associable. (A121)

Further, if they weren't associable, and all rules were empirical-associative concepts, then no rule would be applicable throughout the episode. Because, as I showed in the last chapter, it is the unfolding of an accompanying rule that constitutes my abidingness or identity, it would follow that there would in the episode

exist a multitude of perceptions . . . in which much empirical consciousness would arise in my mind, but in a state of separation, and without belonging to a consciousness of myself. (A122)

What is needed are rules necessarily operative throughout *any* episodes of extended perceiving (even episodes that are not associatively connected) if I am to be an identical self through any episodes. Again, these non-associative episodes are most of the episodes of my life. This, finally, is where space as a necessary universal form of intuition (underlying any possible episode) comes in. I always have available rules for how I am shifting spatial attention. As I go into the buzzing, bumbling room, I have available a rule (or several rules) for how to walk through it or for how to shift spatial attention. Suppose such a rule is in fact operative. I am prone to regulate my perceptual uptake, that is, not in terms of what uptake leads to what uptake, but in terms of how to go about “exploring” for perceptual uptakes

whatever they may be. Then, in the constant unfolding of this accompanying proneness to regulate my apprehension episode, I am an abiding intellectual marshaling throughout it. Of course I may just go into the room and wander about aimlessly (with no rule for proceeding), but the self-conscious accompaniment for Kant is not something always operative but, rather, something always available. He says,

The thought that the representations given in an intuition one and all belong to me, is therefore equivalent to the thought that I unite them in one self-consciousness, *or can at least* so unite them. (B134; italics mine)

A full discussion of this point (of unexercised self-consciousness) will have to wait until Part IV Chapter 10. For now the pertinent idea is that pure apperception (rules for spatial shifting on its own *per se*) is required for empirical apperception (for *all* extended apprehensions of *appearances* to be governed by rule). Kant makes this point when he says,

The . . . unity of all empirical consciousness [any empirical episode] in one consciousness, that of original apperception . . . is a necessary consequence of a synthesis in [pure] imagination which is grounded *a priori* on rules. (A123)

It is only by having a repertoire of rules for any potential spatial shifting that I am capable of being an identical subject throughout any extended perceptual episode. Kant says at A116,

empirical consciousness [is grounded in] pure apperception, that is, in the thoroughgoing identity of the self in all possible representations.

I can now interpret this remark as follows. Unless rules for any empirical connection of appearances (as in a dog-wise connection) were accompanied by (were grounded in) rules for spatial shifting (=pure apperception) within which these empirical connections may or may not arise, rules would not govern the connection of appearances in all possible extended experiential episodes. Consequently, there would be no “thoroughgoing identity of the self in all possible representations [extended episodes].”

Again Kant says, at A125, that empirical apperception (the “highest of the merely empirical elements of experience”) is “thanks to” the

formal unity in the [transcendental] synthesis of imagination.

The formal unity is the bringing of spatial (and temporal) shifting under rules. He is thus saying that connection of appearances under rules is “thanks to” the connection of appearances under “formal” rules (for spatial shifting). Otherwise appearances (throughout any possible experiential episode) would

not belong to ourselves (viz, we would not be an identical self throughout any possible extended experiential episode we might undergo).

If I am right, then pure apperception is not a “nonempirical” self. It is, rather, the identity of the conscious subject with respect to space, by which we are an identical conscious subject with respect to any episode of outer perceiving (even when the uptakes are not associatively connected). It is the self-same, identical subject of intellectual consciousness as in empirical apperception accompanied by empirical rules, only now that identity is effected by the accompanying of pure rules. Note that in *either* case, the fact that it is the constant unfolding of a rule that *constitutes* the identity of the cognizing subject throughout makes sense only if the subject’s identity is not that of an entity but that of the abidingness of an intellectual marshaling.

If I am correct, I can again reject Andrew Brook’s important, but mistaken, claim that

Kant never seems to have connected the integration of competencies [the unity of the understanding and its unity with imagination] to the unity of consciousness.⁴

Only this time, I have connected pure apperception and the pure imagination to being an identical self-conscious subject (conscious of itself as the subject via schemata) through extended episodes of outer perception. Furthermore, if I am right, the “functionalist” interpretation of these competencies is also mistaken. These are not subpersonal competencies generating an organism’s representations. Being throughout prone to regulate and to form one’s proneness schematically, either in regard to space or directly in regard to appearances when they happen to be associable, is the very nature and reality of thinking consciousness that pertains to what is given from elsewhere and of the identity of the self as the (abiding) intellectual marshaling that it is. Not only is functionalism then a mistaken interpretation of Kant’s Paralogisms, it is also a mistaken interpretation of the three-fold synthesis (whether pure or empirical⁵) and so indeed of the entire *Transcendental Deduction*. Further, formalist and intentionalist interpretations of the *Transcendental Deduction*, I suggest, fail to take account of the distinction between the unification of a series of perceptual states by a thought or a rule (the topic of section 24 in the B Deduction, which I discuss in Chapter 9) and the identity or abidingness of the *determining* subject in keeping to that thought or rule (the topic of section 25). The former may be fairly said to give thought a formal role as unifying perceivings. The latter is the “determination of my existence” as a thinking subject through the perceiving states. The former may also be fairly said to make the unity of perceptual states “intentional,” as it pertains to those states all being the object of a single thought. The latter, however, is not a matter of my abidingness being any sort of object of thought but rather of my constancy as a subject in keeping to that unifying thought.

(II) PURE APPERCEPTION AND TIME

Let us consider again an extended experiential episode that does not proceed associatively, such as seeing the sky, then turning to listen to a friend, then walking into a room, etcetera. The spatial shifting, as I said, is still subject to a rule. Once the rule governing an episode is spatial, it must be geared to the rate of spatial shifting because how space functions as a form of empirical intuition is determined by how quickly one spatially shifts. What one intuits, that is, depends on when one gets there. Gearing the spatial shift to a rate involves gearing it to a “marking” of a sheer progressiveness of attention. So, for example, one walks into the room with steps that are paced by the marking of one’s temporal attending. Roughly, I mentally mark time and proceed in accord with (paced by) the marking. This is one way time functions as a mediate form of outer intuition. Spatial shifting at a pace, by itself, is a skill or a “blind” synthesis, and so the proneness to so shift can be attributed to the pure, but blind, synthesizing imagination. The rule now is the proneness to regulate such performance (such production of the pure spatiotemporal manifold). As usual, for the episode of outer perceptual apprehension to proceed in accord with the rule is for me throughout to be prone to regulate being so far along in that episode. Thus, at the second step of my walking into a room, I am prone to regulate (assess, correct, guide, etc.) not the beginning of the performance but the performance being at that stage. This adjustment to how far along I am is just what it is for the rule to remain in force through the episode. At various stages, then, in our ongoing performance the accompanying rule involves, in regard to its temporal component, a proneness to regulate being so far along in the marking of the sheer progressiveness of attention. Once again I relax the Kantian abstraction and consider bodily actions that shift the sheer progressiveness of attention, or what I have called temporizing activities. Such an activity in this case, which I shall call the marking-time activity, might be that one makes repeated downbeat gestures to which one gears one’s spatial shifting. These gestures, note, don’t point or direct “outward,” but flow down, or are kept near and towards me. Though the gestures are spatial (a sweep down of my arms), they are not directing attention outward; they are keeping attention with me and determining it (marking it). Kant says, at B154,

Even time itself we cannot represent save in so far as we attend in the drawing of a straight line [say, a downbeat gesture] . . . merely to the act . . . whereby we successively determine inner sense.

Although I believe that in this passage Kant is referring to the schematic imagination, as the schema is a rehearsal or a going-through-the-motions, the same would pertain to what it is a rehearsal of (namely, the timing activity). The proneness to regulate being so far along in the

sheer progressiveness of attention is the proneness to regulate being so far along in marking time or temporizing. Equivalently, this is the proneness to regulate being so far along temporally in the episode.

As usual, when the rule is a judgment, the species of regulation is positive assessment, and so the proneness is to positively assess being so far along temporally in the episode. Suppose the episode began with being affected dog-wise (before looking at the sky, etc.). Then, at each later stage, I am prone to positively assess being so far along temporally from first being dog-wise affected. My proneness, that is, is to positively assess being *past* dog-wise affection. This I suggest is a judgment regarding past reality (how it was), which we can verbally express as “It is proper to be so far along in timing from first being affected dog-wise.”

If it made sense to have such rules for being so far along in timing, not just at a stage of having done so but independently of having done so⁶, then we could have (with the employment of number as the schema of magnitude) rules for being up to or at stage *k* in timing-by-downbeats for any number *k*. Thus if *k* is large enough, we would have rules that pertain to the remote past. We could then cognize what is real in the remote past by a rule for being so far along (up to stage *k*) in timing from first being affected (= a rule for being so far past being thus affected). In this way, the Kantian cognition of the remote past would not be to depict an occurrence existing in its own right at a point of past objective time but to have a rule for being beyond or past being affected. This would be in line with Kant’s understanding that what is real in the remote past is what is real

in a past time-series . . . a series however, which can be represented as actual not in itself but only in the connection of a possible experience. (A495, B523)

Again, verbally, I can express the rule as “It is proper to be up to *k* in timing from first apprehending dog-wise.” With *k* being large enough, this would express a Kantian judgment (proneness to positively assess) regarding a dog existing before I was born (or in the remote past). As in the space case then, what is real in time for Kant is not what is actually encompassed by the sheer progressive shifting of attention; it is what is encompassed by the propriety of being so far along in such shifting (whether actually done or not). In this manner, again, Kantian cognitions, as rules regarding timing, are compatible with the transcendental ideality of time.

The upshot of this discussion is that the accompaniment of an ongoing rule through an outer intuiting episode involves a rule not just for spatial shifting, but a rule with a component for the sheer progressiveness of attention, and indeed for being in the course of (or so far along in) such temporal progression of attention. Just as in the space case the pure manifold of space in its topological aspects (directionality of shift, extent of shift, etc.) is brought under rule, so too as the rule pertains to the timing component,

the pure manifold of time in its topological aspect of past-present-future directionality is brought under rule. I thus have a defense of Kant's claim that being an identical thinking subject in regard to or throughout nonassociative experiential episodes presupposes rules for spatiotemporal shifting explicitly in its topological dimensions (viz, as a pure manifold).

Note again it is exactly the nonassociativity of the episodes that requires such rules. This is not to say that an associative episode, such as simply apprehending dog-wise, is nontemporal: only that the rule doesn't involve a rule for timing *itself*. The dog-wise rule doesn't tell me how fast to perceive (how to gear my perceiving to timing), although it involves of course the skill of doing it fast enough if the dog is moving and there isn't much time to apprehend.

As usual, now the formulation of the proneness to regulate is the schema or the production of a rehearsal that goes through the motions. In this particular case, the schema of being prone to regulate being so far along in temporizing is to make quick (rushed) marking-time gestures up to the stage one is at and then relatively more relaxed gestures of how to proceed. It is like a modeling to small temporal scale of the actual timing, with the initial rushing indicating one is already past that timing. To clarify this, let's look at an analogy. Suppose I am going to bake a cake and have a rule for doing so. The initial schema or rehearsal would be to quickly go through the motions of what I am supposed to do (I "feign" reaching for the pan, cracking eggs, etc.). Suppose now that I am in the course of this activity. The pan has beaten eggs and flour in it, but not yet vanilla, and so on. The schema now (which formulates my proneness to regulate being at this stage of the procedure or which formulates the original rule still being in force) is to quickly rush through the motions of what is past or already done and then gesture the rest of the procedure at relatively relaxed rate (the rate, say, of the initial rehearsal). This "formulates" that I am supposed to be past (or through or beyond) certain stages. Note that in my guiding another who, in the middle of the baking, mistakenly goes back to crack some eggs, I would quickly rush them with my gestures through already accomplished stages and then indicate by more relaxed gesturing what is yet to be done. Kant says at A102,

When I seek to draw a line in thought, or to think of the time from one noon to another . . . the various manifold representations that are involved must be apprehended by me *in thought, one after the other.* (italics mine),

which seems to imply that I go through the succession from one noon to another in thought (viz, I rehearse the timing to scale). At B154 he says,

Even time itself we cannot represent [in thought] save in so far as we attend in the *drawing* of a straight line [in thought] merely to the act of the synthesis by which we successively determine inner sense.

I take him to be saying here that even in just thinking time I determine inner sense. If so, he is saying I must actually progressively shift attention in order to think time. This coheres, I believe, with my contention that the schema of the thought is a “scaled down” version of the actual progression that time (as a form of intuition) is.

My interest, as I remarked, is not the deduction of the categories, and so I will skip Kant’s presentation of the schemata of particular categories and of how such schemata are “given expression” by categories. I note however that his characterization of the schema of a pure concept (A142, B181) does fit my interpretation. He says such a schema

can never be brought into any image whatsoever.

Recall an empirical schema is for a procedure with perceptual uptake. I have suggested that a holistic perceptual uptake is a more instructive notion than an “image.” In any case, the pure procedure (the pure progressiveness of attention) that the pure schema rehearses has per se no perceptual uptake at all: thus neither does the schema (the rehearsal). Kant goes on to say the pure schema

is a transcendental product of the imagination, a product which concerns the determination of inner sense in general according to conditions of its form (time) in respect of all representations.

This I suggest is just the idea that the schema is a “rehearsal” of time, which is a form of all representations (inner or outer), and Kant ends by saying

so far as these representations are to be connected *a priori* in one concept in conformity with the unity of apperception.

The schema, that is, is tied to a concept (a rule) by which what arises in the course of an actual episode is connected . . . in conformity with the unity of apperception. It is the employment of the rehearsal as a template or monogram of how one must proceed throughout an episode that connects representations (any uptake there happens to be) under apperception (that makes the temporally extended episode with whatever uptake something that belongs to the identity of my consciousness throughout). I caution again that Kant sometimes uses the term ‘schema’ for the template itself and sometimes for the entire rule (formulated with the template). This, together with his not always distinguishing the blind synthesizing imagination (pure or empirical) from the schematic imagination (the imagination that produces the template), often makes his presentation obscure.

According to Heidegger, Kant thinks of time as a series of nows as opposed to a flow or ecstasis. He says that Kant does not understand that

It is this transposition of the self into itself stretched in all dimensions of temporality which constitutes the genuine existential concept of identification of the self.⁷

If I am correct, Heidegger is triply mistaken in his assessment of Kant. First, the Kantian schema for time (as the self progresses by rule in an episode) is exactly an “ecstasy” of the self “transferring” itself as being further and further along in the flow of progressive attention (temporizing). Second, Heidegger is wrong to hold that just the ongoing schematizing itself is a genuine “concept of identification of the self.” The schematizing itself, without the tie to the rule for proceeding that it formulates (the template without being *employed* to regulate) is just a meaningless ongoing “pantomime” accompanying the proceeding that doesn’t constitute either my ongoing identity (as a thinker) or my (regulating) being in the world, as it by itself is tied neither to my intellectual marshaling nor to what is thereby schematized (*viz.*, a form of intuition or a temporal proceeding in an episode). Kant says regarding space and the figuring of the productive imagination,

yet even this . . . would be nothing but a playing with a mere figment of the brain, were it not that space has to be regarded as a condition of the appearances which constitute the material for outer experience. (A157, B196)

Similarly, I believe, Heidegger’s “self-transposition” by itself is just a figment (not part of genuine *Dasein*) without its pertaining to all possible appearances. For Kant it is the schema as a formulation of a proneness to regulate the form of appearance-obtaining commerce that gives the schema worldly significance.

Third, note that for Kant it is the real time of the world that flows as possible (proper) attention shifting (or the timing activity that effects such shifting). Time never becomes a composed series of *nows* for Kant. I believe Kant (unlike Heidegger in *Being and Time*) basically succeeds in showing how “ecstatic” self-transposition (given the propriety of shifting it formulates or blueprints) is also the time of the entire world. I show in Part V, Chapter 11, that with the category of substance, Kant can have rules for being in the course of arbitrarily long temporizing (flowing) procedures, putting me as an intellect in world-time (in world time-flow). Heidegger’s “flattened-out-series-of-nows, (“scientific” world time) is not, *contra* Heidegger, how Kant would ever have thought of time, as it is exactly what Kant would have rejected as a transcendental realist conception of time. For Kant, world-time (and scientific time) is the full propriety of temporizing, including being in the course of temporizing.

Part IV

The Person as Subject

9 Apperception and Inner Sense

In the first subsection of this chapter I extend my analysis of accompanying a synthesis of apprehension by a rule to the case where the synthesis is one of apprehending our own inner states of perceiving. This subsection begins with a discussion of inner and outer sense and then basically covers Section 24 of the B edition Deduction that begins at B152 (starting “This is a suitable place for explaining the paradox . . .”). In the second subsection of this chapter, I extend the connection I found between the ongoing accompaniment of a rule and the identity of the intellectual subject throughout what is accompanied to the case of a synthesis of inner apprehension. This yields the analysis of what it is to be an identical intellectual subject through an episode of inner apprehending of one’s own perceiving states. This subsection basically covers Section 25 of the B edition Deduction. If I am correct, the transition from Section 24 to Section 25 (both regarding a synthesis of inner attending) is parallel to the transition in the A edition Deduction (regarding a synthesis of outer attending) from the

formal unity [unity in accord with a rule] . . . in the synthesis of the manifold of representations (A105)

to the identity of the subject through those representations:

For the mind could never think its identity in the manifoldness of its representations . . . if it did not have before its eyes the identity of the act whereby it subordinates all synthesis of apprehension . . . to a . . . unity . . . according to . . . rules. (A108)

The discussion in this chapter regarding inner sense will count as further textual evidence that Kant’s intellectual subject is intellectual marshaling action. Furthermore, the application of my analysis to the parallel case of inner sense in this chapter will be key to understanding Kant’s conception of a person in the Third Paralogism. Being a person for Kant (see Chapter 10) involves understanding oneself as a cognizing being. For discursive intellects such as ours, cognizing requires being in receptive or perceiving states; only insofar as we can cognize our own states can we understand ourselves as (identical)

cognizing beings. The discussion in this chapter then will prepare the way for my discussion of Kant's positive doctrine in the Third Paralogism.

(I) KNOWING MYSELF AS I APPEAR TO MYSELF

In a synthesis of inner apprehension one's attention is retracted inward, and what is thereby focused on, for Kant, are one's own states of perceiving: how one is looking at things, listening, etcetera. Kant is not interested in any feelings one may thereby attend to nor in any images that may come before one's mind. Rather he is interested in those states by which we are outer receptive. He says of inner sense,

the representation of the outer senses constitute the proper material with which we occupy our mind. (B67)

In a synthesis of inner apprehension, then, one is outer perceiving but only peripherally because the focus of attention is on the perceiving, not what is perceived. Suppose I am walking in the woods, and I keep my attention retracted inward. This ongoing retracting of attending is a sheer progressiveness of attending (as opposed to a progressiveness of attention alongside oneself). This sheer progressiveness is the pure intuition that time is. This retracting of attending, I suggest, is the activity by which I get affected by my own perceivings. Kant says of time,

it can be nothing but the mode in which the mind is affected through its own activity (namely through the positing of its representations) and so is affected by itself. (B67)

The activity by which I get affected by my own perceiving is not the progressiveness of attending. That obtains whether my attention is outer directed or inward retracted. Rather, the activity is keeping my attention retracted. Even with my attention focused outward I am being affected, and so I am perceiving, and this perceiving arises as I outerly shift attention progressively, only I am not focused on it. In other words, retracting attention doesn't first make my perceivings temporal (they are already arising); it first "posits" them (makes them what is focused on).

Kant says (footnote (a) to B156),

I do not see why so much difficulty should be found in admitting that our inner sense is affected by ourselves. Such affection finds exemplification in each and every act of attention.

I do not believe he is saying that we affect our inner sense by altering it. We don't alter any manifold (whether inner or outer) by simply altering our

attention as between inner and outer. Rather, our inner sense is “affected” by us just in the fact that keeping our attention turned inward brings a manifold (of our own perceivings) into focus that is not otherwise in focus. This is what I think he means when he next says,

How much the mind is thereby affected [by keeping attention inward] everyone will be able to perceive in himself,

and what he means when he says at B68,

If the faculty of coming to consciousness of oneself [of one’s perceivings] is to seek out (to apprehend) that which lies in the mind, it [the faculty of coming to consciousness of oneself] must affect the mind, and only in this way can it give rise to an intuition of itself.

Again, the way the mind is affected (altered) by the activity of seeking out what lies in it is that a focus on what is outerly perceived is changed into a focus on (and so an intuition of) the perceiving of it.

What is discerned or focused on with attention held inward are our own receptive states. Kant’s way of putting this is that we have an inner sense by which we get affected by our states. The important point is not whether one calls it an inner sense or not but that apprehending these states is part of receptivity: that is, distinct from the spontaneity of thinking, even if we also conceptualize them. Kant says,

. . . the understanding in us men is not a faculty of intuitions, and cannot even if intuitions be given to sensibility, take them up *into itself* as to combine them as the manifold of its *own* intuition. (B153)

If I relax Kant’s abstracting from our bodily nature, then I can say that what we discern is, for example, that our eyes are straining to focus, that our head is tilted upward, that our fingers are pressing hard, and so on. These are all aspects of obtaining outer affection, but that is exactly the kind of receptive state, I have noted, that Kant is limiting himself to. What I thus discern about these aspects of being outer affected is not discerned by directing outer attention to them. I don’t look to see how my head is tilted, and I don’t reach with my other arm to feel how my fingers are pressing, etcetera. My attention in discerning them is all the while kept inward. It is these sorts of discernible aspects, I believe, that constitute the manifold of inner sense.

So far, then, I can say that a synthesis of inner apprehension is an outer experiential episode but with attention kept inward. This ongoing keeping of attention inward is an activity that affects the mind (brings a new manifold into focus) and is the activity by which this new manifold noticeably affects us (is discerned). The “mode in which the manifold is together in the

mind” when thus keeping attention inward is just that it arises in the *sheer* progressiveness of attention (=time).

I have one more point to consider before turning to how the understanding or the faculty of thought brings unity to this synthesis, and that is that the subject, as it is an object of inner sense

can be represented through it [inner sense] only as appearance. (B68)

My contention is that this means first that perceivings *exist* only *as arising* in the progressiveness of outer attention. They have no further existence as intrinsic stages of an *entity* (me) that exists underlying the action of (intellectually unfolding with) attending. Such stages of an entity, to be in time, would have to be in a time corresponding to the flow of attending. However, there is no such time, as time is merely the form of intuition and so exists only as the flow of attending. That perceivings thus exist only as arising in the progressiveness of outer attending implies that they exist (when focused on) only as appearing in the sheer progressiveness of inner attending. Even in inner attending, then, I don't discern intrinsic or internal stages of an entity (myself). To try to make this point clearer, as well as to reinforce my other claims regarding the inner manifold, I turn to Kant's argument at B156 for the claim that I know myself only as appearance in inner sense.

In regard to knowing myself in intuition, like other phenomena, only as I appear to myself, he says,

Indeed, that is how it must be, is easily shown—if we admit that space is merely a pure form of appearances of outer sense—by the fact that we cannot obtain for ourselves a representation of time, which is not an object of outer intuition, except under the image of a line. (B156)

He seems to be saying that the sheer progressive shifting of attending (time) basically exists as accompanying spatial shifting (“under the image of a line”). This doesn't mean that inner attending is an abstraction but, rather, that it is a focus, with outer attending remaining peripheral. He had already said,

Even time itself we cannot represent, save in so far as we attend, in the *drawing* of a straight line [an outer figurative representation] to the act . . . whereby we successively determine inner sense. (B154)

Suppose it is so that inner attending is always just a retracting of outer attending. Suppose further that outer affection is “mere appearance”: that is, exists only as affecting that arises in the course of progressively outer (spatial) shifting. Now outer affecting is inseparable from being outer affected, just as a body's gravitational attracting is inseparable from another body's being gravitationally attracted. Hence the perceiving (the

being affected), though only peripheral when we outer attend, arises only with the outer affecting. As the latter arises (or exists) only in the progressive spatial shifting, so does the perceiving. Because inner attending is only a shift or retracting of focus (retracting to the sheer progressiveness of that outer attending), the perceiving that, as peripheral, arises only in the progressiveness of outer attending now focally arises in (and only in) the retraction of that attending. Thus, from the fact that outer objects exist in space only as they externally affect in the course of progressive spatial shifting, it follows that perceivings (being externally affected) arise with that affecting (even if only peripherally) only in the course of that shifting, and so they arise focally to affect us only in the course of retracted attending (that very progressiveness within which they arise focally). Thus Kant can say,

If, then, as regards the latter [the appearances in outer sense] we admit we know objects only in so far as we are externally affected, we must recognize, as regards inner sense, that by means of it we intuit ourselves only as we are inwardly affected. . . . (B156)

It will turn out to be crucial to an understanding of the Fourth Paralogism that in retracting to inner sense we do not retract to a manifold (of perceivings) that didn't already exist in outer sense, but rather we retract to a focus on them by which they affect us (first become noticeable to us).

So far the synthesis of inner apprehension has no unity for the thinking subject that I am. As I keep noticing my perceiving (how my head is turned, how my fingers are pressing, etc.) in an episode of walking through the woods, there is a series of inner apprehensions but no recognition of that series and no fixed and abiding self. This is perfectly parallel to the case of a synthesis of outer apprehension, and, as in that case, the "formal" unity of a synthesis of inner apprehension for thought will be in terms of a rule, and the constant or abiding self will be the constant intellectual marshaling throughout for the unfolding of that rule. The former indeed is the topic of Section 24 of the B edition Deduction and of this subsection, whereas the latter is the topic of Section 25 and my subsection (ii).

I can skip merely empirical rules, for there is even less empirical association to base empirical rules on in regard to my perceivings themselves than there is in regard to the outer uptake of perceivings. Humean association is even less plausible (more accidental) for the unity of internal episodes than it is for the unity of outer episodes. A rule governing the pure progressiveness of attending itself, however, is always available. I again use the temporizing activity of marking time by downbeat gestures: an activity that keeps attention retracted inward and so effects and marks the pure progressiveness of attention. Then the rule governing perceivings is to mark time in order to discern specifically how I am perceiving (not, or not just, what I am perceiving). I might explicitly employ such a rule if I am in an

art gallery and have only so much time, say, to discern how to perceptually interact with what is to be seen, touched, and so on. Recall, Kant's claim is not that we are always unifying syntheses according to rules (let alone inner syntheses) but that we always can (roughly, our existence as unified subjects through episodes is always available). I return to this important point in Chapter 10.

Kant discusses the relation of the understanding's power of combining to the manifold of inner sense (arising in a synthesis of inner apprehension) at B153. I turn now to an exposition of this passage in terms of my account of schematized rules in Part III. Kant begins by saying

What determines [unifies] inner sense is the understanding and its original power of [collectively] combining the manifold.

Now a schematized rule is a rehearsal of the entire episode and serves as a template for regulating the episode. In this way it "combines" the manifold. But very quickly Kant goes on to say,

Now the understanding in us men is not itself a faculty of intuitions, and cannot even if intuitions be given to sensibility, take them up *into itself* in such a manner as to combine them as the manifold of its *own* intuition.

Literally, what belongs to the schematized or formulated rule is the rehearsal (what he will go on to call the "figurative synthesis"), not the manifold that is rehearsed (that only arises in the episode). What the understanding does "even if intuitions be given in sensibility" is to *accompany* the synthesis of apprehension by the formulated rule. He next says,

its [the understanding's] synthesis, therefore, if the synthesis be viewed by itself alone, is nothing but the unity of the act, of which, as an act, it is conscious to itself, even without (the aid of) sensibility.

The unity in the formulated rule itself (as an entire template or blueprint for regulating) pertains to the whole act of an episode of inner apprehending, and I am conscious of this whole act (via the template or blueprint) as what is required to be done, even without the aid of sensibility (that is, prior to doing it, or even without doing it at all). The formulated rule, that is, doesn't have to be accompanying an actual episode of inner apprehending. This is most clear in cases of guiding another, or in cases of formulating the rule, but then deciding not to proceed in accord with it. Although I have the whole act combined in mind (in the form of a template regulating) even without sensibility, this whole power of combining of the understanding

is yet able to determine the sensibility,

viz, it can regulate (accompany) an actual episode of inner attending. That Kant has the schematized understanding in mind in this passage is clear, as he goes on to say,

Thus the understanding, under the title of a *transcendental synthesis of imagination* performs this act [of regulating according to a template] upon the passive subject whose faculty it is,

and then that the act of this imagination is the “figurative synthesis” (=schematized rule).

Further, Kant has in mind (see B154) the pure imagination which “figures” time itself (not what arises in time). If so, then Kant is saying that what introduces unity into a synthesis of inner apprehending is a schematized rule for temporizing. This is just my claim that the “formal” unity of a synthesis of inner apprehension for thought is a pure rule for progressively attending.

In Section 24, in the paragraph beginning “How the ‘I’ that thinks . . .” (B155), Kant raises two issues he does not claim to have explained, but which he says

raise no greater or less difficulty than how I can be an object to myself all.

My contention is that both of these issues have been raised elsewhere by Kant and do not specifically concern how the formal unity of a rule is at the same time my existence as an intellect through a synthesis of inner apprehension. That, rather, is brought up in Section 25.

The first issue Kant claims not to have explained is how the ‘I’ that thinks can be the ‘I’ that intuits itself when other forms of intuition are possible. Thoughts, for Kant, are rules, and the mere notion of a rule (a mere intellectual synthesis) is the notion of necessity or requirement. This notion is separable from being a rule for timing and, so, from being a rule formulated by a schema (rehearsal) of timing. But Kant had already said that

This schematism of our understanding . . . is an art concealed in the depths of the human soul (A141, B180),

and I believe he is just reiterating in Section 24 that he is not explaining how our understanding is able to formulate rules by schematizing temporality. The second issue Kant raises is how I, when I am something other than what is given in intuition,

yet know myself like other phenomena only as I appear to myself.

I believe Kant's basic worry here is how I can affect myself (compare B68) or how inner affection is possible. Note that he similarly says of outer affection,

The *immediate* consciousness of the existence of outer things is, in the preceding thesis, not presupposed, but proved, be the possibility of this consciousness understood by us or not. (footnote (a) to B277)

The latter for Kant is like asking how gravitational attraction is possible. For Kant, reality is fundamentally action or affecting (not entities with intrinsic existence by which action takes place), and this is true for material action, material-to-mental action (the immediate consciousness of outer things), and mental-to-mental action (self-affection). Beyond this general denial of an intrinsic understanding of the possibility of action, any specific worry about an object affecting itself (acting on itself) should be somewhat ameliorated by thinking of it along the lines of something emerging from an object also affecting it. This is the case, for example, of a gun being affected (recoiling) by the bullet that emerges from it: Thus pulling the trigger affects the gun to shoot and also to be affected (to recoil) by what is elicited to emerge from it. I show in my final discussion in this chapter that perceivings can be understood as emerging from ourselves to (also) affect us.

Before turning to section 25 and the issue of our determining our existence as intellects, I want to consider how a rule for a synthesis of inner apprehending can also be a *judgment* regarding myself. My rule, recall, is to mark time (to mark keeping attention retracted) by downbeats (say from a first to a tenth downbeat) to discern specifically how I am perceiving (say to discern how my perceiving connects to what is seen and touched as I explore the look and feel of a dog). Suppose now I proceed with this synthesis and initially discern that my fingers flow easily along the contour of its coat. As the synthesis proceeds, my proneness to regulate keeps shifting, so that at each point I am prone to regulate being so far along in the exploratory procedure. Further, this procedure as an exploration is one in which some of what I was exploring for has been found out. For me to keep regulating a procedure of seeking out is exactly to keep tabs of what has been found out. Suppose now that I am at the tenth downbeat. Thus, I am prone to regulate being so far along (up to stage ten) in temporizing from first discerning what touching-dog-wise was like. Note that because outer attention, as claimed above, is still going on peripherally, I can focus on the touching while yet discerning it as dog-pertaining. I now use Kant's conception of this discernment as a matter of being affected by the touching, and, as usual, I use positive assessment as the mode of regulation pertinent to judgment. Then at the end of the synthesis, I am prone to positively assess being up to ten in temporizing from first being affected touching-dog-wise. Once again I can linguistically symbolize this thought by the claim: "It is proper to be up to ten in marking time from first touching-dog-wise." This

I suggest is the Kantian version of the claim: “I was touching a dog ten units ago”; that is, a claim about how things were with myself in the past or a claim about a past perceiving of mine. Note again that the Kantian version of a judgment about myself in the past, as a rule for positively assessing being past or beyond perceiving a certain way, is consonant with his doctrine of the transcendental ideality of time.

(II) DETERMINING MY EXISTENCE AS THE INTELLIGENCE THAT I AM

In Section 25, Kant turns to the issue of the existence of the thinking self that rules belong to. As noted at the beginning of this chapter, this would make the flow of the discussion from Section 24 to 25 parallel to the flow of the discussion in the A edition Deduction I considered in Chapter 7. Recall that there Kant first talked of the synthesis of recognition unifying the synthesis of apprehension under a rule (which I interpreted as accompanying it with a proneness to regulate). He then traced this “formal” unity of a rule back to a transcendental condition until he eventually equated the formal unity (the unfolding of the rule) with the necessary identity of the self through apprehension. The transition then was from the formal function of a rule (as unifying an apprehension or episode) to the identical subject of the rule. My contention is that Section 25 likewise is concerned with determining my existence as the *being (the subject) who* unifies inner sense, not with determining the unity of inner sense (which has already been done in Section 24). Further this “determining” of the existence of that being must mean determining it as an *identical* subject. The issue then is how the thinking subject which unifies or determines inner sense (and so is the *determining* subject) is itself to be determined in its existence as identical (or fixed through variation). One last preliminary point—Kant says,

the determination of my existence can take place only in conformity with the *form* of inner sense, according to the special mode in which the manifold which I combine is given in inner intuition. (B158)

The determination of my existence (as an intellect), that is, takes place not in conformity with inner sense but with its form (namely, time). It is in regard to time, or to the progressiveness of inner attending, that my existence is to be, or can be, determined. In particular, my existence is not to be determined by what is given in inner sense but by my being a subject (an intelligence) in regard to inner attending. It is then my identity as inner attending (not the unity of what arises in that attending) that in Section 25 constitutes my existence as an intelligence being determined (being something identical or fixed through variation).

Kant begins Section 25 by saying,

. . . in the transcendental synthesis . . . and therefore in the synthetic original unity of apperception, I am conscious of myself, not as I appear to myself, nor as I am in myself, but only that I am.

I exist as something other than, or more than, perceivings appearing in inner attending: namely as the unifying subject (the subject who unifies inner sense by a rule). Kant similarly says in footnote (a) to B158,

The “I think” expresses the act of determining [unifying] my existence. Existence [as more than what is unified] is already thereby given.

It is this existence (the ‘I think,’ the consciousness that I am, the intelligence conscious of its power of combination) whose determination is now at issue.

Kant goes on to say (B157)

Now in order to *know* ourselves, there is required in addition to the act of thought . . . a determinate mode of intuition whereby this manifold . . . is given.

As I am not appearance, however, what this means is that determining my existence as intelligence is not a matter of knowing myself as something given. Therefore, Kant says,

the determination of my existence can take place only in conformity with the *form* of inner sense. (italics mine)

The determination of my existence then is exactly in my being an intelligence that is “in conformity with” time but is not given in time. This I claim is exactly what I am in the unfolding of a rule for timing (for the progressiveness of inner attending). In being the subject of a rule that unfolds in conformity with attending, I am determined (in my existence) as an identical (abiding, fixed) subject through the attending.

As I have shown before, if I am an intellectual marshaling action coalesced about a rule for timing, the unfolding of this rule adjusts in conformity with timing, and the marshaling action abides (remains coalesced about the rule) exactly by thus adjusting. My very existence then is determined (fixed throughout variation) by being an identical marshaling “in conformity with” (shifting to being so far along in the regulating of) the form of inner sense.

In the footnote to B158 Kant says,

The “I think” expresses the act of determining my existence . . . but the mode in which I am to determine *this* [determining] existence, that is the manifold belonging to it, is not thereby given. (italics mine)

If again we take the mode in which I determine this existence to mean the mode of determination of the 'I think', then Kant is saying the mode in which I am a *fixed* intelligence is not provided simply by being the intellect that I am. The sheer 'I think' gives existence (as neither appearance nor thing in itself), but it does not give the fixity of that existence. Being an intelligence, fixed or identical through difference, requires there be difference that I am fixed or identical through. But, now, if my intelligence is to be the subject of rules, I can be fixedly marshaled to a rule through the difference of its unfolding in what it rules (time or inner attending). Without time there is simply nothing to be identical or steadfast through.

For determining my existence Kant says,

self-intuition is required.

Because Kant is talking of the mode of determining my existence as an act of determining, he must mean self-intuiting is required (not that anything be given but that I have a mode of attending by which a manifold can be given). Then, so to speak, the rule (and myself as marshaled about it) can be steadfast or identical through it (the attending). This is not to say that as a rule unfolds with attending I can intuit the lastingness of my intellectual fixity. The way time gives me a way of being a fixed intellect is by my being the fixed intellectual marshaling that accompanies it (to being so far along in the rule). I am conscious of this accompanying spontaneity (or can be) not by intuiting it in time but by transcendental self-consciousness (by the accompanying marshaling having the structure outlined in Chapter 5). It is only in being that sort of marshaling for the rule (encompassing its own marshaling as the source of the rule via formulating or schematizing it) that I can be fixedly self-conscious throughout. So Kant says,

I do not have another self-intuition which gives the *determining* in me (I am conscious only of the spontaneity of it) prior to the act of *determination*. . . .

It isn't prior to the act of determination (prior to the act of determining inner intuiting) that I am aware of my steadfast existence. Therefore,

I cannot determine my existence as that of a self-active being

by intuiting *myself*. As far as determining existence by intuiting goes

my existence is still only determinable sensibly, that is, as the existence of an appearance.

As difficult as Kant's (and my own) exposition in this section is, the idea as I have interpreted it is fairly simple. It is the transcendental ideality of

time that drives both claims Kant is making—that I know (or intuit) myself only as I appear and that I determine my existence as an intellect only in the act of determining (unifying) my existence as appearance. The former I discussed in subsection (i) in relation to Kant's Section 24. The latter is as follows: If my fixity through time were anything more than the accompanying fixity of my unifying attending, then it would be an aspect of my reality fixed in or through a time other than the time of progressive attending, contradicting Kant's claim that time is merely the progressiveness of attending.

In Section 25, finally, Kant is concerned to reiterate that even though my intellectual existence is in *accompanying* time, it is not separable from thus accompanying it. He says (B159),

I exist as an intelligence which is conscious solely of its power of combination, but . . . this combination can be made intuitable only according to relations of time which lie entirely outside pure concepts of the understanding, strictly regarded.

In this passage, the “pure concepts” are the pure categories (not the logical functions of judgment), or pure concepts involved in rules per se without restriction to what is regulated, so long as the form of intuition the rules accompany (unify) is sensible (not intellectual). The sheer notion of a fixed or steadfast spontaneous source of regulating is just that it is fixed or steadfast “through” the variation in its (pure) intuiting (its mode of attending), which may be other than progressive (temporal) attending. Still, as we can give no sense to other forms of attending, for us “fixed” or “steadfast” has to mean “abiding” or “constant” in a temporal sense.

A discursive intelligence (that thinks by rules that combine or unify what is given from elsewhere) can only be fixed in its existence as being the fixed accompaniment of unifying and can only know itself (be given to itself as it attends to its receptivity) as appearance. An intellectual intuition (that thinks without combining or unifying what is given from elsewhere) is not per se limited in either of these ways, though we have no idea of what such thinking could be.

I can use my discussion of Section 25, I believe, to explain the relation of particular thoughts (even abstract ruminations) to time. Without the identity or fixity of the subject, thoughts are “sparks of spontaneity.” But different thoughts or thinkings can only belong to an identical self if that self is the abiding source of an accompaniment of time by a rule. Thus thoughts themselves have to emerge in relation to the emergence and fixity of such a rule. In thus emerging, the thoughts themselves accompany time (emerge with or in the intellectual action of accompanying time by rule). Because they emerge in the accompaniment they don't *arise* in time like intuitions; but because they have no relation to a fixed self without emerging in the accompaniment, they have no intrinsic existence beyond thus emerging in

the intellectual accompaniment of time. In this way, thoughts or thinkings are neither appearances nor (atemporal states of) things in themselves, and pure apperception (and its identity) is not the existence of a pure intelligence whose thinking is divorced from time.

My result from Sections 24 and 25 is that by the unfolding of a rule for temporizing (for the progressiveness of keeping attention retracted), we are identical subjects through a synthesis of inner apprehension. This is exactly the same as my result for a synthesis of outer apprehension in Part III. There is one way, however, that the synthesis of inner apprehension is specifically important. We are discursively thinking beings in that our cognizing is by our thought unifying what is given from elsewhere (by our thoughts being rules for a given manifold). But then to be the cognizing beings we are entails that we are receptive beings (beings who can be in receptive states) or, in effect, perceiving beings. Bringing inner sense to apperception is equivalent to representing ourselves as perceiving beings. If we just had rules for outer syntheses of apprehension, we would be identical cognizing beings throughout (we would be perceiving or be outer affected), but we wouldn't be representing that we are beings apt for cognizing (*viz.*, beings who are in those receptive states). In other terminology, it is only in unifying a synthesis of inner apprehension that I determine my existence (throughout) as a discursively cognizing being.

I believe now that for Kant being a person is not only being an identical cognizing being but an identical cognizing being that can determine itself to be such a being. If so, then being a person (at least through an uninterrupted cognizing episode) is being an identical intellectual subject who can apply a rule for inner attending through the episode. Thus, even if I am outer attending and cognizing (unifying) what is perceived, I am a person who is thus attending only if I could throughout retract attention and govern the sheer progressiveness of retracted attending (time) by a rule. For my purposes, the important point is that to be a person (through an uninterrupted episode) requires not only that I can be constant in my regulating but that I can be constant in my regulating of specifically inner attending. In other terms, being fully actualized in one's personhood is exactly being an ongoing intellectual marshaling regulating one's inner point of view. One's personhood, that is, is fully activated by being a constant intellect with regard to one's own inner point of view or being an ongoing intellectual subjectivity cognizant of its own point of view for receptiveness. This is the key result I bring to the discussion of the Third Paralogism and Kant's conception of personal identity in Chapter 10.

There are basically two kinds of interpretations, alternative to mine, of Kant's understanding of the connection between the transcendental "self" (the intellectual thinking subject that I am) and the empirical "self" (the perceiving states that appear to me in inner attending). The first kind inflates the transcendental self to a noumenal, atemporal entity or reality. Peter Strawson expresses this view when he says,

If the appearances of x to x occur in time, they cannot be assigned to the history of the transcendental subject for that being has no history.¹

And David Carr says,

While I cannot *know* myself to exist as a transcendental subject, I *may* yet exist this way, not as appearance but as thing in itself.²

As against Strawson, in my view the transcendental subject has a history by being the (constant) source of a rule for timing that “unfolds” in its regulating with the timing (regulating being-so-far-along as the timing progresses), and it is within this history that its perceivings appear to it. As against Carr, in my view, though I cannot “know” my existence as a transcendental subject as what appears, my existence as such a subject is fixed throughout appearing to myself, and it is my existence as a (transcendentally) self-conscious subject (see Chapter 5) that is thus fixed throughout. The noumenal ground of my intellectual marshaling capacity may or may not be fixed in its existence and is not in time at all.

The second kind of alternative interpretation deflates the transcendental subject to something merely formal or abstract. Robert Howell at one point says,

As far as our grasp of this entity through the ‘I think’ goes, its identity is purely “formal” or, one might say, “functional”. What in itself plays the role on one occasion might be completely different from what plays the same role on another occasion.³

My existence as an ongoing intellectual marshaling action (which is the determination of the ‘I think,’ or its fixity throughout an episode) is no mere role or function—it is my being as an intellect. In one respect Howell is correct in that for Kant no identity of a real noumenal entity (underlying this constant intellectual action) is implicated in the ‘I think’ but that does not make this action merely formal or functional. The “merely” formal for Kant is the unifying function of a rule (apart from the subject as the source of the rule) that Kant discusses in Section 24. The determination of the existence of the subject who has rules (the transcendental subject) as in Section 25 is not merely formal. A similar mistake, I believe, is made by Andrew Brook. He says,

Remarkably enough despite adding *unity* and its *temporal* dimension to Hume, Kant’s account of what we can know about our own identity is exactly the same as Humes’.⁴ (italics mine)

Now the Hume-like account of our identity would be that our identity through an episode of perceivings is according to the empirical

associability of these perceivings. I call this Hume-like because I am not sure that Hume always distinguishes perceivings from uptake (inner from outer attending). If we add inner attending, we get the Kantian mere (un-unified) synthesis of inner apprehension: that is, a sheer progressiveness of retracted attending (time) within which perceivings are discerned. In this way a temporal dimension is added. If we add a rule that regulates the retracted attending, we get the Kantian synthesis of inner apprehension brought under the unity of apperception as in Section 24 (viz, the sheerly formal notion of a rule for attending accompanying the progressive attending, within which perceivings are discerned). At any stage this rule gives unity to what is being done (at any stage, that is, the rule is for being-so-far-along in the entire episode). This much, for Kant, adds no new knowledge of our *identity* beyond Hume's account. Brook's mistake is that he leaves out Section 25 where Kant, I contend, holds that my identity (the determination or fixity of my existence as an 'I think' or intelligence) is just in this unfolding of a rule, so long as what I am is not an entity but a constancy or fixity as the source of the unfolding rule. In my way of putting this, I am an ongoing or abiding intellectual marshaling action of coalescing about the rule. Kant would not say his contention in Section 25 is that we can know (intuit) more about our identity than Hume claims. Kant agrees with Hume that we cannot find our identity (our identical selves) arising within inner attending. In this sense, Brook is correct as far as knowing our identity is concerned. But for Kant I am an identical self, conscious of itself as having a rule throughout the episode. This surely is a huge addition to Hume's thought regarding the identity of the self-conscious being that I am. Kant's full response to Hume is that although as I keep looking inside myself, I find no identical self (just perceivings) that is because my identical self (conscious of itself) exists throughout in the intellectual constancy of the looking.

I believe the mistake of both the inflationary and deflationary alternatives probably turns on the truth that for Kant knowing myself as I appear is knowing just a series of (perceiving) states and on the falsehood that for Kant all existence is either appearance (phenomenal) or thing in itself (noumenal). It would follow from these two claims that the self appeared to is noumenal and that as far as our non-noumenal grasp of ourselves and our identity is concerned, we are mere appearance. But for Kant there is existence which is neither phenomenal nor noumenal, and it is this existence which is appeared to, which grasps itself in transcendental self-consciousness, and which, through being thus appeared to, is fixed or identical or abiding. This existence is the accompanying intellectual action I am in determining (unifying) my inner attending and is itself determined (fixed through variation) by being the identical intellectual action that keeps up with the attending. I repeat two references to Kant. He says at B157,

On the other hand, in the synthetic original unity of apperception I conscious of [though I do not know by intuition] myself not as I appear to myself, nor as I am to myself, but only that I am.

Thus there is a third mode of existence (neither existence intuitable in time, nor atemporal existence). He then says at B157–158,

It therefore follows that although my existence is not indeed appearance (still less mere [Hume-like] illusion), the determination [fixity, identity] of my existence can take place only in conformity with [by accompanying] the form of inner sense.

It is in this third mode of existence for Kant that my graspable identity lies.

(III) SOME LEFT OVER ISSUES

Kant does not, so far as I can tell, explicitly give an account of being the identical thinking subject through a “series” of having different and perhaps disconnected thoughts. I have shown that disconnected perceivings are unified for a single subject, not by their relations to one another, but by an unfolding rule for inner attending that unifies them as arising in that attending. I suggest this account could be extended to “thinkings” as well. Take the case of an internal monologue or train of thought where one is having these thoughts while attention is retracted inward. Although these thoughts (as sheer comprehensions, as opposed to be formulated verbally or schematically) do not arise (to be found) in the progression of inner attending, they do “accompany” that attending. If so, then just as the unfolding of a rule for inner attending unifies perceivings that arise and constitutes thereby my identity throughout (as a steady intellectual marshaling for holding onto the unfolding of the rule), so too the unfolding of a rule for inner attending unifies thinkings that accompany it and constitutes my identity thereby throughout the thinkings that accompany it. I am therefore the identical subject of the series of accompanying thoughts. At any stage of thus bringing thoughts under identical apperception I may be “forming” the thought for a report (if someone interrupts my train of thought by asking “What are you thinking?”) and so, in line with Chapter 5, at any stage I may be conscious of myself as the subject of the thought at that stage. Without the accompanying or overall predominant rule unfolding, however, I would still be only at each stage a subject conscious of itself having a thought but no identical subject throughout.

Kant also does not give a fully developed account of the relation between the thinking subject and the perceiving subject. I believe this is the source of certain charges that Kant’s account of the self is overly intellectualist, charges pressed most notably by Merleau-Ponty in *The Phenomenology of*

Perception. My contention is that a more developed account is consistent with Kant and that the danger is rather that his critics have pulled too far away from Kant's account of the intellect.

I have shown that for Kant I can think of perceivings by bringing them under rules for unifying inner attending and thereby be an identical thinking subject through a series of perceptions. But what makes them my perceptions? Why, when I retract attention, do I find or discern what belongs to me, the thinking subject? Just as thoughts belong to a subject not by being thought about, but by emerging, being coalesced about, held onto, etcetera, so too perceivings can belong to a subject not by being thought about but only by emerging from a marshaling that coalesces about the perceiving, holds onto it, etcetera. Now perceivings don't emerge from the *intellectual* marshaling that I am, and so I have to add, I believe, that our subjectivity (the marshaling action that we are) includes a perceptual marshaling action as well as intellectual marshaling action. Relaxing Kant's abstraction from bodily existence we can take this to be bodily potencies for perceiving. My seeing emerges from a whole realm of inchoate bodily posturings and orientings as well as from a generalized bodily alertness or readiness to perceptually focus elsewhere or otherwise. This is so whether I am outer or inner attending. Note that when I say a perceiving thus emerges from such action, this is consistent with saying this emergence is elicited by being outer affected. Just as pulling a trigger elicits, with how the gun is set up, the emergence of a bullet from it, so too being outer affected is an emerging from our bodily marshaling elicited in part by the character of the outer affection.

This much would provide a perceptual self to which perceivings belong but only as a "second" self or marshaling action in addition to the thinking self. Cassam is surely right when he says,

it surely makes it unattractive to suggest that the consciousness of oneself as a thinker can be detached from the consciousness of oneself as a perceiver.⁵

I have to add that the marshalings are "indivisible" in the sense of Chapter 4 or, at least, that I am never just an intellectual marshaling. However deep or concentrated or lost in thought, there is always a peripheral marshaling for perceiving, and I cannot imagine entering into a sheer marshaling concentrated on thinking that has no peripheral marshaling for perceiving. As per Chapter 4, I then am the "simple" (indivisible) subject of thinking and perceiving. It is conceivable that Kant had something like this in mind when he said,

The "I think" expresses an *indeterminate* empirical intuition; i.e., *perception* (and thus shows that sensation, which as such belongs to sensibility), lies at the basis of this existential proposition. (B424)

Even in the meditative cogito I am not a sheer thinking being, but am (at least inchoately) perceptually alert, even if without any focused perceiving.

Suppose then that we are this subject (this intellectual-cum-perceptual marshaling) that retracts attention inward to discern how we are perceiving: for example, how we are visually focusing, how our head is tilted, etcetera. I suggest that what arises in inner attending is never the full perceptual marshaling from which perceiving emerges. That remains ineluctably unattended to if what we discern is not just the visual experiencing but its emerging from us. If our complete perceptual marshaling were attended to, then there would be nothing for it or our visual experiencing to emerge from, and so our visual experience would not be discerned as emerging from us or what we coalesce about. Further, if I could attend to my full perceptual marshaling, I could supposedly also think of it and so, as thus thinking, I would again be a pure thinking subject (a pure intellectual source). Rather than being a simple (indivisible) self (marshaling action) within which thinking and perceiving are discerned as emerging (and so belonging), there would be a thinking self that had as “object” a perceiving self. Cassam characterized this view (which he rejects) as follows—

Thus, it is the subject qua thinker or core-self which cannot be grasped ‘as an object’ and whose status as an object among others in the world is deeply problematic . . . the bodily self [the perceptual marshaling source] might be the *presented* subject of sensation and perception [inner attending].⁶ (italics mine)

Although I now have it that what I inner attend to emerges from the intellectual-cum-perceptual marshaling that I am, it seems to emerge from only the perceptual aspect of the marshaling. Although my subjectivity is unified (indivisible), the emerging seems not to be from this “whole” subject. For this discernment, or sense of the perceiving, to belong to the indivisible subject that I am, it must be that there is some inchoate intellectual marshaling that coalesces or holds onto (or lets go of) the perceiving that is attended to. Usually in retracting attention we are not merely trying to find out how it is with our perceiving, but we are trying to control it, correct it, assess whether it is functioning properly, experiment with it, etcetera (all in regard to its usual function of providing information about our surroundings). Inner attending is not usually sheer inner exploring; it is exploring to see how it is working, what happens when it varies, etcetera, or exploring at the service of regulating. If I say that at least implicitly (inchoately) the potency for regulating is always part of the marshaling for perceiving when attention is directed inward, then the perceiving attended to is something emerging from, held onto, or modified by our intellectual-cum-perceptual marshaling.

Assuming my discussion can be worked out in a plausible way, I would have the result that as we proceed to regulate an episode of inner attending,

what we find (or are affected by) are perceivings that emerge from the same subject that is focused on the regulation of the episode. That I can thus be affected by what belongs to me goes part of the way towards addressing the question Kant appears content to leave open, viz,

how I (the “I” that thinks) can be an object to itself at all, and more ,
an object of intuition and of inner perception (B156)

or towards addressing the difficulty he raises,

The whole difficulty is as to how a subject can inwardly intuit *itself* and this is a difficulty common to every theory. (B68; italics mine)

In inner attending, I am not only attending to what belongs to me (perceivings) but to what I can be conscious of as belonging to me. In other terms, I am not only aware of perceivings that belong to (emerge from) me, but I am aware of myself as the subject of the perceivings. In Chapter 5, I analyzed transcendental self-consciousness (consciousness of myself as the subject of thoughts) or consciousness of the thinking subject that I am. I claim I can extend that analysis to consciousness of myself as the subject of perceiving. As I inner attend, suppose I notice *how* I am perceiving and attempt to alter or modify my state in order to see how that changes *what is* perceived. This would be the case with a child experimenting with, say, pressing his eyeballs to discern how that varies what is outer detected or an adult who is puzzled by what is seen and re-forms his perceiving (refocuses his eyes, alters the tilt of his head, etc.) to see what happens. These cases have the two components of my analysis of self-consciousness, or consciousness of ourselves as subject—a *forming* of a perceiving encompassed by a wider (and outer-directed) predominant marshaling concentrated on finding out how the forming of the perceiving is “reflected” on changes of outer uptake. My being the *source* of perceiving is thus encompassed within my overall predominant marshaling, and so I am conscious of myself as the subject (source) of perceiving. I have then my final result for the integration of the thinking subject with the perceiving subject as follows: As we proceed to regulate a synthesis of inner attending, what we find are perceivings that belong to us and (when re-forming or adjusting) perceivings that we are conscious of as belonging to us.

In the first *Critique*, Kant abstracts from our moods, feelings, desires, and evaluations, as he is interested in the cognizing self. The account I have just given of the perceiving “self” and how it is to be integrated with the thinking or the intellectual self can perhaps be carried over as well to the self as what valuations belong to. There would be no pressure, I believe, towards equating the self with an entity from thus incorporating practical goal-directed resources. Whether, and in what way, Kant does so is beyond the scope of this work. One significant consequence, however, for Kant’s

metaphysics of the practical self is a version of agent causation. If I take deliberations to be constituted by thoughts and the intellectual self, integrated with behavioral and evaluation resources, to be an agent, then my view implies that thoughts going into deliberations emerge from the agent and are held or discarded by the agent. As the agent itself exists in and as action, this notion of agent causation is not a case of a thing or substance causing an event but of the action I am yielding results. However, for Kant such agent causation is not freedom. As I have shown, the agent (the subject) and its deliberation (its thoughts) both exist temporally for Kant, and for him whatever exists temporally is causally determined by preceding actions or events. Hence, although I am the source of my deliberations, that I am the source of any particular deliberation is causally determined by preceding occurrences.

My discussion has indicated how our nature as intellectual beings may be integrated with our nature as perceiving beings. Within the short-term intercourse with our environment, neither of these is dominant. When it comes to our existence as persons with a history in a world stretching into prehistory, however, perceptual bodily subjectivity will not accomplish much, and our intellectual (representational) capacities must come to the fore. In this larger sense of being worldly subjects, Merleau-Ponty's deemphasizing of the intellect loses much of its plausibility, just as I claimed in Chapter 8 that Heidegger's deemphasizing of judgment and intellect in relation to temporalizing loses plausibility as an account (even descriptive) of full world time (the time in which we too as "long-range" subjects, or persons, have our being). There comes a point when the extension of the relation of our being to our own personal history and the history of the world makes our intellectual nature, if not separable, nevertheless paramount. These claims should become clearer when I consider the role apperception plays in our relation to ourselves as persons in Chapter 10 and again in Chapter 11. Kant can accommodate the insights of Merleau-Ponty and Heidegger as enrichments of his basic views, but they, without Kant's insights into our fundamental intellectual nature, leave us with no sustainable understanding of ourselves and the wide world

10 The Third Paralogism and Kant's Conception of a Person

So far I have considered being an identical intellect through an inner episode by accompanying inner attending with an unfolding rule. Now we are hardly ever engaged in so regulating inner attending. For most of the time we are merely outer attending, and even then we are often doing so habitually without any accompaniment by rule. Just as obvious, when sleeping we are not regulating inner attending. But at these times we are the persons that we are. Kant says,

For personality does not itself at once cease because its activity is for a time interrupted. (A365)

In this chapter I argue that for Kant a person is an ongoing capacity for being an identical intellect accompanying inner attending, which exists even when not active. Put in other terms, a person is an ongoing capacity for being an abiding intellectual grasp of an inner point of view belonging to that grasp. In still other terms a person is an ongoing capacity to be an identical subject (an 'I think') of an inner history. In this view the identity of a person is neither the identity of an entity nor a mere series of states connected by psychological relations.

In subsection (i) I analyze the text of the Third Paralogism leading to the conclusion that this indeed is Kant's conception of a person. In subsection (ii) I present Kant's view somewhat more systematically as a view according to which a person is that which is able to represent itself subjectively throughout the time it has existed as the abiding bearer of its states. I then discuss how Kant's view contrasts with psychological connectedness views as developed, for example, by Derek Parfit, with particular regard to the issue of fission and fusion. I defer until Chapter 11 a comparison of Kant's identity-of-bearer view with views according to which a person is a body of a certain sort (bodily identity views).

(I) THE TEXT OF THE THIRD PARALOGISM

I focus on the A edition Paralogism. Kant says very little in the B edition that is specific to this Paralogism. As with the first two Paralogisms, the

major premise is a definition, and the minor premise brings something (the soul) under that definition. In the present case, the definition is of a person as that which is conscious of its numerical identity at different times. The minor premise attributes this defining feature to the soul. My contention is that the ambiguity over the middle term is whether numerical identity signifies the numerical identity of an entity or signifies the numerical identity of a capacity for unifying (states arising in) inner attending. In the latter signification the soul (a person) is not an entity at all. Now Kant agrees with the rational psychologist that the soul or the identical subject (however understood) is not intuitably given in inner or outer sense. If the soul were an entity (something beyond the sheer capacity for intellectual unifying), then its identity at different times would violate the transcendental ideality of time. It would have some intrinsic existence beyond accompanying inner attending, and so its temporal nature would be something other than accompanying the course of such attending. As it is not intuitable, its temporal nature would be other than either accompanying or arising within the course of inner attending. Time then would not be the mere form of inner intuiting (nothing apart from inner intuiting). Given the transcendental ideality of time, then, what is identical through my temporal existence would have to itself be atemporal or noumenal. What would make me the same person at different times then is that I am throughout underlain or grounded by a single noumenal entity. As the argument supposedly establishes its conclusion on the basis of my representing myself as the same at different times (something Kant accepts), Kant would be forced to conclude that I have knowledge of myself as a noumenon, which clearly violates his entire metaphysics.

As with the first two Paralogisms, the rational psychologist is thinking of a person generally (or objectively) as being what represents itself as identical at different times. For Kant, on the other hand, any conclusion from the minor premise has to be drawn rather from subjectively undergoing such self-representation. Undergoing such self-representation only supports that I am (now) the very reality that is represented (as formerly existing). As what I am now (as subjectively discerned) is no more than an action for such self-representation, it follows that all one can conclude is that I am an exercise of the very *capacity* for such action (that has been ongoing as a capacity).

Kant's formal presentation of the paralogism aside, the key issue is whether the consciousness of myself as having been so-and-so (having been in certain states) is the consciousness of a substance or entity. In the first paragraph, I believe, Kant will recapitulate from the Deduction what it is to be an identical self (an identical apperception) in undergoing an *uninterrupted* episode of inner attending. This, recall, is not to be an identical entity but an abiding intellectual (marshaling) action accompanying and unifying inner attending. But now Kant will have to consider the issue of my identity through or across interruptions of such action. I am conscious

of myself this morning as the same subject I was last night before I fell asleep. Clearly Kant's analysis of identity as an ongoing action won't apply. It seems then that the entity theorist can now come back and say the only identity I can have when not in action is that of an entity, and as my identity when in action is the same as when not in action, I must throughout be a soul, in the sense of an entity conscious of its numerical identity at different times. I believe it is the point of the second through fourth paragraphs to reject this argument. Indeed the fifth paragraph which recapitulates what has been done up to it, clearly concerns the nature of identity through interruption; concerns, that is, the fact that

personality does not itself at once cease because its activity is for a time interrupted.

The first paragraph concerns my identity through an uninterrupted stretch of time. Such an episode can be called an extended cogito. At any stage through the short time period, I can think of myself as being so far along through the period. At each time, then, I am conscious of my identity through the earlier times. I believe Kant accepts that this extended cogito is witness to my identity as subject through the episode, just as the Cartesian cogito is witness to my existence as a present subject. Kant's contention, however, is that it is not therefore witness to my being an identical entity through the episode. He makes this claim by recapitulating his account from the A edition Deduction of the identity of apperception through an episode (through a synthesis of apprehension), only now applied to an episode of (uninterrupted) inner attending. He says,

Now I am an object of inner sense and all the time is merely the form inner sense. Consequently I refer each and all my successive determinations to the numerically identical self, and do so *throughout* time [viz, uninterruptedly], that is, in the form of inner intuition of myself.

This passage, I believe, is to be understood along the lines of my discussion in Part III. As I proceed in inner attending, at any stage I "refer each and all my successive determinations to the numerically identical self" by having the rule at that stage for being so far along in the attending (with whatever determinations or inner states arise). To "do so throughout time" then is just for this rule to unfold throughout the inner attending. It is just this unfolding of a rule for inner attending that constitutes my going through a stretch of time as an intellect that refers what it is going through to itself: viz, this is the undergoing of the extended cogito. But now Kant says

This being so, the personality of the soul has to be regarded *not as inferred* but as a completely identical proposition of self-consciousness in time. (*italics mine*)

Here Kant is equating, as being literally the same thing, the personality of the soul (being an identical subject throughout inner apprehension) with “self-consciousness in time” (with the referring of determinations to myself throughout). My real identity, that is, is equated to the unfolding of the rule throughout (by which I represent being so far along). The reason he gives for this equation is

For it [the personality of the soul] says nothing more than that in the whole time in which I am conscious of myself, I am conscious of this time as belonging to the unity of myself.

That is, the numerical identity of the subject through time is nothing more than the unfolding of the rule for inner attending (=the constant unifying of inner attending for thought). I have shown this equation before in the A edition Deduction where Kant says,

The original and necessary consciousness of the *identity of the self* is thus the same time [is the same thing as] a consciousness of an equally necessary *unity* . . . according to rules . . . For the mind could never think its identity *a priori* if it did not have before its eyes the identity of its act . . . rendering possible . . . interconnection according to . . . rules. (A108, italics mine).

As usual, in my interpretation this equation makes sense if the numerical identity of the self is just the abidingness of intellectual action (for being the source of the unifying rule that unfolds). Note then that Kant in the just-quoted passage of the Third Paralogism is not saying my identity is only a “logical” identity. Rather he is saying my identity (as an abiding intellect) is exactly the same thing as, or is logically identical to, self-consciousness in time (the unfolding of a rule that unifies inner attending). Any further identity of myself as an entity that undergoes that action is not given in the extended cogito and so would have to be “inferred.” In denying that personality has to be inferred Kant is explicitly denying any notion of my identity through the episode that goes beyond undergoing the representation of my identity in the episode.

Kant ends the paragraph by saying,

. . . it comes to the same thing whether I say this whole time is in me, as individual unity, or that I am to be found as numerically identical in all this time.

Again he is equating my (at each stage) unifying, the whole time I am going through, with being identical through this time. Put in terms of my interpretation, the unfolding of the rule for timing (at each stage unifying timing already gone through for my thought at that stage) is equivalent to the

abidingness of the intellectual action (for the rule) that I am. One should avoid a merely "intentionalist" interpretation of this last sentence according to which I only exist momentarily, and the time or previous existence is only in me (then) as an intentional object (what I am thinking)—so that *therefore* there is no abiding 'I' or subject throughout but only a series of successive 'I's with intentions. It is true for Kant that there is therefore no abiding entity but not that therefore there is no real identity. At each stage I am the intellectual marshaling for (or the source of) the rule by which I refer what has gone on to me (by which I think of being so far along). Throughout, therefore, I am this identical intellectual marshaling action (intellectually abiding in the unfolding of the rule), and that is a real identity. In thus being the constant intellectual accompaniment that keeps giving unity to inner attending (=this whole time is in me as individual unity), I am thereby the abiding or identical intellectual action shifting or adjusting with the attending (= I am numerically identical in all this time).

In my interpretation, then, all that exists and is discerned by *undergoing* the uninterrupted episode (as opposed to inferring something further from it) is my identity as an intellectual marshaling action accompanying the progressiveness of time. Note further that, in Kant's view, to be the intellectual action of representing (unifying), being so far along in attending is to be the same intellectual action that abides and so is represented. Self-representation, that is, is a matter of being the very reality that is represented, without having to identify any reality as being me, as the representation shows which ongoing self I am. Of course the same would be true if I were an (identical) entity that acts, but the point remains that nothing in undergoing the cogito reveals that I am an entity at all.

All this would refute the rational psychologist's argument were it not for the problem of interruption. The result of the first paragraph simply cannot, as is, be carried over to that case. By definition there is no abiding or constant intellectual action during an interruption (sleep, habitually moving about one's business, etc.). The rational psychologist then can now argue that only if I am presently and was (prior to the interruption) the same entity could it be that I am anything identical throughout that whole time. Kant, unlike John Locke, accepts that I am the same person when asleep as when awake. Once again, he says in the fifth paragraph,

For personality does not itself at once cease because its activity is for a time interrupted.

The second through fourth paragraphs present Kant's response that, despite the interruption, my identity is not that of an entity (whether conceptualized or intuited).

In the second paragraph, Kant talks of viewing myself from the standpoint of an observer as an object of his outer intuition. He does not mean the observer intuits my thinking self. I showed in the Second Paralogism

that for Kant one subject represents another only by projecting or transferring their own subjective consciousness. Indeed Kant says here that the observer will

admit [not intuit], therefore, the "I" which accompanies . . . with complete identity all representations at all times.

The observer, that is, is still projecting back onto my subjective consciousness. Kant says the time of the supposed observer is not the time of my own consciousness. I believe this means the observer may uninterruptedly intuit my body even in the time when my consciousness is interrupted (when I am not thinking of time or unifying inner attending). There is no other reason for Kant to go through the detour of inviting me to take the position of an outside observer intuiting and projecting back onto me than to introduce the discrepancy between my in fact interrupted consciousness and his uninterrupted consciousness. What I cannot do (without this detour) is be an uninterrupted consciousness projecting onto my own interrupted consciousness. Kant now says,

He will draw no inference from this to the objective permanence myself.

In other words, he will not conclude simply from the lastingness of my body that I am a person through the period of interruption. The reason is that in just observing my body he cannot project back his identity onto me through the interruption. What is required for any such projection, I suggest, is for him to think that but for me not being active (but for my needing to be activated), I am an ongoing consciousness of time or, equivalently, an ongoing intellectual marshaling for unifying inner attention. If this is correct, then Kant is saying that it is not by bodily identity through interruption that I am a person through interruption (that personhood can be projected onto me through interruption). Rather, my being such a person is the ongoingness of the capacity to be such an abiding intellectual action. What I am exactly (in a way that can be projected onto me) is this ongoing capacity, and my body is only relevant to the extent that empirically it is by my body being influenced that this capacity can be activated. Thus if I am sleeping, shaking this body during that time activates the capacity I am in sleep. If I am behaving habitually or automatically, speaking to this body (calling for inner attending) activates the specific capacity for such marshaling action. Continuing to have the same body, then, is no essential part of my personal identity through interruption but only (in fact) an enduring way for the capacity I am to be activated or deactivated. This allows, as Kant will indicate in the next paragraph, that if the ongoing capacity that I am could shift bodies I would still be the same person. As long as during the interruption of my consciousness it is true that but for influencing those bodies (during the interruption), I am an (uninterrupted) ongoing consciousness of

the whole time—then I am the same person across interruption. Note that once again, as is the usual case in the Paralogisms, Kant is considering what can be discerned just from a subjective point of view—this time imagining projecting back onto myself. Anything beyond this would be an inference from the Cartesian viewpoint, not something discerned within it.

Having shown in the first paragraph that my identity just in undergoing the extended (uninterrupted) cogito is not that of an intellectual substance (*res cogitans*), and in the second paragraph that it is not that of an intuited substance (my body), Kant can open the third paragraph by saying,

The identity of my consciousness at different times is therefore only a formal [not material] condition of my thoughts, and in no way proves the numerical identity [as substance] of my subject.

Note that he talks here of identity “at different times” rather than as in the first paragraph of “identity throughout the time of which I am conscious of myself.” He would be saying then that even across interruption my identity is only the formal (nonsubstantial) condition of my thoughts. Across interruption there isn’t even the real identity (abidingness) of intellectual action. All there is is a “formal” condition of my thoughts. The ongoingness of a capacity for Kant is, I believe, “formal” in the sense that it is nothing but the potency or potentiality for action. It is not *per se* a real actual material (or immaterial) identity or constancy. Kant holds in effect what we can call a “thin” (sheer potentiality) view of capacities. The capacity through time is not *per se* a real (actual) state existing throughout the ongoingness of the capacity. This contrasts with the thick view according to which a capacity is ongoing only by an underlying real constancy by which the potentiality exists. In the thin sense, the ongoingness of the capacity is nothing more than the sheer truth that, but for not being fully activated (but for missing activation conditions), there is ongoing action. Applied to the case of intellectual marshaling action then, the thin capacity I am (the “formal” condition of my thoughts) can be characterized as follows: but for certain ways of activating failing to be realized, I am an ongoing intellectual marshaling for uninterrupted unifying of inner attention. Equivalently, my existence as a person across the interruptions of life is just the truth that, but for being inactive, my life is one long episode of a rule for inner attending.

In the second paragraph, Kant had argued that the persistence of my body was relevant only to the extent that it is what can be manipulated to activate the capacity that I am. In this third paragraph, I believe, Kant is reinforcing this point (that it is the “thin” capacity that constitutes my identity) by saying I would likewise be the same capacity even if activation conditions were to (successively) pertain to different entities. In the footnote, he compares this possibility to the case of motion being transferred from one body to another. It is the same motion, but not in the sense of a persisting state of an entity. A better example than motion, I believe, would

be mechanical energy or the mechanical capacity to do work. In a moving object this capacity (kinetic energy) is active as a moving force, whereas in transferring it to an object that is moved up by it to land on a high ledge, this capacity is only potentially a moving force (it has to be dislodged from the ledge to act again as a moving force). The point is that this energy (the capacity to do work) persists through a succession of entities, and it does so in different states of activation. Similarly, the capacity for intellectual marshaling action unifying inner attending can persist in different states of activation through a succession of entities. Just as in the mechanical energy case, I can say “but for being inactivated (resting on the ledge), there is ongoing moving force (active capacity to do work),” so too I can say that, but for being inactivated, there is ongoing intellectual action. I don’t believe this “thin” sense of a capacity (say, to do work) is “formal” as opposed to being real. It is formal just in the sense of being opposed to being either an uninterrupted action or inhering in an uninterrupted entity.

Our existence as such “thin” capacities would involve simply there being ways of activating it throughout. In our case (so far as I know empirically), these ways are by manipulating a single persisting body. The latter then is an empirical criterion of its existence, not what constitutes it. Kant says at B415 that the permanence of the soul

during life is, of course, evident per se, since the thinking being (as man) is itself [as a thin capacity] likewise the object of the outer senses.

I don’t think Kant is equating identity of the soul (the person) with bodily identity, as he is in this context allowing that we *might* survive bodily death. He is saying rather that empirically we only know how this capacity for intellectual marshaling can be activated via a single body. The body remains however not that which is the “thin” ongoingness of the capacity (which is the person) but only that which contingently “has” (is tied to) the capacity.

In the fourth paragraph, I claim Kant’s point is that the ongoingness of the capacity that I am cannot be validated (verified) just from my own self-consciousness. In the uninterrupted cogito I have evidence that I am an ongoing action from, say, memory. By definition, however, I cannot remember being an ongoing intellectual action (action for regulating inner attending) through interruption of that action. I can of course judge (represent) that but for interruption, it is proper to be so far along in regulating inner attending, thus judging that I did exist prior to the interruption. I cannot however validate this judgment (its truth) simply by the witness of self-consciousness. That truth requires there be potentially some way of activating the capacity through the interruption and I cannot represent myself as having (even potentially) activated myself during the interruption. That everything in the world is in a “flux” is thereby not “refuted” by the witness of self-consciousness, not even the ongoingness of a “thin” capacity for intellectual action is thereby refuted.

The fifth paragraph is obscure and ambiguous even by Kant's standards. He begins by saying,

it is strange that personality, and its presupposition, permanence, and the substantiality of the soul should have to be proved *at this stage and not earlier*.

I believe that by "not earlier" he means directly from the definition and the minor premise. The proof would be that even if I am now conscious only of my intellectual action (avoiding Kant's objection to the psychologist in the First Paralogism), I am still conscious of my identity at earlier times and so must be an entity that then (and now) undergoes that action. Here, there is no specific mention of whether there is any interruption in the consciousness of myself at the earlier time. This issue comes in only later with the second paragraph of the Paralogism. But now to be the same entity at different times is to be permanent throughout the time between and hence substance. Once this is established,

there would follow, not indeed the continuance of consciousness, yet at least the possibility of a continuing consciousness in an abiding subject and that is sufficient for personality.

In other words, once I am a substance (entity) through time, that allows that it isn't always active in intellectual consciousness. This way of proceeding goes directly from consciousness of identity at different times (interrupted or no) to substance to possibility of interruption. But the first paragraph has shown that simply from sheer consciousness of my identity at earlier times, nothing at all follows about numerical identity of an entity. All that follows is identity of apperception (identity of action). Kant says,

This permanence, however, is in no way given prior to that identity of ourself which we infer from identical apperception, but on the contrary is *inferred* first from the numerical identity. (*italics mine*)

In uninterrupted consciousness, that is, my "permanence" (as discerned in undergoing the episode, not inferred) is that of abiding action. He continues,

. . . this identity of a person [as a numerically identical entity] . . . in nowise follows from the identity of the 'I' in the [uninterrupted] consciousness of all the time in which I know myself.

The argument rather has to explicitly turn on identity even through times in which by my consciousness I don't know myself. It is in this case that the first paragraph notion of an abiding action (precluding the direct argument to identity of an entity) collapses. Now the opponent may proceed with his

argument: Even if my identity through an uninterrupted episode is that of an abiding action, at least through interruption it can only be the identity of an enduring entity having that action intermittently, and hence the “substantiality of the soul” can be founded upon the consciousness of identity at different times *specifically through* an interruption. But of course even the proof of substantiality at this “later stage” (than what is discerned in the extended uninterrupted cogito) is bogus for Kant. This is how the argument had to proceed (given what Kant points out in the first paragraph), but it still doesn’t succeed (as shown in Paragraphs Two through Four). I can be an ongoing capacity (in the thin sense), that can be activated and deactivated in various ways, without being any enduring actual reality (substance) through an interruption. Not only can I be, but putting myself in the place of an outside observer (as in Paragraph Two) shows that is all I require to be a person (a subjectivity I can project back on myself).

In Paragraph Six Kant says that he retains the concept of personality

in so far as it is merely transcendental.

Note first that Kant had said that personality (which he is now retaining)

does not itself at once cease because its activity is for a time interrupted.

If so, he is retaining the full concept of a person, not just the concept of a thinking (transcendental) subject through an uninterrupted episode. He retains it

in so far as it concerns the unity of the subject . . . in the determinations of which there is a thoroughgoing connection of apperception.

In my interpretation, apperception extends to determinations (inner states) across interruption via its being the case that, but for interruption, there is connection of determinations through ongoing (thoroughgoing) intellectual action governing inner attention. He says the subject is otherwise unknown, referring to the atemporal noumenal basis of this ongoing (thin) capacity. He does not say it is the noumenal basis that makes me a person or that the noumenal basis is that by which I am a person. That the noumenal ground is even individually different as between me and other persons (other capacities for ongoing intellectual unity of inner attending) is not something that can be known.

(II) KANT’S CONCEPTION OF A PERSON

In this section I set out Kant’s view of a person somewhat more systematically. His view, as I have interpreted the Third Paralogism, is that a person is an ongoing capacity for transcendental subjectivity or for intellectually

unifying inner attending with an unfolding rule. The aim is ultimately to compare this view to psychological continuity views according to which a person is a series of states connected by psychological relations (causal and/or phenomenological).

Kant's way of approaching the issue of what a person is (or what he calls personality) is to tailor what a person is to how we represent ourselves subjectively. His view of what we are approached by considering what we would have to minimally be if our subjective representations of ourselves are to be (possibly) true. Again it is not surprising that this should be Kant's procedure in the Third Paralogism, because the Paralogisms all along have followed this method. In the First Paralogism, the Cartesian conclusion of an entity being the subject that thinks went beyond, Kant claimed, what is discerned or represented subjectively in undergoing the cogito. He thought that all that could be discerned is being the spontaneous source of a thought which by itself is just being intellectual action *within* which a thought emerges, is focused on, held onto, etcetera. There are then two components to Kant's view of a person—how we represent ourselves subjectively and what minimally we have to be for such representation to be true.

In my interpretation, Kant holds that I do represent myself subjectively as having existed across interruptions and that I do so according to how I represent myself as having existed through an uninterrupted episode (what I have called an extended cogito), only with the modification of “but for being interrupted.” In line with my discussion in Chapter 8, I can take the representation through an uninterrupted episode (synthesis of inner apprehension) to be of the form: It is proper to be so far along in unifying (regulating) inner attending. If this representation is true, then there has been an abiding action for unifying inner attending leading up to me now (that action for regulating I am now), and that for Kant constitutes my identity (what I am) through an uninterrupted episode. This representation then is indeed a representation of having existed through the episode. It is a “subjective” representation in the sense that it doesn't require identifying anything intuitable as having been me. In subjective or first-person representation there is, what is called in the literature, “immunity to error through misidentification.” I prefer to put it in Kantian terms that there is no identification of anything coming under a general concept with myself.¹ As against Edmund Husserl, in this sense at least, I do not subjectively represent my past self as an object (as something intuited) which I then identify with myself (by some sort of special intimacy). The representation that it is proper to be so far along in unifying inner attending meets this condition of subjective representation, for it involves only being the (tail end of) the action that I am throughout, not identifying any item as being of a certain kind which is then equated with me now. If so then subjective representation extends to my having been.

Let us turn next to the issue of representing myself subjectively as having been through an interruption. Because for most of my life I am not unifying inner attending, it would only seem to be on rare and short

occasions that I am a “mental self” (a self that represents itself subjectively as a transcendental subject). This is Galen Strawson’s view.² For him the mental self is a thing or process of relatively short duration; those times when we have a “subjective sense” of self are short and intermittent. It is here that Kant’s Third Paralogism is significant. I believe that for Kant we have a subjective sense of self across interruptions extending to the course of our life. Recall I claimed in Chapter 6 that for Kant the person would not turn out to be a subject or entity in addition to the transcendental self (in addition to transcendental apperception) but an extension of it. I can now make out this claim. The person is an extension across interruptions, which allows the same sort of subjective self-representation as in the short and intermittent periods of uninterrupted unifying of inner attending. In the preceding section, I characterized this self-representation as follows: But for interruption (but for being inactive), it is proper to be so far along in unifying inner attending from first so-and-so (where “so-and-so” signifies any discernment of a perceptual state arising within inner attending). If what I am is the minimal I must be for subjective representations of myself to be true, then I am not an ongoing action for unifying inner attending but an ongoing capacity (activated or not, interrupted in its action or not) for unifying inner attending. The subjective representation does not by itself require that I be such a capacity in anything more than the “thin” or pure sense of a sheer potency that exists throughout only in that there are ways throughout of its being activated. It doesn’t require a thick sense of a capacity involving an underlying *ongoing* actual reality or structure by which it exists throughout. Note then that my identity even in the uninterrupted episode (the extended cogito) is the capacity that I am in a state of activation, for this is exactly the action I am in the cogito. If so, then this conception of a person (as a “thin” capacity) is indeed an extension of the identity of apperception in the uninterrupted episode (not a second subject in addition to it). Further, I don’t have to identify this capacity in representing myself because I am now the exercise of it (if I extend the capacity to include making “but-for” representations). Nor do I have to identify any ongoing entity or organism that has this capacity, for that would be a capacity in the “thick” sense. Kant’s view allows that I am not the same body or organism through my existence. This doesn’t imply that if Napoleon’s psychological history were implanted in me I would be Napoleon, for that is not the same as my being the same bearer of states (ongoing thin capacity to which the states belong). For there to be an ongoing capacity (in the thin sense) requires there be activation conditions throughout. In the sleep case, the activation condition is simply to be awoken. In the Napoleon case, as far as we can tell, there simply are no activation conditions between the demise of Napoleon and the implantation of his psychological history in me.

Kant in effect has extended Galen Strawson’s “sense of self” to the life of the person. Recall that for Kant the schema of the representation (rule) for being so far along is to presently go through the motions of what has

already been done. In the representation, then, I would have the "sense" that but for interruption, this is how it has been (where this is quickly going through or recapitulating an uninterrupted inner attending). But then I have the same sense of self (as an ongoing unity of transcendental apperception) as I have in those sporadic and short-duration episodes Strawson describes.

I turn now to a comparison of Kant's view with the psychological continuity view. The psychological continuity view allows phenomenological, causal, and functional relations (whether discerned by the organism or not), thus avoiding Locke's conclusions regarding the sleep case and the prince-cobbler case. Such a view may further allow some of these states to be first-person or perspectival representations of previous states that *represent* them as belonging to an identical subject. It may allow, that is, a merely intentional notion of an identical *bearer* of states. What it cannot allow (without lapsing into the Kantian view) is that these representations are literally true according to their exact intentional content. That would be to allow a real identity to a bearer that states belong to (beyond or other than the relations between states), which is what the psychological connection view denies. In Kant's view, on the other hand, my identity is what I have to be for my self-representations of previous states as belonging to an identical bearer to be true. Given his theory of self-representation, this leads to the view of an identical capacity for intellectual marshaling as the bearer of the states (what they belong to). Kant's view agrees with the psychological continuity view that there is no identical entity that is the bearer of all "my" states; neither a Cartesian ego nor an intuitable substance (body or organism) is implied by the thin capacity I am. However, unlike that view he retains the notion of an abiding bearer by which states are "mine" (and by which I represent them as mine), apart from what other relations they may have by which they are "psychologically" or "functionally" continuous.

I now compare the two views by considering how they fare with respect to fission and fusion cases. This will point out what I believe is a certain arbitrariness of the psychological continuity view that can only be made up for by switching to a Kant-like view. Suppose then that there was a fissioning at a period in the past and that I am now on the left branch. Then I can intellectually unify inner attending back beyond the fissioning (by representing that but for inactivation of the capacity I now am, it is proper to be so far along in regulating inner attending from first so-and-so, where "so-and-so" signifies a state prior to the fissioning). But I can now also similarly unify inner attending back to the point of fission and from there up the right-hand branch (but for inactivation of the capacity I now am, it is proper to be so far along in regulating inner attending from its first being proper to regulate inner attending up the right branch). I can, that is, "trace" inner attending in both these ways: back to the point of fission and further back and back to the point of fission and forward along the second branch. Because, for Kant, I am what I can intellectually

trace, I am *now* not just at a point on the left branch but also (simultaneously) at a point on the right branch. As I am not now aware of what arises in me on the right branch, and I am now inner attending (my attention is retracted inward), it follows that there must be another *dimension* to inner attending, and I must not be retracting my attention that way. In other words, I am a being with a two-dimensional form of inner intuiting, where each dimension precludes attending the other way. In Kantian terms, I am no longer a person but a being (one being, in accord with the scope of intellectually unifying inner attending) with a form of intuition different than persons.

Suppose to avoid this conclusion I say that there is something about being me now (on the left branch) which is such that although I can intellectually unify inner attending back and then up the right branch, what happens on the right branch is nevertheless not happening to me (isn't a state belonging to me now). In this supposition there is some intrinsic reality involved in being a state of mine, other than just the capacity for it to be in the course of intellectually unifying inner attending (this something more holding on the left branch but not on the right). If this intrinsic reality beyond intellectual unity is discernible, then in Kantian terms I am no longer a person but a being with an intellectual intuition (for I can discern the intrinsic reality beyond my being an identical apperception). If it is not discernible, then in Kantian terms I am a completely unfathomable noumenal being, *instead* of (only partially overlapping with) a capacity to intellectually unify inner attending, and so I am no longer a person. The attempt to cut off the right branch to have me being only on the left is also considered by Parfit. He says,

There is one view on which it [our identity being determinate] might be true . . . [the view according to which] there are immaterial substances, or Cartesian souls.³

As such beings for Parfit, as for Kant, are unfathomable, he is agreeing with my analysis of the Kantian view that identity can be preserved on just one branch only by having the identity being unfathomable (an intellectual intuition or an indiscernible noumenal reality).

My result then is that to suppose that I am now past a point of fissioning is to suppose that I am not now a person at all but some unfathomable being with either a different form of inner intuiting or requiring an intellectual intuition to know myself at all. It follows that being a *person* at all (being that kind of being) can't survive fission (whether now or in the future). What is left after fission (whenever it happens) is a single being with a two-dimensional form of intuition or two noumenal beings. In the Kantian view, then, to be of the kind 'person' is incompatible with fissioning. In this respect the Kantian view agrees with Thomas Reid that personal identity is stricter than any other identity. A body can fission into

two bodies and theoretically a ship can fission into two ships. A person can fission perhaps but not into two persons (nor remain one person).

John Campbell says of the kind of fission case I am considering that we are dealing with a scenario

in which the creatures involved do not grasp the first-person . . . and that . . . this in turn means that we are dealing with creatures that are not persons . . . it is not so easy to see how one might go about taking up their subjective stance oneself.⁴

In the view that I have attributed to Kant, being a person likewise involves grasping (representing) the person one is first-personally (subjectively), and I have tried to show how in this Kantian view (of subjective representation as intellectual unifying of inner attending) one cannot take up a subjective stance. It may be that the concept of the kind 'person' is "quaint"⁵ because perhaps fission is possible. But it is quaint just in Kant's sense that being a discursive intellect with our form of intuition is "quaint." In my reconstruction, whatever exists subsequent to fission either has a form of inner intuiting different than ours or an identity beyond being an ongoing discursive intellect.

Kant's notion of a person (and personal identity) is "perspectival" in the sense that a person is a capacity for intellectually unifying inner attending, whose very doing so (by the unfolding of a rule) represents itself subjectively as that capacity by being an exercise of it. J. David Velleman claims that the fission case shows such a view of personal identity is impossible. He says,

Although I cannot refer first-personally to products of my fission, they can refer first-personally to me . . . *When I imagine that I am the product of fission that occurred yesterday, I still seem to have a complete past.* This result also demonstrates that self-hood [perspectival first-person accessibility] cannot coincide with the identity of a person, since self-hood turns out to be asymmetric, whereas relations of identity cannot. ⁶ (italics mine)

In my account the italicized sentence is misleading because, in effect, I have too much of a past (incorporating in my intellectual unity of inner attending what happens on the right branch). My self-hood, that is, is destroyed insofar as the first-person accessibility (intellectual unity) involves a non-standard form of inner intuiting. Thus there is no asymmetry—perspective is lost as well when I imagine myself the product of fission.

I claim that the case of fusion (beginning by supposing me now to be a product of fusion that happened in the past) leads similarly to the result that my capacity for inner attending encompasses both branches leading to the fusion (making me again a being with a two-dimensional form of

inner attending), or despite that encompassing I existed on only one of the branches (making me again a being with an intellectual intuition or an unfathomable noumenal being instead of, because only partially overlapping with, intellectual unity).

Let us see now why the psychological continuity view gives a different result for the case of fission than the Kantian view. If the continuity view defines the kind 'person,' this view like Kant's rejects any account according to which it is to be a substantial identity (whether bodily organization or Cartesian ego). Rather to be a person is to be a *linear* series of psychological states connected by relations, including causal relations. In this notion, clearly after fission we have two persons (two of that kind), neither of which is identical with the prefission person because (and only because) of the abstract failure of the transitivity of identity. In other words with fission we go from one of a kind to two of a kind with no further identity characterization. The reason is that the branches in the psychological continuity view don't have the connection to each other that this view defines as necessary for being of that kind—they only each have it separately. In the Kantian view, I have claimed we go from one of a kind to *none of that kind*. The reason here is that the branches in this view still have a connection to each other (back across the common root) of intellectual unifying but are not one person (because the inner attending unified becomes two-dimensional); nor are they two persons (because each would have to be other than a capacity for intellectual unifying). Roughly, the two components of a person—that it be an intellectual unity (not an entity departing from the scope of such unity) and that its form of inner intuiting be one-dimensional time—simply come apart (can't both be preserved). Note that this has nothing to do with any abstract transitivity of identity issues. In the psychological continuity view, no matter what the left-branch person represents (even if he represents intellectually unifying back and across to the other branch), the causal conditions of his representation are still isolated from the right branch, and it is only those conditions that matter. In Kant's view, intellectual unifying of inner attending is definitive no matter what the causal conditions of the representations are, and so there is extending across branches.

The continuity theorist defines one of the kind 'person' as a linear series of states connected by psychological causation; but why not define it as any series of states connected by psychological counterfactual dependence? In this definition a person could survive fission, because each state on the left branch, we may presume, has causal conditions going back to prefission, and that is enough to say that if the being on the right branch hadn't been in its state, then the being on the left wouldn't have been in its state. Two phenomena with a common causal ancestry are related to one another by counterfactual dependence. We have been given no reason by the continuity theorist for defining the relation or connection that makes a person to be causal rather than counterfactual dependency. The only nonarbitrary

difference in the definitions, it seems, is that in the counterfactual definition the wrong kind of representation of states would be *true*. As I have shown, I on the left branch have inner accessibility to the past point of fission and from there up through the right branch. Of course it turns out that it is nonstandard or multidimensional inner attending that would be true on the counterfactual definition. But now the truth or falsity of the content of self-representation takes us beyond the psychological continuity view altogether.

The continuity theorist might say counterfactual dependence is to be rejected because it allows (in the case of fission) simultaneous disjoint consciousness. But why shouldn't being a person be compatible with such consciousness? If it is said that a person must be a "unified" consciousness at any time, the question is why should it be unified by causal interaction of contemporaneous elements rather than unified by counterfactual dependence of disjoint contemporaneous elements? Of course if a person at any time is a (unified, indivisible) *subject* of consciousness, then being a person would be incompatible with simultaneous disjoint consciousness. But then the continuity theorist owes us an account of what it is to be the subject that is conscious. If, further, an account such as Kant's is available of the abidingness or constancy of such a unified subject, it is plausible to identify the person over time in relation to being such a subject over time (thus leading away from the psychological continuity view). If so, the psychological continuity view has no nonarbitrary grounds of specifying which sort of connection constitutes a series of states as the kind a person is. Given now that the sort of self-*representation* that needs to be true is that of a discursive intellect with time as the single dimension of retracting attention inward, we get the view that a person has to be an intellectual unity of inner attending or, in outline, the Kantian view of a person. Note this argument goes through whether or not time is transcendently ideal. Even if time were the real objective (substantial) medium within which my inner attending (and everything else) takes place, so long as that is the only fathomable way that it takes place (proceeding unidimensionally with time), the objection against the arbitrariness of the psychological continuity view holds.

Finally, let me briefly remark on the issue of whether I should care about failing to survive fission (as I do fail on both views). In Parfit's account I fail to survive as the same person, but two other persons "close to me" in all the other ways adumbrated by his account of a person do survive and, as Parfit puts it,

The fact that I'm not there [in either person] is not a real absence.⁷

In the Kantian view I fail to survive not only as the *same* person but nothing of the kind 'person' survives. Should I care? Well, whatever survives is completely unfathomable to me, not just distinct from me. I don't know if the left

branch hurts when it represents itself as now attending on the right branch. If it does, and it doesn't hurt on the left branch, then it both feels and doesn't feel pain. If it doesn't, then it truly represents itself as now attending to pain it doesn't feel, and I don't know what that means. If I am correct, then Kant's nonsubstantialist (nonentitative) view of what a person is holds up against the psychological continuity view, removing the arbitrariness of that view by reintroducing a nonsubstantial notion of an ongoing bearer of states.

I end this chapter by recapitulating the various kinds of self-identity or identity of apperception that I have considered in Chapters 7 to 10.

1. Empirical Apperception (Chapter 7): There is self-identity (constancy or abidingness of intellectual action) through an extended perceptual episode via an empirical concept or rule governing the episode. I believe this sort of self-identity likely obtains in social animals who have to regulate their behavior at various times to conform to social practices. This sort of self-identity is intermittent; it is not an identity encompassing the life of the animal or organism. For this reason animals can be identical selves through certain episodes, but they are not like persons.
2. Pure Apperception (Chapter 8): There is self-identity through extended episodes via a pure concept or rule of spatial shifting governing the episode. This identity, unlike empirical apperception, is always available independent of empirical circumstances, so the capacity for it could be ongoing (always exercisable) throughout our entire lives. If this were our only self-identity, however, then although we would have an ongoing point of view (from inner to outer), we would have no conception or cognizance of being the subject with that point of view. That requires self-identity in regard to inner attending via a rule for progressive attending. Further, without a rule for inner attending (that brings inner sense to apperception), although we would still be cognizing beings in regard to what affects in outer sense, we would have no conception or cognizance of ourselves as being thus cognizing beings (beings who have perceptions or who are affected).
3. Pure Apperception in Regard to Inner Sense (Chapter 9): The constancy or abidingness of intellectual action (self-identity) in regard to inner sense via rules for temporizing, or for the sheer progressiveness of retracted attention, is a self-identity that, in its capacity (Chapter 10) encompasses our entire lives and provides for cognizance of ourselves as cognizing (perceiving) beings with an ongoing point of view. This much is required for Kant's conception of personal identity.
4. Cutting across each of these kinds of self-identity is transcendental self-consciousness or consciousness of oneself as the subject (Chapter 5). This can exist in regard to any of 1, 2, and 3. For Kant, probably, the "lifelong" capacity for such self-consciousness is required for being a person. Hence the intellectual unity of 3 and the "reflectivity" of 4 together constitute for Kant the identity of the self as a person.

Part V

The Subject and Material Reality

11 The Embodied Subject

In the B edition, Kant, at B409, characterizes the Fourth Paralogism as concerning the possible separate existence of the subject from material reality (including its own body). This would clearly align the Fourth Paralogism with the others as regarding what can be concluded from the cogito. Descartes, recall, contended that he clearly and distinctly perceived (within reflection on the cogito) that he as a thinking subject could exist separate from extension (matter). After all a thinking subject even in Kant's sense of a subject unifying inner attending, seems to be separable from any capacity to be bodily affected (as in outer attending). However, the Fourth Paralogism in the A edition actually only addresses the issue of whether I am a thinking substance or entity separate from material substances or entities (including my body), where both kinds of substances are understood in the transcendental realist sense of beings with intrinsic reality. Kant argues that in undergoing the cogito at most what I discern is that I am a capacity for unifying inner attending, and material reality is a capacity for affecting me. Kant doesn't answer the question, however, as to whether I as such a capacity could exist apart from the capacity of material reality to affect me. It is in the B edition Refutation of Idealism (not in the B edition Paralogisms) that Kant addresses this question and answers it in the negative. I cannot exist separately from my also being a capacity to be outer affected and, indeed, from actually being outer affected. In this chapter I consider that answer in the B edition Refutation.

I have already shown that for Kant, as opposed to those who hold psychological continuity views, I am a capacity for being an ongoing real bearer of inner states. In this chapter, I argue that Kant also opposes the bodily (or organism) identity view, according to which a person's identity is the identity of an (organized) body which has the capacity for an inner point of view. In this view (unlike Kant's) it is that body which is the real bearer of psychological states. I contend that Kant's view, rather, is that although I must necessarily be embodied, bodily identity of whatever sort is not part of my identity. There is pressure on Kant's view from two sides. On the one side there are those (Wilfrid Sellars and Strawson) who hold that Kant has to go all the way to bodily identity, not mere embodiment and, on the other side, those (John McDowell) who hold he cannot even get to embodiment.

Sellars contends that Kant is forced to the view that I am a phenomenal (material) substance because the First Analogy shows that any change of state (including presumably inner states) has to be the change of an enduring intuitable substance.¹ Note however that Sellars's objection flies in the face of the B edition Refutation of Idealism, where Kant argues that because I am not an intuitable phenomenal substance, there must be *external* substances if I am to determine my existence in time.

Peter Strawson² contends that I would not be able to ascribe states to myself except as in contrast to an objective spatial world through which my states constitute one route which, ultimately for Strawson, requires that I be a (re-identifiable) material body among others. This argument I believe is rejected by Kant. He says,

That I distinguish my own existence as that of a thinking being from other things—among them my body—is likewise an analytic proposition, for *other* things are such as I think to be distinct from myself. (B409)

For Kant it is by the witness of my own self-consciousness in the cogito that I distinguish what belongs to me in inner attending from whatever may arise in outer attending. Even if what arises in outer attending is illusory or hallucinatory, so long as it is grasped as outer (spatial), it is distinct from, or in contrast to, the capacity for inner attending that I am and know myself to be in the cogito. What is thus grasped (the pink elephant dangling out there) may causally derive from me, but it is not me or my state. Anything, or any nothing, that is outer from my point of view is no part of what belongs to me as a state that arises in inner attending. For Kant, then, I don't have to be one body among others in a spatial world to ascribe states to myself in contrast to what is not myself. Kant then, I believe, would resist the Sellars–Strawson pressure toward identifying the person I am with any body.

Although Kant holds that I distinguish being a capacity for unifying inner attending (a person) from anything arising in outer attending, he goes on to say at B409 that by this distinguishing I do not

. . . learn whether this consciousness of myself would even be possible apart from things outside me . . . and whether therefore I could exist merely as a thinking being (i.e., without existing in human form).

McDowell, I believe, exerts pressure on Kant in the opposite way; namely, once we allow that I am an ongoing capacity for inner attending (having thus a point of view), we must go on to hold that I am not essentially embodied at all (let alone identical to a body). He says,

If we start with a referent for the "I" that is only geometrically in the world [in the world only as having a point of view] it seems impossible to build up a substantial presence as an embodied perceiver.³

In that passage just quoted from the B Paralogisms Kant is obviously referring to the B edition Refutation of Idealism for an answer to the question of separable existence (the question, recall, not fully answered in the A edition Fourth Paralogism), and his answer there, contrary to McDowell, is that I (the capacity for unifying inner attending or for having a geometric point of view) must be an embodied perceiver.

We have then, on the one side, Sellars and Strawson contending that Kant has to go all the way to my being identical to a body (of a special kind 'person') and McDowell on the other side contending that Kant can't get as far as being embodied at all (whether or not such embodiment is part of my identity). Kant, I believe, wants to resist both these contentions, and the goal of this chapter is to defend Kant from both sides. I shall present two arguments for why an ongoing capacity for unifying inner attending has to be embodied, neither of which imply it is identical (through time) with any body. The first, which I shall call the argument-from-interruption is not explicitly given by Kant, but it is closely modeled on the argument that he gives in the B Refutation of Idealism which I shall call the argument-from-time-permanence.

Kant says in the B edition Deduction,

for all inner perceptions we must derive the determination of lengths of time or of points of time from the changes that are exhibited to us in outer things. (B156).

I consider this remark of Kant's as it pertains specifically to the case of *interruption* of inner perceptions, when there is no progressiveness of attending, as in sleep. How, this morning, do I represent that I was awake yesterday? I must represent the interruption in progressive attending as nevertheless a temporal interruption; viz, I represent I existed at times when there wasn't progressive attending. But now time is *merely* a form of intuition (nothing beyond the progressiveness of attending) for Kant, so I cannot represent objective time (relational or absolute) as the time or period of interruption. I showed in Chapter 2 that for Kant what is real is not merely that which is encompassed by, or pertains to, actual progressiveness, but rather to the course of possible or proper attention shifting. It must then be that the temporal interruption in actual attending is represented somehow by the propriety of being so far along in progressive attending. I cannot, however, presently represent or claim that it is proper to be so far along in progressively attending from first so-and-so, if this goes back across an interruption (if so-and-so is a state of mine yesterday). All I can claim is that, but for interruption (but for being inactive), this is proper. This however would be to claim, absurdly, that but for interruption there is ongoing (uninterrupted) time.

Recall now that for Kant thoughts that underlie claims are rules. The question then is how I can now have a rule for being so far along

in uninterrupted progressiveness, when my progressiveness has been interrupted? It would be like saying that I am now prone to be up to 10 in regulating reciting without having been regulating reciting 5, 6, 7, 8. Of course I could have this proneness, but it would be bogus or false, as it expresses being so far along in regulating when I am not that far along in regulating. We need some way of its being proper to be so far along in a procedure (synthesis) even when I haven't been actually regulating preceding stages of the procedure. Let us leave the inner-interrupted synthesis aside for the moment and consider cases where it would be proper to be so far along without having regulated earlier stages.⁴ One such case is as follows. Suppose I have a rule for baking a cake in a certain exact order of steps (which ingredient goes in first, which second, etc.), and suppose I come into a room and find that several of the ingredients are already mixed in a bowl. Then, even though I haven't been regulating those initial stages, my proneness now to be so far along in regulating (the brown sugar, or the fourth ingredient, is what is to be put in the bowl) is not bogus but correct. Something present, that is, correctly sets me ahead in the unfolding of a rule, even though it hasn't been unfolding in me. The reason it is correct is that the unfolding of the rule is geared to something (getting a cake baked) that itself is so far along, independent of my having actually been regulating anything. Similarly my now being prone to be so far along in regulating *outer* progressive attending can be correct if it is geared to something present that is so far along (in its career). To gear outer attending to something is to keep attention fixed on it, or to keep tracking it. Consider then the following representation or claim:

R-Upon being outer affected, it is proper to be so far along in regulating tracking from first detecting so-and-so.

What presently affects, then, is represented as putting me so far along in regulating keeping track. This represents what presently affects as what I now come in upon so as to put me so far along or set me ahead so far along (analogous to how the already mixed ingredients in a bowl put me so far along). But this is exactly to represent what presently affects as what has been (as what first exists now cannot put me so far along in the course of regulating tracking it). But to represent what presently affects as what has been is in turn to represent it as a substance. That the real that affects is "permanent" (has been) is Kant's conception of phenomenal substance.

The schema of substance is the permanence of the real in time, that is, the *representation* of the real as the substrate of empirical determination time in general. (B183; italics mine)

In R the "real" arising in presently outer attending is represented as the substrate (basis) of being so far along in regulating progressive outer attending

(the propriety of progressive attending, which *is* time). Because such a representation is the representation of the real as permanent (having been), it is at the same time the representation of substance. Any “empirical determination” of what arose in the past (in the course of proper progressive attending I am now beyond) will be based on substance, as in R so-and-so is represented as having arisen in the past based on representing the permanence of the real.

What we have in R is a representation of past time that is apart from (independent of) any actual regulating of progressive attending but not apart from (independent of) the possibility (propriety) of being so far along in regulating progressive attending. The representation, that is, is consistent with the transcendental ideality of time. Following Kant now, there is nothing permanent similarly given in inner sense. He says in the Refutation of Idealism,

This permanent cannot, however, be something in me . . . Thus perception of this permanent is possible only through a thing outside me. (B276)⁵

In other words there is nothing in inner sense (or in my capacity to unify inner sense) that can be the basis or substratum of being so far along in regulating tracking. If so, then the only way I can presently represent the capacity for unifying inner attending as existing through times (as in sleep) when it was interrupted or inactive is by representing these times in terms of being presently outer affected (as in R).

Once I can represent past time (being so far along in regulating progressive outer attending) independent of having actually been regulating attending, I can then represent the interruption (as in sleep), as having been within that time, and so represent myself as an ongoing capacity that exists during times of interruption. Thus, I can correctly claim that but for the interruption *from sunset to sunrise*, it is proper to be so far along in unifying inner attending from first so-and-so, where so-and-so indicates a state of mine yesterday prior to the interruption.⁶ In this manner,

consciousness [of my existence] in time . . . is necessarily bound up with the existence of things outside me, as the condition of the time-determination. (B276)

It isn't just that I empirically determine when the interruption happened in terms of the sun but that I determine its happening in time at all in terms of the sun.

I can sum up the argument so far as follows. For me now to truly represent my past existence (as a capacity for unifying inner attending) through *times* of inactivation, I must now truly represent myself as being outer affected. Note that although presented in terms of representation, this is not a mere claim about how I must “regard” things but of how things must

truly be. According to Kant's transcendental ideality of time, the existence of everything (including my own existence as an ongoing capacity) in past time is its arising in, or being within, the propriety (upon being presently affected) of being so far along in regulating progressive attending. This is so whether or not I now or ever represent that.

Given, however, that part of being a person, for Kant, is being able to represent oneself as the person one is (an ongoing, though often inactivated, capacity), it follows that I cannot be a person without the capacity to be truly outer affected. As Kant puts it,

In other words, the consciousness of my existence [as a person] is at same time an immediate consciousness of the existence of other things outside me [is at the same time being really outer affected]. (B276)

We have then an argument from my being an ongoing capacity for unifying inner attending to my also being a capacity for being truly outer affected. This argument, which I have called the argument-from-interruption, is not explicitly given by Kant. Rather it *applies* the argument Kant actually gives in the B edition Refutation (relying on the First Analogy) to the case of interruption. In the First Analogy (B224–225), Kant holds substance to be the “substratum which represents time in general,” where time is the “permanent form of inner intuition” (the progressivity of attending). I believe he is saying, in line with the argument that I have presented, that it is by what presently affects (the real) being what sets us ahead in (regulating procedures involving) progressive attending, that we represent, *or that there is*, the past at all, and, in particular, that past time doesn't begin but is always ongoing. In the B edition Refutation, then, the point is that my existing now is necessarily to exist in time that doesn't begin now. I am not now at the beginning or edge of time, nor have I ever been (even if there never was any interruption of my actual progressive attending). As nothing real in or of me can be such as to set me so far ahead in regulating procedures that thus reach back (as time must) before my entire history, it must be what is outside me that is the basis for time before my existence. The argument, that is, is exactly the same as the argument-from-interruption, only the issue is not there being (or representing) time through interruption of activation in my history but, rather, there being (or representing) time back beyond my entire history.

The argument from interruption implies that at *any* stage of my history that was (or even might have been) preceded by interruption in progressive attending, I was a capacity to be (in fact or in reality, not just seemingly) outer affected. Let me now again relax Kant's abstraction in the *Critique* from outer reality's being impenetrable material existence. Kant himself in the B edition became more willing to do so. He says at B278,

This “I” has not therefore the least predicate of intuition, which, as permanent, might serve as the correlate for the determination of time

in inner sense—in the manner in which, for instance, impenetrability serves in our empirical intuition of matter.

Then the capacity to be affected is a receptivity to impenetrability which, we may presume, requires being impenetrable or bodily. If so, the argument establishes that I must be bodily throughout my existence as a capacity for unifying inner attending (if there is to be a “correlate for the determination of time in inner sense,” or in the capacity for inner attending that I am). In this manner, for Kant, I am throughout my existence a “real presence in the world.” I can thus reject McDowell’s criticism,

If we start with a referent for the ‘I’ that is only geometrically in the world, it seems impossible to build up a substantial presence as an embodied perceiver.⁷

What McDowell says is impossible is exactly what Kant builds up, if we take “substantial presence” to imply that only one is always embodied (not the same body). According to Kant’s argument, I am always a substantial (impenetrable, bodily) presence, but nothing in the argument implies that I am the “same” bodily or impenetrable presence throughout. All it requires is that at any stage of my history (as a capacity for unifying inner attending) I am also a receptivity to impenetrability. It requires only that at any stage I must be able to be truly affected by material substance, not that I myself am embodied as an ongoing material substance. McDowell characterizes Kant’s view in the Paralogisms as follows,

In the Paralogisms of Pure Reason he claims that if we credit the “I” with a persisting referent, the relevant idea of identity through time is only formal. It has nothing to do with the substantial identity of a subject who persists as a real person in the world she perceives.⁸

McDowell is correct, I believe, that in the Third Paralogism Kant does credit ‘I’ with the referent of a persisting formal (=nonmaterial) identity, as a thin ongoing capacity, which so far leaves it open whether any capacity for truly perceiving material reality is essential to either being such a referent or to the identity through time of the referent. By the time of the B edition Refutation, Kant holds that being throughout a material presence in the world is essential to being such a referent, but being the same presence is not essential to its identity. It has everything to do then with a “subject who persists as a real presence” but nothing to do with “the substantial identity of a subject.”

The criticism of Kant from the other side, recall, was that identity must be material (say, the identity of an organism or an organized body having the capacity for inner attending). Sellars holds that if only Kant would have allowed that bodies (living organisms) can have properties constitutive of

personality (capacities for inner unifying inner attending), then he could have held that we are material substances. Strawson, of course, holds that we are substances to which both material and psychological (or “personal”) predicates pertain. The criticism, then, is that Kant’s denial of material or bodily identity conditions is due to some sort of “immaterialism” about that reality that makes us persons. Kant of course is not a materialist with regard to intellectual action or the capacity for it. Further, for him, nothing is given in inner sense either as being what grounds or constitutes the intellectual capacity, so any further ground or basis, for Kant, is nonphenomenal. However, even if materialism were true and certain physical subcapacities for action at any time constituted the capacity for being a subject at that time, it wouldn’t follow that these subcapacities themselves were tied to a particular entity or system of entities. They could still be “transferable” as a whole to other systems, and my identity would go with these constituting actions, not with the system of entities that temporarily realize them. In such a case, the constancy or abidingness of the subject I am would not be identifiable over time with the identity of any material substance. Kant’s result about the material identity of persons, thus, would still hold as long as the thin capacity, even if “material,” could survive (as a thin capacity) through multiple realizations that break off any bodily identity. What would be required is that throughout the diachronic multiple realizability activation conditions remained for the action of unifying inner attending. The mechanical capacity to do work (mechanical energy) is such a thin capacity; one doesn’t have to be an immaterialist about such energy to deny there are bodily or material identity conditions for being the same mechanical energy (transferable, indeed, from one body to another) over time. Indeed abstractly at least in Kant’s view my embodiment (just as the embodiment of mechanical energy) could fission so that I continue to be the same ongoing capacity for unifying inner attending, but the capacity for being outer affected (which continues to be essential) required that two separate material bodies be receptive. Before I was aware of anything arising in outer attending, each of two separate bodies would have to be affected. Note that this is not the same case as the case of fission of the capacity for unifying *inner* attending that I considered in Chapter 10. There might be all sorts of epistemological complications for me in regard to where things are or where I am, but my ontological essence and identity as a person, an epistemologically challenged person, would remain.

Putting my results in this chapter together with my previous results, I can say that, in my interpretation, all of the following, suitably understood, are equivalent characterizations of Kant’s conception of a (non-noumenal) person. A person is an ongoing embodied capacity for being:

1. an abiding identical apperception through inner attending.
2. an abiding thinking subject conscious of itself as such throughout inner attending.

3. an abiding 'I think' accompanying all one's representations.
4. the abiding unity of affecting oneself (retracting attention) so as to be affected by oneself (by what arises in inner attending).
5. the spontaneous constant source of the unfolding of a rule for inner attending.
6. an abiding intellect with an ongoing inner point of view.
7. the abiding bearer of what arises in inner attending.
8. abiding intellectual marshaling action for holding on to a rule unfolding with inner attending.

In all these characterizations, a person is a capacity for accompanying (and so unfolding according to) the sheer progressivity of inner attending, not for being something that arises in either inner or outer attending. In this manner, a person is not noumenal (as it unfolds with the progressiveness of time as a form of intuiting), but it is also not something intuitable that appears in space or time. Just as the 'I think' is neither appearance nor thing in itself for Kant, but the sheer spontaneity of thought (the act of determining my existence), so the person as the capacity for abiding spontaneity of thought (for abiding *determining* of existence arising in inner sense) is neither appearance nor thing in itself. Even in "embedding" the ongoing capacity that a person is within the course of time that extends through interruptions of its existence and back before its existence, that capacity is embedded not as something intuited but as a thin capacity for accompanying inner attending that relates to proprieties of (being in the course of) outer attending.

12 The Fourth Paralogism

In this chapter I consider a general trait of non-noumenal reality for Kant: namely that it is never intrinsic substantial complete reality that acts but always mere potency or capacity. My interpretation of the Kantian person has been that it is an ongoing capacity for being a subject or for being an action of spontaneity from which thoughts emerge. Although this action is not intuitable, it is still part of the non-noumenal status of the person according to my interpretation of Kant. To the extent that this interpretation of the person fits in with the characterization of non-noumenal reality generally as consisting of capacities or potencies throughout (with no fully intrinsic action of entities underlying them) to be defended in this chapter, I will have further evidence that the Kantian thinking subject, as non-noumenal, is the activation of a capacity.

In section (i) I argue that the nonintrinsic nature of material reality follows from the transcendental ideality of space and time. I also try to show how this is compatible with a robust empirical realism regarding material potencies. I then contend that in this conception of material reality we can be immediately related to what is outside us in space. The results of section (i) are applied in section (ii) to interpret the text of the A edition Fourth Paralogism.

(I) THE NONINTRINSIC NATURE OF MATERIAL REALITY

Rae Langton¹ has argued with great power and clarity that for Kant all phenomenal reality is relational rather than intrinsic and that capacities or potencies, as being relational, are part of phenomenal reality. In section (ii) I defend her claim in relation to the text of the Fourth Paralogism.

A capacity or potency is relational in the sense that its very being is in how it acts in regard to what is other than itself. A potency is activated by being brought into suitable circumstances and, as activated, its existence does not belong to it itself, but to it together with (in relation to) the activation of other potencies. The activation of the potency or disposition of sugar to be dissolved in water is at the same time the activation of a disposition of water to dissolve sugar. In its activated state the being of a potency is “outside itself,” and its existence throughout (whether active or not) is thus for being outside itself. Similarly, our capacity to be affected in its

realized or activated state is also the realization of the capacity of material reality to affect us, so its existence as that activated state belongs to it only with the material reality's existence in its activated state. In this regard, our being as a capacity to be affected (whether active or not) is for being outside ourselves. As an aside, I believe that much of what Martin Heidegger says about Dasein being outside itself (alongside things, etc.) can be understood as his thinking of Dasein as a sheer (thin) capacity, rather than a Cartesian substantiality.

On the other hand, an entity with intrinsic existence has intrinsic states that belong to it alone and remain that way so long as they exist. (Note that an "entity" without any intrinsic states at all is nothing other than a sheer or thin capacity). There is no such thing as an intrinsic state of an entity having its existence in any way belonging to anything outside the entity. This contrasts with a potency whose states of activation literally no longer belong to it alone but to it together with states of activation of distinct potencies. Entities with intrinsic reality can only be mediately or externally related to one another and are always complete in their existential status in their own right.

Unlike Langton, I believe that the characterization of phenomenal reality as nonintrinsic through and through is not basic but derives as a consequence from the transcendental ideality of space and time.² Kant says at B66,

In confirmation of this theory of the ideality of both inner and outer sense. and therefore of all objects of the senses, as mere appearances, it is especially relevant to observe that everything in our knowledge which belongs to intuition . . . contains nothing but mere relations. (italics mine)

The nonintrinsic nature of phenomenal reality then is said to confirm ideality. This can only mean that ideality entails it, and so its truth confirms ideality. My understanding of the transcendental ideality of space in Chapter 2 was that space is merely a form of intuiting (outer shifting of attention) and that what exists in space, therefore, has its existence only as arising in the course of such attending (whether that attending be actual or only proper). The being of material reality then is to (actually or properly) affect us. If it had any further intrinsic existence—while still being spatial rather than noumenal—then it, in its own right (apart from affecting us) would exist in space, and so space would also be something objective (something other than a mere form of intuition). Material reality, then, must be a sheer potency to affect us or, in my other terminology, a thin capacity to affect us.

Although one can thus derive the nonintrinsic nature of material reality from the ideality of space, one cannot reverse-wise derive the ideality of space from the nonintrinsic nature of material reality. Sheer potencies could exist in objective space. Furthermore, Langton has no basis for Kant's claim that intrinsic reality is not spatial. Even if, as she argues, I cannot be

affected by intrinsic reality, I can still think (based on how I am affected) that there is intrinsic reality at that position in space that is somehow (noumenally) responsible for my being affected. In my view, on the other hand, whatever intrinsic reality there may be can't be in space, because space exists only as this shift by which I am affected.

Kant then is deriving the relational nature of phenomenal reality from its fundamental nature of being related to *us* which follows from the ideality of space. This doesn't imply that material reality cannot actually act on other material reality without actually acting on us. What this would mean, however, is that one way of our being properly affected (in the course of proper attention shifting) determines a second way of our being properly affected. The actual actions between material realities, that is, are just connections of determination or mutual determination between different proprieties of being affected in the course of different attention shiftings (spatializing behaviors). This is opposed to such action between material realities being action for altering supposed intrinsic states of each other. Furthermore, that all material reality is in relation to us allows that a material reality can also be in part a potency to act on other material realities. To say, for example, that a diamond has the potency to cut glass is to say something along the following lines—the propriety of being affected diamond-wise determines the propriety, except for failing to be affected glass-wise, of being affected cut-glass-wise. Thus a material reality can have a potency to act on another, but this potency in turn is just the propriety of certain ways of being affected to obtain upon other ways of being affected properly obtaining, but for the lack of certain other proprieties of being affected. This is opposed to any potency to act (but for lack of certain conditions) to alter intrinsic states (out of relation to us).

The point of this is that Kant's transcendental ideality of space allows actual and potential actions between material realities but only in a way in which such actions involve no intrinsic reality (no reality out of all relation to proprieties of attention shifting or spatializing and what arises or exists only within those proprieties). A material reality, then, is not just a potency to affect us but also a potency to affect other material reality. (It is, in my terminology, a thin capacity to affect us and other thin capacities.) A material substance for Kant is just an ongoing or enduring material reality, where this too signifies its being a thin capacity to be trackable. In tracking, or shifting, outer attention so as to keep it focused on what originally affects, the material reality is not an entity in motion in objective space but, rather, the continuing potency for my being affected as I shift attention to keep track. Of course this continuing potency is also a potency to act on other material reality (*viz.*, its entire being is not just to continually affect me), but this latter, I have shown, is nothing intrinsic by which it affects me, but rather other thin capacities that it has. Although there is more to the material substance than being a sheer capacity to be tracked, this "more than" is nothing intrinsic (which would locate it in objective space).

In sum, a material substance for Kant is an ongoing capacity to properly affect us (in the course of a possible or proper tracking by outer-attending) that is also through and through nothing more than a capacity to affect (determine) other ways in which it is proper to be affected upon other ways of proper attending. In other words, a material substance is an ongoing, complex thin capacity through and through.

Just as the denial that material reality is more than a thin capacity follows from the ideality of space, so too the denial that a person is more than a thin capacity (for unifying inner attending) follows from the ideality of time. Just as a material substance is nothing intrinsic beyond the ongoing capacity to actively affect us (so that we are then precisely outer affected), so too we, for Kant, are nothing intrinsic beyond the ongoing capacity to actively affect ourselves by regulating or unifying an attending that is kept retracted or inward (so that we are then precisely inner affected by our own perceivings). Anything more to us than this intellectual unifying of attending that is kept retracted would, if temporal, have its being in a time corresponding to (rather than merely going with) the progressiveness of the flow of inner attending, thus violating Kant's doctrine that time is nothing but this flow. This capacity of intellectual unifying, though temporal only in regard to progressive attending, is so by accompanying that attending, not by arising within it. Although the person (as intellect) is not appearance (never arises in the course of inner or outer attending), it is yet phenomenal (exists temporally) and, like all phenomenal reality, is nonintrinsic. It might seem that the person, unlike material reality, can be insular in its action of unifying inner attending so that its potency is not relational but just to unfold on its own. Recall, however, that inner attending is a retraction from outer attending and that the person, as shown in Chapter 11, is not just a capacity for inner attending but also essentially a capacity for being outer affected. When it is unifying inner attending it may be proceeding internally on its own, but it is also always a potency for being outer affected, and so it is a relational capacity (not an insular existence).

A key consequence Kant wishes to draw from transcendental idealism in the Fourth Paralogism is that we can be immediately related to outer objects. Our capacity to be outer affected, that is, is a capacity to be immediately related to what affects us. I will try now to set out how this follows from the fact that we and what affects us are capacities and potencies rather than entities with intrinsic reality complete in themselves (that may or may not underlie such potencies). I begin with two simple examples and then try to apply the results of the second example to the case of outer affection.

Suppose a proton and an electron are nothing but potencies to attract and be attracted, repel and be repelled, etcetera. Suppose further a potency that is activated and afterwards (after no longer activated) retains the potency is the same potency throughout. Thus a proton after attracting an electron and then being moved away (so no longer attracting) retains a potency to

attract and is thus the same potency throughout. When a proton attracts an electron, the attracting of the proton is the same action as the being attracted of the electron so that the two potencies are coactivated (or share their activation). There is nothing intermediary between the activations. It is not as if the proton is attracting, the electron is being attracted, and there is some further extrinsic relation between them. Their both being activated potencies is the relation. This conception of immediate relation is similar in some ways to the doctrine of internal relations and also to Kant's characterization in the *Amphibolies* (A283–285, B339–341) of relations without intrinsic *relata*. It is not as if we have the proton potency in its activation state, and the electron potency in its activation state (the *relata*), and then a relation between them. Their each being in their “state” is the relation. On the other hand, suppose there is an intrinsic nature to the proton that constitutes what it is (a “plus-ness actuality”) that at most “underlies” its potency to attract and similarly for the electron. Then, when attraction between them takes place, the electron is only mediately related to the proton (the plus-ness actuality it is), for the relation is now mediated by the activation of the proton's potency. My contention is not that in a world of sheer potencies without intrinsic existence all relations are immediate. If an electron gun shoots an electron, an object with an excess surface positive charge may attract it. The gun and the object, even if both are sheer potencies, are not in immediate relation because a third potency acting (the discharged free electron) is intermediary between them. My contention, rather, is that in a world of intrinsic existences (where everything has its own internal, fully actualized nature) these existences (even if they underlie potencies) are never in immediate relation.

Immediate relations need not be restricted to such a fundamental level as protons and electrons. As long as there is no separable intermediary potency (separable from the two potencies acting) there will be an immediate relation. Consider as my second example one billiard ball striking another. The potency of the first to impart motion is activated together with the activation of the potency of the second to have motion imparted to it. If they are both sheer motive potencies, then they are immediately related, whereas if inertia, mass, etcetera, are intrinsic actualities that are more than sheer potencies, and constitute thus the being of the billiard balls, then they are not immediately related by the impact (the imparting of motion is extrinsic to both). This immediacy is compatible with each of the balls being composed of atoms, so long as these atoms, in turn, are potencies and not intrinsic realities having potencies. If they are potencies, then the balls are organizations of atomistic potencies internally related to one another (as to overall cohesiveness), and so the balls are simply this overall cohesiveness for imparting motion or having motion imparted. On the other hand, if the atoms are intrinsic realities, each ball is a collection of intrinsic natures spatially related to one another, which overall merely underlies cohesiveness (for imparting motion or having motion imparted), and so the balls,

as such collections, are only mediately related by the impact that each at best underlies.

Turn now to the case at hand—our being immediately related by outer sense to what exists outside us in space. Kant says that what he has proved in the B edition Refutation of Idealism is

The immediate consciousness of the existence of outer things . . . be the possibility of this consciousness understood by us or not. (footnote (a) to B277)

For Kant, I believe, outer sense, or being outer affected, is basically a matter of mechanical energy being exchanged, as when one bumps up against things, is pulled by them, lifts them, etcetera. Being outer affected, that is, is the detection of impenetrability, inertia, and moving force (A226, B247). The discussion that follows pertains to these cases of outer perception, not to vision or hearing.

Suppose a potency to impart mechanical energy (a body) pushes me along or pushes me back. Say that my outer attending opens me up to such energy being imparted to me all the way through to conscious detection. By “opening me up” I mean it sets my nervous system (including the brain) to be a cohesive potency for having energy imparted throughout the system. If we equate perception with the activation of this cohesive potency for having energy imparted, then perception would be an immediate relation to the potency for imparting energy (the external body) in its activated state. This would just be a more complicated version of the coactivation of two potencies when one billiard ball strikes another. It is just that in this case we (the second ball) are a cohesive potency for energy being imparted not only as mechanical impetus for our body to move but also thereby (as a single system) a reverberation of energy throughout the nervous system.

The difficult point is the supposed identification of conscious perception with this entire reception of energy (with the entire coactivation of the potency we are with the potency the external body is). It seems that the consciousness takes place in the brain and so that the conscious perception is not the entire activation but only the “tail end” of it in the brain (in which case conscious perception would not be immediately related to the body imparting energy). It is something like this difficulty, I believe, that is the source of Kant’s disclaimer “be the possibility of this [immediate] consciousness understood by us or not.”

My first suggestion is that what corresponds to that which goes on in the brain alone is not conscious perception but a retaining of it in a form (as short-term memory or whatever) for utilization in relation to intellectual apprehension, judgment, inference, etcetera. What goes on in the brain alone, that is, is the holding of the perceiving for its functional role in relation to judgment and action. In a word, what goes on (or what corresponds to what goes on) in the brain alone (that which is not in immediate relation

to the body in space) is reflective consciousness. If this is correct, and if a conscious hallucination takes place in the brain alone, then being taken in by an hallucination is a failure to discern in mere reflective consciousness a retained form of (actual) perceiving from the hallucination which is just like it. It is clear then why I may not be able to tell the difference by reflection, because perceptual consciousness in its retained form is no different than the hallucination. The best way to discern the difference is not to try to discern it by inner reflection but just the opposite: to stop trying and let the bodily cohesive system for having energy imparted operate (*viz.*, to direct attention outward).

This distinction between sheer perceptual consciousness versus its retained form as a functional unit supposes that the sheer perceptual consciousness “takes place” in (or is) the entire cohesive system being activated. But how can what takes place outside the brain (the seat of consciousness) be what we are conscious of? I believe the correct model, phenomenologically speaking, is not that consciousness contains within it what we are conscious of but, rather, that consciousness envelops or encompasses what we are conscious of, somewhat like an awning envelops or encompasses, in its shading, everything under it down to the ground beneath it. After all, phenomenologically my consciousness of a body pushing on me seems to encompass the body without incorporating it (containing it) within itself. In this enveloping model, now, the reception of energy in the brain can be said to be that component of the entire imparting of the external body’s mechanical energy that envelops the entire energy being imparted. There is a single cohesive potency for having energy imparted, that is, so that the tail end of the imparting (in the brain) envelops the energy imparted in the rest of the system. This “envelopment” simply signifies that the brain receives energy from the entire system, not just the nerves in the left toe, etcetera.

If the conscious perception then is (or corresponds to) the activation of the cohesive potency I am (in outer attending) for having energy imparted throughout unto envelopment, then I, in consciously perceiving, am a potency coactivated with the potency the external body is for imparting energy. Hence in conscious perception I am immediately related to what is outside me. I am immediately related, that is, to the sheer potency that material reality outside me is in its activated state. What we are conscious of is energy being imparted, which is the imparting of energy which, in its turn, is the potency to impart energy in its activated state which, finally, is the body outside us. Once again, as in the billiard ball case, this immediate relation is consistent with these large-scale potencies being constituted by subpotencies, although not consistent with being constituted by intrinsically existing subelements.

To summarize the results of this section, intrinsic existence is what belongs to something internally or on its own, and it remains that way in any case of “acting” on other things (which action is extrinsic to it), whereas existence as a potency is “real” outside itself in activated

conditions. For Kant, the transcendental ideality of space implies that all material reality existing in space exists as potency or capacity, not as intrinsic. This is consistent with actual and potential interaction between material realities (neither of which is us or our bodies) and also allows our being immediately related in outer sense to material reality. With these points in hand, I turn to the text of the Fourth Paralogism.

(II) THE TEXT OF THE FOURTH PARALOGISM

To be in line with the first three Paralogisms, the fourth should pertain to a conclusion drawn from the cogito that doesn't follow from it but seems to follow because of an ambiguity. The aspect of the cogito that is pertinent to the Fourth Paralogism is the immediately revealed distinction between what is inner and so belongs to me versus what is outer and distinct from me. As usual, Kant accepts that there is a valid conclusion to be drawn (a real distinction between inner and outer), but that the rational psychologist concludes to a sense of outer that is more than what can be revealed in the cogito. The key ambiguity then is over the notion of existence *outside* me. The rational psychologist concludes that I am a substance (to which inner states belong) distinct from outer objects which are substances with their own intrinsic existence that I, as inner, am never immediately related to. But neither my substantiality nor that of objects in space can be derived from the sheer distinction between inner and outer that is discerned in the cogito. As usual, Kant's own positive conclusion is a nonsubstantial (non-entitative) one. All that can be concluded is that the action of inner representing is distinct from the action of outer representing, but not that these actions are distinct by the former pertaining to me alone as a substantial entity, and the latter pertaining also to substantial entities distinct from me (that somehow are responsible for inner actions in me). Rather, for Kant, the action of outer representing is an immediate relation to action of reality in space (outside me), and inner representing is simply a matter of retracting attention inward—so that it is not *by* inner representing that we have representations of what is real in space.

Although I believe the Fourth Paralogism basically proceeds as just characterized (and so in line with my interpretation of the first three Paralogisms), Kant presents the syllogism itself in epistemological rather than ontological terms as concerning the doubtfulness of material existence. He goes on to characterize the two views to be discussed (idealism versus dualism) in epistemological terms as well as concerning doubtfulness versus the "possible certainty in regard to objects of outer sense." However, in the body of the Paralogism any supposed epistemological difference is derived from a more fundamental ontological difference between objects outside us in the transcendental sense and objects outside us in the empirical sense (transcendental versus empirical dualism). The ontological ambiguity thus

is the fundamental one. I believe Kant cast the paralogism in epistemological terms for architectonic reasons. He wanted the four paralogisms to correspond to the four-fold division of the table of categories. The fourth group of these (modality) become, as principles, postulates of empirical thought, which Kant understood as epistemic principles, not ontological ones (see A219). This casting, however, obscures the genuine ontological nature of the Fourth Paralogism.

The Fourth Paralogism was replaced in the B edition by the Refutation of Idealism. The reason I believe is not because the Fourth Paralogism in fact espouses some sort of subjective idealism which is then rejected or contradicted in the B edition Refutation. Nor is the reason just that Kant wanted to present the B edition in ways that would avoid the misrepresentation by his readers that he espoused such idealism (a misrepresentation the Fourth Paralogism invites). I believe the key relationship, rather, is that there was an issue left open by the Fourth Paralogism. Suppose the Fourth Paralogism establishes that I, as the subject of inner states, am not an entity or substance distinct from material entities or substances but only a capacity for both inner and outer action (the latter relating me immediately to material action in space). It still remains open whether I could exist only as a capacity for inner action; that is, it remains open whether my existence is separable from all material existence. It is this question which is settled in the negative in the B edition Refutation. With this in mind I shall avoid any reading of the Fourth Paralogism as espousing subjective idealism (the doctrine that I am a reality with representations belonging to me alone—only some of them have “outer” or spatial quality).

In the second paragraph (beginning “Let us first examine the premise . . .” at A367) and continuing in the third and fourth paragraphs, Kant characterizes his opponent’s view (the opponent being Descartes). For Descartes all perception is “inner” (a state of the thinking subject), and so any representation of what is outside me distinct from my inner perceptions is no immediate representation; rather, it is the thought of what (itself unperceived) causes my inner states. Again emphasizing the ontological point, for Descartes an outer object is a substance or entity that I am not in immediate relation to. The object with its intrinsic nature has also a potency to act on me which, given my potency to be acted on, produces an inner state in me. It is this action that mediates between me (in my intrinsic nature) and the outer object, including my body, in its intrinsic nature, so that I am not in immediate relation to outer objects.

In Paragraphs Five through Seven (beginning “Before exhibiting our Paralogism in all its deceptiveness . . .” at A369), Kant presents his doctrine of transcendental idealism and distinguishes it from transcendental realism. He says the transcendental realist

regards space and time as something given in themselves, independently of our sensibility [and] . . . thus interprets outer appearances

as things in themselves . . . which are therefore outside us—the phrase “outside us” being interpreted in conformity with the pure concepts of understanding. (A369)

Kant’s opponent conceives of outer appearances (what appears externally) as being entities existing in their own right in objective space and so as subjects to which properties of extension, relations of spatial location, etcetera apply. What is outside us, that is, is what “bears” in its own being spatial properties and relations (=the pure concept of substance as subject of predicates). If so, then what distinguishes inner from outer perceptions is at most that outer perception has a spatial quality to it and corresponds to, or is caused by, outer entities with true spatiality. In particular, the difference is not, as for Kant, that outer perception involves different action (outer attending) than inner perception. Inner and outer perceptions for the transcendental realist may be qualitatively different and differentially caused, but ontologically they are both states of me alone. Note that this is true even in veridical outer perception. Outerness, that is, is an intrinsic quality of some of my perceptions and a feature or relation of entities distinct from me, and so it is not that by which I am in immediate relation to outer reality.

Kant on the other hand (Paragraph Six) considers

this matter, and even its inner possibility, to be appearance merely; . . . [which] if separated from our sensibility is nothing.

Matter, that is, is nothing more than the potency to affect us (to appear) and has no intrinsic existence beyond such potency. As such matter exists in a “species of representations”: viz, in outer representations. The potency matter is to affect us, as activated, is the action of our thus being affected (again, as the potency of a billiard ball to impart motion, as activated, is that action of motion being imparted). For Kant, unlike Descartes, outer representation is not a species of inner representation (those inner representations that have spatial quality to them and which are extrinsically caused by material entities existing intrinsically, or in their own right, in objective space). Rather, outer representations are that species of representations that, unlike inner representations, are immediately related to (indeed, contain) the potency that matter is in its activated condition. Kant, note, calls the species of representations that matter is “external” representations; that is, they involve the potency matter is in its activated condition. Again he contrasts this with calling them external because they extrinsically relate “to objects in themselves external” (to entities existing in their own right in space, as more than potencies to affect). But if there are to be such outer or external representations, there must be on our part a potency to be affected all the way “in” or “through” unto detection (sensitivity, consciousness). It is the action of outer attending that brings the potency

to be affected all the way in. Even without outer attending my body can be receptive to affecting action of matter. Outer attending (as in section (i)) opens me up from the inside, converting a mere bodily receptivity into my receptivity. My “internal” bodily organization (brain and nervous system) is made receptive along with my mechanically receptive body (as one cohesive system) for the imparting of energy or motion by outer attending. In the *Aesthetic*, Kant says of space,

It is the subjective condition of sensibility, under which alone outer intuition is possible . . . [it is] *the receptivity of the subject, its capacity to be affected by objects*. . . . (italics mine; A26, B42)

Outer representations, then, are distinguished from inner representations by the *action* of outer attending which makes us a receptivity for the potency of matter. In then proceeding to shift outer attention various actions of matter affecting us arise. It is this arising in the course of outer (spatial) shifting along of attention that constitutes the spatiality of matter. As Kant says, outer perceptions (perceptions that involve being affected) are ones that

relate perception to the space in which all things are external to one another.

What makes something belong to the species of outer perception or outer representation is that it is perceiving in the course of outer attending. It is in this same outer attending that all things are external to one another (the spatial existence of matter is “where” it arises in action in the shift of attending). Of course as an ongoing potency the matter that acts may “separate” from me (move off), but at the point of affecting me it (that potency in its activated condition) is not external to my receptivity. (Its moving off, of course, will likewise not be its motion in objective space but, rather, proprieties of our being affected or its affecting in the course of proper shifts of attention that are alternative to my actual shift of attention.) Kant concludes the paragraph with the ominous sounding words

while yet the space itself is in us.

Again, to understand this as meaning that some of our representations have spatial quality (qualitative spatial organization) is to confuse Kant with his opponent. What it means rather is that space is that outer attending by which we are receptive to the action of matter being imparted. Outer attention opens us up to being immediately related to material action arising in the course of that attention.

For Kant, the distinction between inner and outer is not the distinction between perceiving as a purely inner state and the outer object existing in

objective space that causes it via intervening action. Perceiving in the course of outer attending is being affected all the way unto detection, not a purely inner state. The purely inner state comes only with retracting attention inward. In retracting attention I am discerning part of my own potency or receptivity to being outer affected. In lifting a boulder, I may attend to how I am bodily or mechanically operating and adjusting (usually with the idea of getting a better grip, more leverage, etc.). These discernments are not caused by the boulder or by lifting the boulder; they are, rather, potencies that I have to organize and reorganize my own detecting (my own receptivity to being outer affected). In inner attending, we discern our own way of actively functioning, as opposed to discerning the realization of our sheer potency to be affected.

If I am correct, Kant in the Fourth Paralogism, via his transcendental idealism, is holding a version of what later came to be called naïve realism regarding perception. This is the doctrine that the immediate object of perception is not an effect distinct from what causes the perception: it is the “cause” itself. In Kant’s version, the cause is a potency (the potency to affect that matter is), and the object is that very potency (in its activated condition of affecting us). The distinction is just that the potency can “move on” (move off) after the transaction. It is not that we perceive (transact with) only an effect of the potency; the potency exists with our potency to be affected as the transaction (the imparting of energy). The potency then is something “more” than what exists in the transaction, but not something “other” than what exists in the transaction. Kant says in a quite remarkable passage,

. . . and it is not therefore the motion of matter that produces representations in us; the motion itself is representation only as also is the matter that makes itself known in this way. (A387)

In my interpretation, the realization or activation of matter’s potency (= the motion itself) *is* the outer representation, and it is at the same time also the matter (the potency in its then-activated condition or state of imparting motion).

Let us return for a moment to the issue of what is revealed in the cogito. Kant accepts that a distinction between inner and outer (a distinction between what belongs to us versus what is other than us) is revealed. My suggestion is that what Kant believes is thus revealed (what I discern within the cogito) is the difference between outer attending and retracting attention inward. This is not a difference in the quality of inner states (some having spatial quality, others not), nor a difference in some inner states being extrinsically related to entities with their own existence outside me in objective space. Rather it is the discerned difference between being “opened up” for (receptive to) being materially affected versus being “closed in on oneself” (attending to and governing how one is receiving). Kant says in Paragraph Seven,

The only difference is that the representation of myself, as the thinking subject, belongs to inner sense only, while representations which mark extended beings belong also to outer sense. (A371)

What is discerned in the cogito then is not the certain or indubitable existence of thinking *substance* versus the only problematic existence of distinct material substances existing in objective space in their own right but, rather, the “certainty” of inner attending to what belongs to me versus outer attending that opens me up to what is other than me (makes me a receptivity for imparting of action by matter).

For Kant, unlike Descartes, the meditative “retreat” into the cogito is not a retreat into a thinking subject with its own internal states (some with spatial quality and some not). This would be a retreat not only from material reality but from space itself. For Kant, there is no retreat from either time or space. In meditating I come back to a subject (me) with a progression of inner and outer attending. My being is essentially temporal and open for affection by what is distinct from my temporal being. Even if I inner attend I have not abstracted myself from outer attending, which always remains at least peripherally. What is discerned in the cogito, that is, is no substantial ‘I’ without space but, in Heideggerian terms, a being that is always ahead of itself in having been (*viz.*, a subject of inner attending) that is also always outside or alongside itself (*viz.*, a subject of outer attending). As with the other three Paralogisms, then, what is revealed in the cogito is the subject as action and the potency or capacity for action, not the subject as intrinsic self-subsistent entity.

The positive conclusion that Kant thinks can be drawn from the cogito in regard to distinguishing myself from what is other than me is that I am an action for inner attending (to my own states), and I am also an action for outer attending by which I am in immediate relation to (material) action for affecting me. If we add now the extension of this beyond the immediate present cogito and the intellectual unity (rules) governing attending, we get that I am an ongoing capacity for unifying inner attending, which is also a capacity for being outer affected by material reality that has an ongoing potency to affect me. Both I, and what is other than me, then, are capacities—not intrinsic self-subsistent (spatiotemporal) entities having or underlying these capacities. This is in line with my interpretation of Kant’s conception of a person in Part IV, and the distinction within the cogito as one of action for inner versus outer attending (as opposed to inner vs. outer substantiality or entity-hood) is in line with my general interpretation of each of the first three Paralogisms.

In the ninth paragraph (beginning “Since so far as I know, all psychologists who accept empirical idealism,” at A372), Kant allows there may be intrinsic substantial reality distinct from us. He says,

We can indeed admit that something, which may be (in the transcendental sense) outside us, is the cause of our outer intuitions.

This substantial intrinsic reality, however, is not outside us in space because for Kant there is no intrinsic self-subsistent reality (beyond potencies to affect us) in space. It is rather the noumenal ground and as such may not even be outside us (distinct from us) in the transcendental sense. He says,

The transcendental object is equally unknown in respect to inner and outer intuition.

It may be, for example, that this ground is the Spinozistic God with attributes of both thought and extension. Whatever else, note that the admission of such a ground is by no means a doctrine of double affection. Being affected is something that arises in the course of outer attending, and affecting matter likewise so arises. The potency that matter is may continue as we divert our attention, but it continues as a potency to affect in the course of the propriety of shifting attention so as to keep track. Matter exists thus only in appearing (affecting) in the course of proper (even if unperformed) attention shifting. To say that which is inseparable from thus properly arising to appear (to affect) cannot be that which affects us (but requires a noumenal object) is the antithesis of Kant's view, and is absurd on the face of it. Kant says,

this [transcendental object] is not the object of which we are thinking in the representation of matter, and of corporeal things.

Thinking of at least one case of the noumenal as Spinoza's God is helpful, I believe, in avoiding misunderstandings of the relation of Kant's idealism to the idea of noumenal reality.

If we compare the Fourth Paralogism to the first three, it should end here with the ninth paragraph. Each of the first three Paralogisms, after exposing the ambiguity and arguing which disambiguation (namely Kant's) really follows from what is discernible in the cogito, ends with allowing the psychologist's version as a noumenal possibility. The Fourth Paralogism, through Paragraph Nine, exactly follows this structure. It lays out the ambiguity of being outside us (other than us) in the substantial or transcendental sense (in which we are one substance with internal states and what is other than us is a distinct self-subsistent substance in space) versus being outside us in the empirical sense (in which we are a capacity for outer attending immediately related to potencies for affecting us in the course of such attending). It claims that the former is not revealed in the cogito. Rather the phenomenological truth of the cogito is that I am immediately related to what I outer attend to (not my own states). Then finally in Paragraph Nine it allows the psychologist's version (substantial dualism) as a noumenal possibility. I believe that the ontological issue of the nature of our distinctness from material reality (what affects us) has been basically settled, and so the Fourth Paralogism in this regard is basically complete.

The rest of the Paralogism, to a large extent, tries to derive epistemological consequences from this ontological conclusion (that certain forms of skepticism are avoided). I do not pursue these issues here, for I don't believe that Kant is successful, either here or in the B Refutation, in avoiding all aspects of Cartesian skepticism. I do, however, consider a few passages from his remaining paragraphs that reinforce my interpretation of the ontological conclusion.

In the tenth paragraph (beginning "The expression "outside us" is thus unavoidably ambiguous" at A373), Kant reiterates that it is the ontological ambiguity between existing outside us as appearance versus as thing in itself that is the crux of the paralogism. He characterizes empirically external objects as

things which are *to be found* in space. (italics mine)

Things in themselves or entities with intrinsic reality would exist in objective space apart from being what is to be found, whereas appearances have their entire existence in being found in space (in arising in the course of spatial attending).

In the eleventh paragraph Kant says,

Thirdly, space itself is nothing but mere representation, and therefore nothing in it can count as real save only what is represented in it. (A374)

Space is nothing but that outer attending by which we are affected, and so what is real in space is only what affects in the course of that attending: as Kant said at the end of the sixth paragraph, "while yet the space itself is in us." To say that space is in us and what is real is what arises in space seems to express a subjective idealism, but this is to misunderstand Kant. What is in us (space) is exactly the action of outer attending by which we are receptive to the potency of material action. What is in us, that is, is our capacity to be immediately related to what is not in us. In one sense this is the key distinction Kant sees between himself and Berkeley. He, like Berkeley, denies objective space existing intrinsically apart from us. He, like Berkeley then, puts space "in" us. Only for Berkeley, as Kant sees him, space (extension, location, etc.) pertains to further qualities of our mental ideas or perceptions and their relations. Space, that is, is empirically inner—somewhat like color. For Kant on the other hand space is that by which we get outside ourselves, rather than a further aspect of what is found within us. In a purely structural way Kant's transcendental idealism is like phenomenalism. Both ascribe reality to what exists in actual or possible experience (not to what exists apart from the full possibility of experience). The difference is that for Kant experience is a transactional occurrence, not an internal occurrence. Outer experience for Kant does not happen inside the subject;

it happens between the subject, with its liability to be affected as it shifts attention along, and what arises as acting on the subject in the course of that shifting. Equivalently, from Kant's point of view, the phenomenalist's reality is in actual and possible inner perceptions (even if those perceptions have spatial quality), whereas Kantian phenomenal reality is in actual and possible (proper) outer perceiving. For Kant, reality is neither purely external (a transcendental realism according to which real objects with their own existence beyond any potency to affect us exist in objective space), nor purely internal (an empirical idealism according to which real objects have no existence beyond internal perceptions). Reality exists rather in the actual and possible commerce of being affected: a commerce or nexus that is not derived from a purely external and a purely internal component but is fundamental.

Kant says in the twelfth paragraph,

reality in space being the reality of a mere representation, is nothing other than perception itself. (A376)

He means by perception here (as he has just previously said) "representation and intuition," not internal sensing. An outer perception is a realization of a receptivity to being affected, with outer attending being the action by which this is a receptivity for being affected all the way into, or unto, discernment. This realization is, at the same time, the realization of the potency of matter to affect us. Matter imparting energy or "motion" in us unto discernment, that is, is our being affected unto discernment. Reality in space acting (imparting motion) is exactly outer perception or our being affected unto discernment (motion being imparted). Kant says in the footnote to Paragraph Twelve (A375),

Nothing whatsoever is in space, save in so far as it is actually represented.

I don't think he means to preclude here that being affected may properly arise in the course of proper shifts of attending that are not actually performed. Rather I believe he means that no reality beyond or other than potency to affect us (reality immediately represented) is in space, as such reality would have its spatial existence apart from arising in the course of attending, again making space something more than the mere form of intuition (the form of outer transaction). He says just previously,

For space is itself nothing but representation, and whatever is in it must therefore be contained in the representation.

To be "contained" in outer attending is to arise within it (as affecting us). Any further reality than such affecting (or the potency thus realized) would have to be nonspatial if space is the mere form of intuition.

After making mostly epistemological points in Paragraphs Thirteen and Fourteen, Kant says in Paragraph Fifteen (A379),

If then we ask whether it follows that in the doctrine of the soul dualism is alone tenable, we must answer “Yes, certainly; but dualism only in the empirical sense.” That is to say, in the connection of experience matter as substance in the [field of] appearance is really given to outer sense, just as the thinking “I,” also as substance in the [field of] appearance is given to inner sense.

By “matter as substance” Kant does not mean a self-subsistent intrinsic reality but matter as ongoing or “permanent” potency to affect in the course of (proper) shifting of attention. His talk of the thinking ‘I’ as “substance in the appearance” is unusual, as there is no intuitable permanence to it. Recall, however, that he said in the First Paralogism,

The proposition “The soul is substance” may however quite well be allowed to stand. (A350)

In Chapter 4, I interpreted this to mean that as far as non-noumenal reality is concerned, I am always subject and never predicate (even though I am no intrinsic reality but an intellectual action of being a source of thoughts, including thoughts unifying inner perceptions). That Kant has this in mind I think is clear from what he goes on to say here in the Fourth Paralogism (A379),

Though the “I” as represented through inner sense in time, and objects in space outside me, *are specifically quite distinct appearances*, they are not for that reason thought as being different things. (italics mine)

What he is getting at, I believe, is that unifying inner attending, as being nonspatial, is not a material capacity. If so, then the marshaling from which the unifying proceeds is a fundamental capacity or potency. Neither the action nor the capacity, that is, is derivative upon a more fundamental material capacity, which would make it (the capacity the ‘I’ is) a predicate or property of matter in the empirical realm (and so no longer subject and never predicate even non-noumenally). Kant, as I have said, rejects mind-brain identity in any of its forms. How much of Kant’s view depends on this rejection is a complicated issue beyond the scope of this book. My hypothesis is that almost everything Kant says about the thinking subject, the person, and the transcendental ideality of space and time would hold even if one accepted mind-brain identity.

Notes

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. Martin Heidegger, *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 234
2. Richard Aquila, "Self as Matter and Form: Some Reflections on Kant's View of the Soul" in *Figuring the Self*, p. 32. See also footnote 5 to p. 32.
3. *Ibid*, p. 38.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. *Being and Nothingness*, Part Two, Chapter Two, II, p. 190.
2. *Bounds of Sense*, p. 174.
3. *Ibid*, p. 170.
4. See my *Themes in Kant's Metaphysics and Ethics*, Chapters 1, 2, and 8.
5. For a detailed presentation, see my *Space, Time, and Thought in Kant*.
6. I consider such matters in detail in my *Representation of the World: A Naturalized Semantics*.
7. See Part IV, Chapter 9, for a discussion of inner sense, self-affection, and determining our existence as appearance.
8. See Part V, Chapter 11.
9. See footnote (a) to B160.
10. See Part IV, Chapter 9.
11. *Being and Nothingness*, Part Two, Chapter Two, II, p. 190.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. Jonathan Bennett, for example, in *Kant's Dialectic*.
2. Karl Ameriks, "The Paralogisms of Pure Reason in the First Edition" in *Immanuel Kant-Kritik der Reinen Vernunft*, p. 381.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. See also Margaret Wilson, "Leibniz and Materialism."
2. Thomas Nagel, *Mortal Questions*.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. The discussion in this chapter is indebted to Robert Howell's remarkable article "Kant, the 'I Think,' and Self-Awareness" in *Kant's Legacy*.
2. Sartre, p. 215.
3. Ibid, p. 218.
4. Ibid, p. 217.
5. Dieter Henrich, "Self-Consciousness and Speculative Thinking" in *Figuring the Self*, p. 115.
6. Peter Strawson, *Individuals*, Chapter 2.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

1. Udo Thiel, "The Critique of Rational Psychology" in *A Companion to Kant*, p. 211.
2. Tobias Rosefeldt, "Kant's Self: Real Entity and Logical Identity" in Glock, *Strawson and Kant*.
3. Graham Bird, *The Revolutionary Kant*, p. 631.
4. See the discussion of the second and third paragraphs of the Second Paralogism in Chapter 4.
5. Graham Bird, "The Paralogisms and Kant's Account of Psychology," *Kant-Studien* (91), p. 144.
6. Quassim Cassam, *Self and World*, p. 160.
7. Ibid, p. 167.
8. Andrew Brook, *Kant and the Mind*, p. 33.
9. Ibid, p. 65.
10. Pierre Keller, *Kant and the Demands of Self-Consciousness*, p. 172.
11. See B428–429, B157.
12. David Rosenthal, "Unity of Consciousness and the Self," *PAS* (103). See p. 332.
13. Ibid, p. 333.
14. Ibid, p. 327.
15. See Parts IV, V.
16. Patricia Kitcher, "Kant on Self-Consciousness," *Philosophical Review* (108), p. 378.
17. Richard Aquila, "Self as Matter and Form: Some Reflections on Kant's View of the Mind," p. 31.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7

1. *Matter and Mind*, p. 167.
2. Ibid, p. 184–185.
3. Ibid, p. 176.
4. *Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics*; translated by Gary Hatfield, p. 57.
5. *Kant and the Mind*, p. 40.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 8

1. Though in Part V, Chapter 11, I consider the relation of the category of substance to rules for space and time.
2. For an insightful discussion, see Paul Guyer, *Kant and the Claims of Knowledge*.

3. For a complete discussion of these issues see my *Representation of the World; A Naturalized Semantics*.
4. *Kant and the Mind*, p. 40.
5. As Patricia Kitcher holds in *Kant's Transcendental Psychology*.
6. I consider the cogency of there being such rules in Part V, Chapter 11.
7. *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique*, p. 268.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 9

1. *Bounds of Sense*, p. 249.
2. David Carr, "The Paradox of Subjectivity," p. 58.
3. "Kant, the 'I think,' and Self-Awareness," p. 121. See also footnote 9 to p. 121.
4. *Kant and the Mind*, p. 193.
5. Quassim Cassam, p. 74.
6. *Ibid*, p. 73–74.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 10

1. For a convincing and thorough discussion of the connection between Kant and the current literature, see Robert Howell, "Kant, the 'I think,' and Self-Awareness."
2. Galen Strawson, "The Self," in Martin and Baressi, p. 362.
3. Derek Parfit, "The Unimportance of Identity," in Martin and Baressi, p. 294.
4. John Campbell, *Past, Space, and Self*, p. 194.
5. See Thomas Nagel, *Mortal Questions*.
6. J. David Velleman, "Self to Self," note 53 to p. 75.
7. Derek Parfit, "The Unimportance of Survival," p. 315.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 11

1. Wilfrid Sellars, "This I or He or It that Thinks," #30.
2. See *The Bounds of Sense*.
3. John McDowell, *Mind and World*, p. 104.
4. For a more detailed version of the discussion that follows, see Chapter 7 of my *Themes in Kant's Metaphysics and Ethics*.
5. For a defense of this claim, see Chapter 7 of my *Themes in Kant's Metaphysics and Ethics*.
6. In more detail the claim is as follows: Upon being affected [sun-wise], it is proper to be so far along in regulating tracking from j-th detecting so-and-so (sunset) to k-th detecting so-and-so (sunrise), *and but for interruption from the j-th detecting to the k-th detecting*, it is proper to be so far along in unifying inner attending from first (=yesterday) so-and-so.
7. *Mind and World*, p. 104.
8. *Mind and World*, p. 99.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 12

1. Rae Langton, *Kantian Humility: Our Ignorance of Things in Themselves*.
2. For a similar point, see Karl Ameriks, "Kant and the Short Arguments to Humility."

Bibliography

WORKS BY KANT

- Immanuel Kant: Gesammelte Schriften*, Berlin: Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; 1902.
- Bernard, J. H. (tr.), *The Critique of Judgment*, Amherst: Prometheus Books, 2000.
- Hatfield, Gary (tr.), *Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Kemp Smith, Norman (tr.), *Critique of Pure Reason*, Boston/N.Y.: Bedford/St. Martin's Press, 1965.
- Wood, Allen W. and Guyer, Paul (tr.), *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*, Cambridge; N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

OTHER WORKS

- Ameriks, Karl, *Kant's Theory of the Mind: An Analysis of the Paralogisms*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Ameriks, Karl, "Kant and Short Arguments to Humility" in *Interpreting Kant's Critiques*, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Ameriks, Karl, "The Paralogisms of Pure Reason in the First Edition" in *Immanuel Kant-Kritik der Reinen Vernunft*, G. Mohr and M. Willaschek (eds.).
- Aquila, Richard, *Matter in Mind*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Aquila, Richard, "Self as Matter and Form: Some Reflections on Kant's View of the Self" in *Figuring the Self*, David Klemm and G. Zoeller (eds.).
- Banham, Gary, *Kant's Transcendental Imagination*, N.Y.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Baressi, Hohn and Martin, Raymond (eds.), *Personal Identity*, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Bennett, Jonathan, *Kant's Dialectic*, London, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Bird, Graham, "The Paralogisms and Kant's Account of Psychology," *Kantstudien* 91, 2000 (129–145).
- Bird, Graham (ed.), *A Companion to Kant*, Malden, Mass, Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.
- Bird, Graham, *The Revolutionary Kant*, Chicago: Open Court, 2006.
- Blackburn, Simon, "Has Kant Refuted Parfit?," in *Reading Parfit*, Jonathan Dancy (ed.).
- Brook, Andrew, *Kant and the Mind*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Brun-Rovert, Etienne, "Reid, Kant, and the Philosophy of Mind," *Ph Q* 52, 2002.
- Campbell, John, *Past, Space, and Self*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1995.
- Carr, David, *The Paradox of Subjectivity: The Self in the Transcendental Tradition*, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Cassam, Quassim, *Self and World*, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Cicovaci, Predrag, *Kant's Legacy: Essays in Honor of Lewis White Beck*, University of Rochester Press, 2001.
- Dancy, Jonathan, *Reading Parfit*, Oxford, Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1997.
- Descartes, Rene, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, John Cuttingham (tr.), N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Gibbons, Sarah, *Kant's Theory of Imagination: Bridging Gaps in Judgment and Experience*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Glock, Hans-Johann (ed.), *Strawson and Kant*, Cambridge, N.Y.: Oxford, 2003.
- Grier, Michele, *Kant's Doctrine of Transcendental Illusion*, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Guyer, Paul, *Kant and the Claims of Knowledge*, Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge, 1987.
- Guyer, Paul (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Kant*, Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge, 1992.
- Guyer, Paul (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Heidegger, Martin, *Being and Time*, John Macquarrie and Edwars Robinson (trs.), Oxford, Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1978.
- Heidegger, Martin, *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (trs.), Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Henrich, Dieter, "Self-Consciousness and Speculative Thinking" in *Figuring the Self*, David Klemm and G. Zoeller (eds.).
- Howell, Robert, "Kant, the 'I Think,' and Self-Awareness" in *Kant's Legacy*, Predrag Cicovaci (ed.).
- Hume, David, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, L. A. Selby-Bigge (tr.), Oxford, 1978.
- Husserl, Edmund, *Cartesian Meditations*, Dorion Cairns (tr.), The Hague: Springer, 1977.
- Husserl, Edmund, *The Phenomenology of Internal Time Consciousness*, James S. Churchill (tr.), Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Keller, Pierre, *Kant and the Demands of Self-Consciousness*, Cambridge UK: Cambridge, 1998.
- Kemp Smith, Norman, *A Commentary to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, MacMillan, 1918.
- Kitcher, Patricia, *Kant's Transcendental Psychology*, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Kitcher, Patricia, "Kant on Self-Consciousness," *Philosophical Review* 108 (3), 1999.
- Klemm, David and Zoeller, G. (eds.), *Figuring the Self*, Albany: SUNY Press, 1997.
- Langton, Rae, *Kantian Humility: Our Ignorance of Things in Themselves*, N.Y.: Oxford, 2001.
- Locke, John, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, N.Y.: Dover, 1959.
- Longuenesse, Beatrice, *Kant on the Human Standpoint*, Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- McDowell, John, *Mind and World*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Melnick, Arthur, *Space, Time, and Thought in Kant*, Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1989.

- Melnick, Arthur, *Representation of the World: A Naturalized Semantics*, N.Y.: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Melnick, Arthur, *Themes in Kant's Metaphysics and Ethics*, Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, *Phenomenology of Perception*, Colin Smith (tr.), London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Mohr, G. and Willaschek, M., *Immanuel Kant-Kritik der Reinen Vernunft*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1998.
- Nagel, Thomas, *Mortal Questions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Parfit, Derek, *Reasons and Persons*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Parfit, Derek, "The Unimportance of Identity" in *Personal Identity*, John Baressi and Raymond Martin (eds.).
- Powell, C. Thomas, *Kant's Theory of Self-Consciousness*, N.Y.: Oxford, 1990.
- Reid, Thomas, *Essays on the Active Powers of Man*, N.Y.: Garland, 1977.
- Rosefeldt, Tobias, "Kant's Self: Real Entity and Logical Identity" in *Strawson and Kant*, Hans-Johann Glock (ed.).
- Rosenberg, Jay, *The Thinking Self*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.
- Rosenthal, David, "Unity of Consciousness and the Self," *PAS* 103 part 3, 2003.
- Sartre, Jean Paul, *Being and Nothingness*, Hazel E. Barnes (tr.), N.Y.: Pocket Books, 1966.
- Sellars, Wilfrid, "The I Which Thinks," *Proceedings and Addresses of the APA* 44, 1971.
- Sellars, Wilfrid, "This I or He or It That Thinks" in *Categories: A Colloquium*, Henry W. Johnstone Jr. (ed.), Pennsylvania State University, 1978.
- Sellars, Wilfrid, *Essays in Philosophy and its History*, Dordrecht, Holland; Boston: D. Reidel, 1974.
- Spinoza, Benedict, *Ethics*, Edward Curley (tr.), Penguin Classics, 2005.
- Strawson, Galen, "The Self," in *Personal Identity*, John Baressi and Raymond Martin (eds.).
- Strawson, Peter, *The Bounds of Sense*, London: Methuen Routledge, 1990.
- Strawson, Peter, *Entity and Identity: and Other Essays*, N.Y.: Oxford, 1997.
- Thiel, Udo, "The Critique of Rational Psychology" in *A Companion To Kant*, Graham Bird (ed.).
- van Straaten, Zak (ed.), *Philosophical Subjects: Essays Presented to P. F. Strawson*, N.Y.: Oxford, 1980.
- Velleman, J. D., "Self to Self" *Philosophical Review* 105, 1996.
- Wilson, Margaret, "Leibniz and Materialism" *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* (3), 1974.

Index

A

Ameriks, 36, 37
appearance, 15,16,20,24,61,102,120,
122,125,173,174; inner versus
outer, 19, 111–115
apperception, 103, 148; empirical,75–
76, 91, 94–95, 96, 100–102,
148; identity of, 22,23; pure, 76,
94–95, 100–102, 103, 148
Aquila, 10–11, 71, 83–84
Armstrong, 50

B

Bennett, 36,37
Berkeley, 20, 174
Bird, 62
Brook, 68, 69, 91–92, 103, 124–125

C

Campbell, 145
Carr, 124
Cassam, 65–66, 127, 128
consciousness, 6–7, 8, 30, 48, 69,
165–166
Crick, 48

D

Descartes, 32, 36, 64, 67, 86, 168, 172

E

experience, 16–17, 20–21, 99, 105,
174–175

H

Heidegger, 9, 107–108, 130, 172
Henrich, 57
Howell, 124
Hume, 124–125

I

imagination, 80, 96; empirical, 77;
pure, 103, 117; schematizing
versus synthesizing, 83, 96–98
inner sense, 19, 111–115, 119,
128–129, 148, 152, 163, 167,
169–171, 172
intrinsic reality, 15, 16, 20, 24, 114,
132, 160–165, 167, 169, 173,
176
intuition, 14, 17, 18, 23

J

James, 41, 42
judgments, 84–86, 99–100; determinant
versus reflective, 58–59; as rules,
76, 84, 105, 118–119

K

Keller, 68
Kitcher, 70

L

Langton, 160, 161
Leibniz, 40, 41

M

material reality, 151, 160–165, 169,
173, 175, 176
McDowell, 151, 152, 153, 157
Merleau-Ponty, 126, 130

N

Nagel, 50, 59

O

outer sense, 19, 111–115, 152,
156–157, 158, 167, 172, 175;

- in immediate relation to reality,
163, 165–166, 169–171, 175
- P**
- Parfit, 131, 144, 147
- persons, 36, 37, 70, 111 131, 132,
140, 142, 144–145, 146, 156,
158–159, 172; embodied, 153,
156, 157, 159; identity of, 88,
136–138, 151, 152, 157–158;
and psychological continuity
view of, 143–148, 151
- R**
- Rosefeldt, 61
- Rosenthal, 69
- rules, 76, 78, 79–80, 81–83, 100, 106,
115–116, 117, 153–154
- S**
- Sartre, 12, 24, 56–57
- schemata, 80–83, 84, 89, 98, 106–108,
116
- self-consciousness, 6, 8, 51–56, 58, 59,
89–90, 91, 102, 103, 121, 129,
148
- Sellars, 151, 152, 153, 157
- simplicity, 3–4, 39, 43–44, 45–48, 55,
63, 127–128
- space, 96, 101, 175; and transcendental
idealism, 14–17, 24–25, 100,
162, 170, 174
- Spinoza, 38, 173
- Strawson, G. 142
- Strawson, P. 12, 13, 35, 170, 123–124,
151, 152, 153, 158
- substance, 29, 32, 33, 154–155, 167,
169; logical sense of, 30, 35;
noumenal, 29, 33, 34; phenom-
enal, 29, 34, 163
- synthesis, 96; of appearances, 78–79; of
apprehension, 77, 80, 84, 86–87,
90, 94, 111–115, 116–117; of
imagination, 77–78, 96; pure, 94
- T**
- Thiel, 62
- thinking subject, 3–5, 7–8, 30, 36, 51,
54, 56, 59, 61, 67, 68, 75, 86,
87, 119–121, 131, 159; identity
of, 22, 23, 88–89, 90, 92, 94,
97–98, 103, 106, 119–121, 126,
133–135; non-noumenal, 12–13,
21, 24, 37–38, 61, 68, 121, 124,
125, 132, 159; noumenal basis
of, 33, 44, 46, 71, 124, 158
- thoughts, 75, 81–83, 86–87, 92,
122–123, 126; as rules, 76, 79,
84, 100
- time, 20, 23, 104–105, 107–108, 112;
and transcendental idealism,
17–21, 27, 108. 114, 121–122,
132, 153, 155–156, 163
- transcendental idealism, 11, 12–13, 17,
24, 100, 161, 167, 168–169,
171, 174
- V**
- Velleman, 145
- W**
- Wittgenstein, 82