

A edition Transcendental Deduction

Ideal space and time are *pure* \emptyset *imperceptible* \emptyset *absent from the field of appearances (lack empirical reality)* \emptyset *appearances neither occupy nor contain space or time* \emptyset *appearances are not empirical objects (events, states, enduring things, etc.): the role the categories fill is to give objective reality to space and time, and, at the same time, give appearances determinate existence in space and time; this makes possible both experience and its objects while at the same time secures the necessary a priori objective validity of the categories themselves.*

Section 2: The A Priori Grounds of the Possibility of Experience

Section 2 begins with a statement that Kant's contemporary readers will surely have found striking, for it is an explicit condemnation of the very position he advanced in the *Dissertation*, his most important publication to date and the one on which his philosophical fame was based. He disavows his former position on the ground established in the metaphysical deduction, that all pure concepts of the understanding derive from, and so are nothing more than, mere logical functions of thought, without any intrinsic objective content at all: "That a concept, although itself neither contained in the concept of possible experience nor consisting of elements of a possible experience, should be produced completely a priori and should relate to an object, is altogether contradictory and impossible. For it would then have no content, since no intuition corresponds to it; and intuitions in general, through which objects can be given to us, constitute the field, the whole object, of possible experience. An a priori concept which did not relate to experience would be only the logical form of a concept, not the concept itself through which something is thought." Thus, if the categories are to be deduced, that is, if their title to objective employment is to be established, then it must be shown that these concepts are elements of a possible experience: "Pure a priori concepts, if such exist, cannot indeed contain anything empirical; yet, none the less, they can serve solely as a priori conditions of a possible experience. Upon this ground alone can their objective reality rest."

Since pure concepts cannot have their objective reality established by experience, Kant's task must therefore be to discover and analyze the concept of possible experience: show that and how the possibility of experience is predicated on certain a priori conditions, identify these conditions, and show that pure categories are among them. This relation, the conditions of possible experience, thus gives us a new definition of what a category is, over and above that offered in the metaphysical deduction: "A concept which universally and adequately expresses ... a formal and objective condition of experience would be entitled pure concepts of understanding." The thesis to be proved is therefore this: "The concepts which thus contain a priori the pure thought involved in every experience, we find in the categories. If we can prove that by their means alone an object can be thought, this will be a sufficient deduction of them, and will justify their objective validity." *Defective formulation? It is not enough that a category be shown to be a condition for thinking an object; it must be shown further that it is a constitutive condition of the object itself; otherwise, we have not gone beyond Hume. Unless thought can be shown to be constitutive of objectivity: thoughts as determinative of objects (Analogies).*

Kant recognizes this objection and deals with it as follows, in which might be taken as a description of his proof technique: "since in such a thought more than simply the faculty of thought, the understanding, is brought into play, and since this itself, as a faculty of cognition that is meant to relate to objects, calls for explanation in regard to the possibility of such relation, we must first of all consider, not in their empirical but in their transcendental constitution, the subjective sources which form the a priori foundation of the possibility of experience."¹

Earlier, in a passage in the first section of the chapter, Kant identified three subjective "sources, capacities or faculties of the mind, which contain the conditions of the possibility of all experience, and cannot themselves be derived from any other faculty of the mind, namely *sense*, *imagination*, and *apperception*." On sense is grounded what he will call the *synopsis* of the manifold, on imagination the *synthesis* of this manifold, and on apperception, the *unity* of this synthesis. In Kant's view, previous philosophers had a mistaken view of synthesis: instead of recognizing that *all* synthesis as such is the doing of imagination, they ascribed much synthesis to the senses, even the sophisticated sort responsible for the presentation of images of objects in environing space and time. Kant, in a footnote at A120, claims he is the first psychologist to have recognized that imagination is a necessary ingredient of perception itself. The originality of the claim is not that apprehension is a synthesis; for in a perceptual consciousness a manifold is contained, that is, there is many representations in one. Rather, the point is that this synthesis is not passive, not an affection, but is instead an expression of the spontaneity of imagination. This is not to say that it is intellectual; on the contrary, it is the most primitive kind of representation imaginable, in that the manifold is left dispersed, unrelated, disjunct, and no relations, not even simple spatial or temporal contiguity, are

¹All the subjective sources of experience, which means the senses and imagination, must be brought in to explain how the categories can stand in a determinative relation to appearances. Kant has been much maligned for introducing psychology into his inquiry in this manner, and setting aside 20th century philosophical prejudices, it is quite right to insist that the deduction should not be seen as an essay in psychology but in transcendental philosophy. And it is also correct to insist that transcendental philosophy is not an appendage to the empirical science of psychology, an investigation of its possibility and grounds; for Kant was far more concerned to establish the possibility of mathematics and physical science on the basis of transcendental philosophy than psychology, i.e. transcendental philosophy is meant to be the grounding of nature in general, and only incidentally of psychology. Nevertheless, transcendental philosophy is just as subjective an investigation as psychology, and subjective in precisely the same sense. Its concern is not the modern epistemological one with the framework in which empirical investigation occurs — i.e. the principles of cognitive reasoning — where the dividing line is between naturalists and philosophical grammarians (Hume being hijacked as the prototype of the former, Kant as that of the latter). Rather, transcendental philosophy is theory of ideas; its concern, like Humean psychology, is to explain how from isolated, disjunct data of the senses, consciousness of a world is possible; and like Hume he seeks to do this without invoking anything outside of our own human nature (not God as Berkeley and Malebranche did, not qualities in things in themselves as Locke did). And the technique is similar to Hume's as well: to seek out the subjective sources of the principles of our cognition as a way of determining their content (what is and is not thought in these principles), and thereby determining the range and limits of their valid application to objects. Thus, psychology has a special, privileged place in Kant's investigation: once transcendental idealism is factored in (as is always imperative to do), it becomes possible to distinguish acts of the mind as they **appear** in inner sense, and are cognized empirically in psychology, from these acts themselves (spontaneity) and their conditions as cognized transcendently, that is, as conditions of the possible experience; the premise of transcendental logic, to be established in the deduction, is that the intellect contributes something through its acts that makes possible all cognition, empirical psychological no less than cognition of physical nature and mathematical constructions.

represented in it. It corresponds to what Locke said about perception: something so primitive even an oyster may be supposed to have it (it is just the other side of non-consciousness, the perceptual obscurity of plant-life and still lower forms of being like Leibnizian simple monads). It is this consciousness, in which a bare manifold is contained, represented as a manifold but nothing more (not as integrated, related, or, *a fortiori*, as subject to a unity-giving rule), that Kant ascribes to imagination, thereby shifting the complete burden of synthesis from the senses to the imagination.

What does this leave the senses? Only synopsis: the presentation of a manifold but not the representation of the manifold as a manifold, that is, as the manifold of some perceptual consciousness; and since in the absence of any consciousness, the manifold is as good as nothing to us, we can say that synopsis by itself does not even get us onto the ladder of mental life (even up to the oyster step); it must always be combined at least with a synthesis of apprehension, as that responsible for perceptual consciousness, in order for even the most primitive form of mental life to obtain. In other words, synopsis should be thought of as a bare potentiality, a necessary but not sufficient condition for perceptual consciousness. The novelty of Kant's position is that the synthesis of apprehension that must be added in order to have a sufficient condition for perceptual consciousness involves an act of imagination.

This represents a complete transformation in the role of imagination (even if we cannot as yet see the ground on which Kant asserts it and what it means to ascribe apprehension to imagination). Up to and including Hume, imagination was conceived as the faculty of transposing perceptions given to it by the senses (what Kant here terms the synthesis of reproduction in imagining): it *separates* perceptions that occur together and *combines* perceptions that occur separately, according to certain principles of human psychology (in Hume, association is the principle: this means the relation of perceptions of the senses as resembling, as contiguous in space and time, and, most importantly for Kant, as cause and effect, understood in terms of customary transitions of thought inculcated in us by constant experience of the succession or concomitance of perceptions). What no one before Kant, not even Hume thought to do, is to claim that *these perceptions themselves* (the consciousness in which a scattered, yet-to-be-related manifold is contained) depend on an operation of imagination; and this of course is impossible to justify on empirical grounds (we cannot catch our minds in the act of producing consciousness itself; we have no experience of this, or, as Kant says, no intuition of the active in ourselves — rather, we know our determinative selves only as spontaneity). It is the transcendental philosopher alone who can venture such a claim, equipped as he is with the doctrine of transcendental idealism, which shows that perception and experience are possible only on the basis of a priori intuitions of space and time; for, on this basis, it follows that the mind must not only be affected with a manifold to have perceptual consciousness, it must also bring it to consciousness (i.e. apprehend it) in such a way that this manifold will admit of being arrayed in relations of space and time (reproduction). In other words, perception should not be conceived, as traditionally, as the mind opening up its eyes, as it were, and simply absorbing the data of sensory affection, including the forms in virtue of which it is reproducible. Apprehension is not so much a taking *in* of the data, as if filling up a preexistent empty space of consciousness which passively waits for sensation to occupy it, but a taking *up*

(*aufnehmen*) of the data, the initial *generation* of a space of consciousness (i.e. a manifold-containing representation), and this must be the mind's own act of synthesis — a synthesis which its own a priori forms, which it stamps on the manifold of synopsis in the production of the manifold-containing representation, and by virtue of which the reproduction of that manifold as a succession or juxtaposition first becomes possible. Thus, for Kant, just as apperception is the faculty of self-consciousness, the imagination is the faculty of consciousness in general; the senses alone never yield any consciousness, their manifold can never be together *as* a manifold, until the mind acts on this raw material to create an apprehension.

This shift of apprehension to imagination means that there is no consciousness at all without imagination, that imagination is nothing less than the faculty of consciousness itself (both transcendental and empirical) just as apperception is the faculty of self-consciousness (transcendental and empirical). This also means that it is the faculty of appearances as well, and so of sensibility, intuition. Note that the title of this synthesis is apprehension *in intuition*; in other texts, Kant refers to it as apprehension of sensations, or apprehension of the senses. It is so-called, I believe, because Kant wished to stress that he was talking about a level of consciousness all previous philosophers had ascribed to the senses; so, for him, that means that imagination is an essential element in all sensibility without exception, that imagination *is* the faculty of intuition: the faculty of all sensible consciousness, all intuition, pure and empirical. But the aspect of this which is key to the theory is that imagination is the faculty of appearances. For to speak legitimately of the manifold, the data of the senses, as appearances, it is necessary that they be intuited, that, in addition to their synopsis, they *appear* to (in) some perceptual consciousness; for if there is no consciousness in or to which it is appearing, then it makes not sense to call these data appearances. Accordingly, the active faculties of the mind, spontaneity, receive a toe-hold in appearances themselves, in the very genesis of appearances; and it is on this constitutive role, as we shall see, that Kant's claim that the categories are determinative of appearances (constitutive of objects), rests, for, *in that case, it will suffice to subordinate the pure synthesis of imagination to the logical functions of judgment in order to say that the categories are not only necessary to our thinking of appearances but to the appearances themselves* (i.e., in the language of the Copernican experiment, that appearances conform, in their constitution, not only to our faculty of intuition but our faculty of concepts as well).

So, the attribution of synthesis of apprehension to the imagination is an absolutely essential element of Kant's theory: it is only if imagination makes possible the object of *perception*, that discursive thought can be supposed to make possible the object of *cognition*. Otherwise, if the objects of perception (appearances) lie beyond its reach, if they may appear without any contribution from spontaneity, then, however we might subsequently *imagine* them to be, we would always have the indifferent appearances staring us in the face in perceptual consciousness, mocking our fictitious imaginings (just as is the case in Hume). If, as Kant holds, the appearance is the product of a priori spontaneity, then it is possible to subordinate it a priori to the categories, and thus make it into a genuine object of cognition, not a mere flux of perceptions as the empiricist supposes it to be. He in effect sews up the curtain behind which the empiricist believes

he can peak, beholding there the naked appearance, divested of all that is fictionally superadded to it in imagination and understanding (hence, devoid of causal relations, substantial unity, everything objective). For Kant, appearances never stand before consciousness since all consciousness is the product of imagination, and so subject a priori to our spontaneity. It is the peaking that is an illusion (= empirical idealism).

Of course, one might object: the manifold in synopsis surely does not conform to the representations of imagination and understanding, so is there not the same problem in Kant: the non-objective datum of the senses? Kant would grant that the manifold of synopsis does not agree with the representations imagination and understanding, but he would then say: so what? Since synopsis is not a consciousness at all, the manifold, as it is in synopsis, is nothing to us. We cannot even think what it might be, for, without the contribution of imagination, there is no representation of which it is the manifold, so what is it the manifold of? Where is it, what is it? Thus, so what if the representations of higher imagination and understanding fail to agree with the manifold in synopsis if this is nothing to us anyway, and never is — anymore than the thing in itself is ever anything to us? What we desire, in philosophy and in common life, is that the representations of our imagination and understanding agree with what is really out there before us, that is, what *appears* to us *immediately* in intuition. And this, Kant claims, they do, provided we recognize the existence of an a priori ground in spontaneity of appearances themselves.

This of course is only a first step on the way to a transcendental deduction of the categories, but it is important because it helps set the pattern for what follows: nothing is anything to us unless it can be present to our consciousness; but spontaneity of synthesis is a factor in the constitution of every consciousness higher up than apprehension, and so constitutive of what appears in that consciousness, i.e. its object.

The true relation between the faculties is as Kant states it on A97:

If each individual representation were entirely alien to every other, isolated, as it were, and separated from it, there would never arise anything like cognition: a whole of compared and connected representations. If for this reason I thus ascribe to sense a synopsis because it contains a manifold in its intuition, there always corresponds to it a synthesis. *Receptivity* can make cognitions possible only if combined with spontaneity. Now, this *spontaneity* is the ground of a threefold synthesis, which occurs in a necessary manner in all cognition: the *apprehension* of representations as modifications in the mind, their *reproduction* in imagination and their *recognition* in a concept (*im Begriff*).

Cognition, says Kant, is a whole, and it results from the comparison and connection (= reflection and judgment) of various representations. These representations derive in the first instance from the *synopsis of sense*, which is responsible for the character of representation as a manifold, its manifoldness, which is the first, crucial function of mind which prevents representations from being totally alien and isolated from one another. But this synopsis of receptivity does not suffice for cognition; it must be complemented by spontaneity, in the form of a threefold *synthesis*: first **apprehension in an intuition**, second **reproduction in imagining**, and third **recognition in a concept**. The titles of the syntheses, as I have suggested, seem to be reflective not so much of the psychology Kant is about to present but of the doctrines derived from Descartes, Locke, and such of

6.

their successors as he could reliably expect his readers to be familiar with. 18th century psychology limited the imagination to reproduction, credited apprehension (intuition, perception) to the senses, and supposed concepts to be limited to recognition of the object, not its very production.

Of course, Kant's purpose was not merely to refine or transform accepted psychological doctrine, but, by getting the psychology right, to be able to direct his readers to the transcendental conditions of experience that actually concerned him. The ultimate objective, it should never be forgotten, is to demonstrate our title to employ the categories as concepts of objects, the need arising from the fact that these concepts neither depend on nor derive from actually existing objects as is the case with empirical concepts (whose title as concepts of objects is, for that reason, beyond dispute), but wholly from the subject's faculty of understanding (as the metaphysical deduction has shown). This means, paradoxically, that their title as concepts of objects cannot be vindicated by the objects but only by the subject (insofar as the objects themselves can be shown to be grounded in the subject — which, in the case of appearances in space and time has already been demonstrated). So, the transcendental grounding of psychology that Kant wishes to explore should be understood as a reinterpretation of psychology in the light of the transcendental ideality of time (the point of the reminder at A99 ...)

Kant's transcendental concern with psychology is stated right at A97, when he says of the three psychological syntheses they they "point to three subjective sources of cognition which make possible the understanding itself — and consequently all experience as its empirical product." Earlier, in the metaphysical deduction of the categories, Kant showed that the understanding is the capacity to judge, its action exhaustively enumerated by the twelve logical functions. When he now declares that the three-fold synthesis makes possible understanding itself it is not that he is changing his mind, he is simply explicating his earlier claim. The concern here is with the understanding as the faculty of concepts (this is, after all, the analytic of concepts), and not the understanding as the actual faculty of judgment. We need to recognize that there is a distinction between what the understanding is claimed to be in the metaphysical deduction — the capacity to judge (*Vermögen zu urteilen*) — and the faculty of judgment properly so called (*Urteilkraft*). The capacity to judge involves not only the actual exercise of judgment but the analysis by virtue of which concepts are first produced; for it is not until we have acquired concepts that we are in a position actually to exercise our faculty of judgment (judgment being the combination of concepts, one must first have concepts in order to judge; without them, one's faculty of judgment must still lie dormant, whereas capacity to judge may still be utilized — the prime example being the transcendental synthesis of imagination, i.e. pure synthesis subjected to logical functions by means of the principle of original apperception). So, the understanding, as the capacity to judge, divides into two stages, two chapters, as it were: the analysis by means of which concepts are produced, and then the judgments we make given these concepts; the first of these is our concern here, the latter is the concern of the analytic of principles (called also the transcendental doctrine of the faculty of judgment: it is not judging itself but the faculty of judgment, the *Urteilkraft*, that is being investigated there).

The synthesis of recognition in a concept

The remainder of section 2 of the transcendental deduction chapter, from A98-A114, is designated as preparative. Having already dealt with apprehension and reproductive imagination, let us proceed directly to the synthesis of recognition at A103-10, in which the highpoint is A108 (the transcendental payoff of what is primarily a psychological analysis in the tradition of Locke).

Kant begins his consideration of recognition with the claim, "Without consciousness that what we are thinking is the same as what we thought a moment before, all reproduction in the series of representations would be in vain. For my present state of mind would be a new representation, not belonging to the act whereby the representation had been successively generated, and its manifold would always fail to constitute a whole, because it would lack the unity only that consciousness can endow it with," i.e. the consciousness that what we are now thinking is connected with (a continuation of) what we had been thinking the moment before. Naturally, it is a common occurrence that our thought breaks off and we move to a new thought, because, e.g., something else attracts our attention, or something else pops into our mind, or, we simply decide to move on to another matter. But Kant's concern here is the other case, where we are pursuing a single *train* of thought, so that the present thought in some yet to be specified sense is the successor in more than just temporal terms to the thought that preceded, i.e. it follows its predecessor in time for a *reason*: we are conscious not only *that* this representation follows that, as in cases of customary association (reproduction), but that it *must*, or *should*, in other words, *why* this representation is the next (= a **rule** governing our representation). This is a condition for representing temporal succession as such, as objective (real), i.e. cause/effect as basis of any awareness of objective succession (cf. *THN76*). Here there is a rule of succession relating the perceptions to one another, not just in relation to their apprehension (i.e. independently of their appearance in perception).

Kant illustrates this by the act of counting: "If in counting I forget that the units which now appear before me are added to one another one by one, then I would not cognize the generation of the amount through this successive addition of unit to unit, and so would not cognize the number; for the concept of number consists in the consciousness of this unity of synthesis." If the successive addition of units is to be genuine counting (representations of numbers), then it is not enough that I successively add one unit to another; I must also be conscious of my operation, reflectively aware of what I am doing. By this Kant has in mind not some sort of perceiving of acts of thoughts, as in the case of Locke's conception of ideas of reflexion. For Locke, and Hume after him, we observe ourselves in the act of perceiving, remembering, comparing, abstracting, and performing a host of other mental operations, from experience of which we soon learn to control our thinking, to govern it in a rational manner as befits our nature as human beings. But for Kant this sort of inner experience of thought is no different than outer sense experience, and poses exactly the same problem of recognition of the unity of the reproductive synthesis of its apprehended manifold contents. In other words, the consciousness required is different *in kind* from mere perception and comparison, it is what Kant calls *conception* and which he will shortly identify with consciousness of the *rule* according to which the imagination synthesizes (the rule which gives eyes to otherwise blind syntheses — blind in that they express actions and habits of mind rooted in our psychology).

He elucidates the meaning of concept' in the next paragraph: "The word concept (*Begriff*)² can by itself leads us toward this remark [viz. that a concept is simply consciousness of the unity of synthesis]. For this unitary consciousness is what unifies the manifold sequentially intuited and then reproduced in a single representation. This consciousness can often be only weak, so that we connect it not with the act itself, i.e. immediately with engendering the representation, but only with its outcome; nevertheless, a consciousness must always be found there, even it lacks the clarity that would make it stand out; without it, concepts, and with them cognition of objects, would be wholly impossible." In preconceptual imagination, nothing but the associating consciousness connects the perceptions, that is, the customary transition of thought from one to the other, and it is only insofar as we are aware of that transition (i.e. conscious of our consciousness as a customary transition), that we may be said to be aware of the perceptions themselves as related. But this is not, to Kant's mind, a true relating of the perceptions, not a genuine unity; for it is only the particular, momentary consciousness, the customary transition, that connects the perceptions; our only awareness of the relation is our awareness of the customary transition itself, and the relation goes no deeper or farther than this transition. Nothing unites the perceptions among themselves, there is no representation in which they are all contained such that the consciousness of this one representation would suffice to connect them, with or without a customary transition in the thought of those perceptions. Such a consciousness is called a *concept* by Kant because in it, or rather, in that which it represents, the manifold is actually grasped together (*begreifen*), the contents related *among themselves* over and above the fact that they are reproduced together.

Kant characterizes the object as that which prevents perceptions from being random and arbitrary, that is, it orders them, subjects them to lawful regularities. Without an object to fix them into definite patterns and relations, appearances might still be intuited as juxtaposed and successive, but there would be only accidental congeries, without meaning or import for the future, for any other location, or for anything resembling; hence, there would be no more than a kaleidoscopic flux, nothing at all approaching cognition and ordered experience. Thus, objects determine the course of present and future existents, fix patterns, and ground constant conjunctions in necessary connections.

Kant next (A105) notes that cognition of an object does not proceed from the object to the lawful regularity of perceptions. For we have no awareness of an object distinct from our perceptions, since, by definition, we have awareness only of that of which we perceive, i.e. appearances. This means not only that we cognize an object only from its effects within perception (the resulting order and fixity of relations we find there), but also that *we proceed from the order and fixity of perceptions to cognition of an object, not vice versa*. (i) Since an object is, by definition, distinct from representations in us, and only these representations are actually present to our consciousness, we must proceed from representations to the object, not vice versa, and so cognize the object through the order and unity perceived in these representations. That is, we must consciousness not only of the representations but of their order (unity) (ii) Query: is this order given or

²To grip, grasp, as one grasps the reins in one's hands to drive a team of horses; the concept is the driving hand, the hand that holds the reins.

made by us? Pre-Kantians answered that it is given (Hume dissented but only partly — succession itself he held to be absolutely real). Kant answered that we are responsible, and we need to understand why he took this bold, even bizarre view.

Pre-Kantians (Cartesians, Locke, and, in one respect or another, virtually every one else) espoused a **Causal Theory of Representation**. The idea, at least where outer objects (material things) are concerned, is that nothing is cognized immediately; instead, all our knowledge of objects external to us is *inferred* from the order and regularity of which we are directly aware through consciousness of our own sensory states. For our states (perceptions) are not themselves in space: they have no location, no extension, etc.; they are mental, non-existended in nature. What is known immediately is therefore only our mind's own states and acts; everything else, everything external to us (objects in space, other minds) have to be known by inference. Although the mind, *qua* substantial substrate of perceptions, is not known immediately, its existence is unquestionable insofar as the perceptions we are aware of, and our awareness itself, are, as qualities/ modes dependent for their existence on the mind; this substance, then, is indubitable, whereas all others are known only by their effects on the mind, i.e. not immediately from their own modifications but indirectly from our own (viz. perceptions).

But there is more, of course, to representative theories of the time than the belief that the object is cognized indirectly by *inference* from immediately apprehended perceptions. There is also the *causal factor* that needs spelling out, and this in two forms: first, the sheer existence as such of perceptions, and the inference to the *causes* of their existence; and second, the order and regularity exhibited by perceptions, and the inference to the *causes* of that order and regularity. In both cases, there is a role for the psychological subject and for the external object. If the subject lacked the requisite faculties, the receptivity, which allowed it to be affected by things outside it, then no perceptions could exist; and while it is conceivable that the subject might be so endowed (by nature or the Creator or what have you) as to be the single, immediate cause of its perceptions, we must at least leave room for the possibility that the subject is affected by things external to it. **For one obvious way by which plausibly to distinguish veridical sense perception from dreams, hallucinations, and such like, is that, in the veridical case, the object represented in our perceptions is in part their cause as well.** Of course, philosophers who held such views (Descartes, Locke) were careful to distinguish the object as represented by the idea and the object as cause of the idea. For the object as represented conforms to the constitution of the subject's faculties, e.g. it is only if the subject is equipped with a faculty of vision, that the object is represented as colored; but there is no need or basis to infer that the object, as it is in itself, *is* colored. No doubt there is some quality in the object (termed by Locke a secondary quality) in virtue of which it has this *power* to affect our senses in such a way that a color is seen, and the color is the one it is rather than some other; but this does not mean that the quality as it is in the object resembles, either individually or generically, the quality of its appearance in the mind of the subject. That is, though the appearance is a representation of a quality of the object, we may not infer either of two things: (i) that, if the appearance is blue (as when I look up at a mid-summer afternoon sky), the object itself (in this case, the earth's atmosphere) is blue too; (ii) but in addition to not being able to infer that they are individually the same (mirror),

we also cannot infer that they are generically the same, i.e. that the sky is colored, if not blue, then red, green, or some other. Suppose I hold up this book at an angle; what you see, the object's appearance, or representations, is an item shaped roughly in the form of a non-rectangular quadrilateral; but the object itself, we might want to say, is rectangular, so only generically, not individually, the same with its appearance (i.e. it has a shape, but not the shape in which it appears to us). The causal theory of representative cognition does not permit us to infer that the object represented is either specifically or generically identical with its representation. Nor can we infer that it is not: other grounds have to be invoked before one can draw a distinction between secondary and primary qualities, or something along those lines; but this distinction is not our present concern. Our focus is on the causal angle, not the representative: there is some quality in the object, the nature of which (primary or secondary) we cannot immediately decide, which is responsible for the existence of the appearances presently before our minds; were the objects constituted differently, different perceptions might be present to us instead, or perhaps even no perceptions at all. *What is never questioned is that the object, its idea, and their causal relation, all exist in time, and are intrinsically subject to principles of temporal order; and most would also situate them in all in space as well (i.e. spatial relations and properties, extension), if only by way of the object's affect on the sense organs. Kant's T.I. rejects even this degree of specific or generic identity between object and representation (i.e. they do not have the temporal in common). Hence, the affection relation to the thing in itself is not cognizable as a causal relation.*

The second element of the causal theory concerns the formal, relational side of appearances: their fixed orderings and regularities. Here again there is a subjective element and an objective. The subject has a psychology, certain capacities of comparing, collating, and associating perceptions. To some patterns we attach significance, because it is in our nature to do so (cf. Humean association); others, which are no less there, we simply ignore, or attach no objective significance to. But somehow it seems to us that all this subjective activity has as its aim to discover, to reproduce, an order that is already there in the appearances themselves. This intrinsic order, from which our psychology supposedly takes its cue and seeks always to produce a match (called 'truth'), is the one we ascribe to the object (Kant terms it *affinity*: "How is association itself possible? The ground of the possibility of the association of the manifold, so far as it lies in the object, is named the *affinity* of the manifold"). If, for example, I walk around this table, what I experience are a succession of perceptions, each a slight change from its predecessor. Do I suppose that there was a succession of similar yet different, momentarily existing entities, with no backside, underside, concealed interior, etc.? Or do I imagine the enduring, solid, three-dimensional object we all know as a "table"? I psychologize it the latter way, of course, and the reason I do so, presumably, is because that is how it is in the object itself, which I try to match by ordering my perceptions in the correct manner. That is, I believe I have *cognized* the object, and attained *truth*, when I unify my perceptions in the manner which best coheres with my experience of this objects, of others like it, and of other things in its environs as well; but it is no mere coherence I am after, rather I seek to reproduce in my imagination the affinity of the appearances themselves as caused by (grounded in) the object: the appearances go together a certain way and no other because the object determines that it be so, imposes that order upon them; and my psychology,

when it works properly, is completely at the service of this objective order. E.g. my perceptions of the table are successive and different (esp. if I also move around it), but the appearances I perceive I take (cognize) to be simultaneous in the object, and the object is thus more than and independent of what I perceive of it (interior, underside, minute particles, etc.).

So, the causal theory exhibits a two-fold causal relation of objects to our representations of them: the first concerns human receptivity (intuition), and explains why we have the perceptions we do in just the sequences in which we have them in terms of qualities in the object (which may or may not be like the qualities characterizing the data they cause in us); and the second is the provision of the affinity, or rule of coherence, which it is the aim of our psychological activity, our processing of sensory data, to reproduce by arranging our perceptions in the correct way. Both together — perceptible *qualities* and *affinity* — are the contents of cognition which have their causes in the objects, which the objects transcribes, as it were, into the language of our sensory data. But in both cases the causation is assumed without question to be a temporal relation: both the object in itself and the representation stand within one and the same time, with the object, as cause, preceding the representation, as effect; and, of course, such a time, being distinct (external, independent) from the subject, is *transcendentally real*.

Now, it was in part Kant's aim to explain qualities and affinity, but to do so, unlike his predecessors, without reference to objects external to the mind but still within time and space (things in themselves), but instead solely in terms of intuitions and concepts (i.e. the faculties thereof — Copernicanism). For, thanks to T.I., there are some substantial transformations in the topography of the traditional problem of representation in the theory of ideas that result on account of the Kant's transcendental idealism, which at A98-99, as you will recall, he reminds the reader of the deduction is an essential premise of the theory he is about to expound. There are two points in particular to which I want to draw your attention:

1) One of the key implications of transcendental idealism is that time, and everything in it, including the psychological subject and everything it does, be treated no differently at all than space and everything in it. This changes the problem of representation quite significantly. Formerly, representations, and the mind whose affections and acts they are, were thought to be in time; hence, our own subjectivity is immediately given and known, whereas everything external to it (physical objects and other minds/perceptions) are only given and knowable mediately, through these affections and acts, insofar as their cause lies outside ourselves. What this means is that a substantial chunk of objectivity is given to us for free (the ease of empiricism mirrors the ease of innatism). But if the time in which our subjective existence is given is as much ideal, as much a construct as the space in which physical objects supposedly exist, then it follows that our real subjectivity is not given to us, not known to us, for this subjectivity must be situated outside and prior to time itself and everything existing in it. In other words, everything philosophers had formerly supposed themselves to be discovering about the subject empirically through internal, temporal observation of its successive perceptions and acts, and the order manifested therein, is not discovery at all,

but construct. Everything empirical psychological must therefore be denied the status of explanans, but instead must be set on the same level as the empirical physical (material reality) and incorporated into the explanandum.

In other words, previous philosophers had relied on a considerable amount of preparatory empirico-psychological spadework, by means of which the respective roles of subject and object were apportioned and demarcated. Thus, after determining that the faculties of the mind are responsible for our having visual and other brands of sensation, plus powers like comparison, association, and abstraction, this left as causal labor to be distributed to the object (its qualities, i.e. faculties, capacities) why we are having the sensations we are having now and not others, and why in the particular pattern and sequence in which they occur. Further, with specific reference to our psychological powers, it was still left to the object to determine the true affinity (e.g. simultaneity or succession relations) of the data processed by us, so that the object fixes the goal, or target, at which the subject's activity is aimed.

There was no question that the subjective doctrine on the basis of which these causal labors were distributed and the remainder ascribed to the object outside our representations was empirical. Nevertheless, it was thought absolutely indubitable. For example, the temporal character of perceptions as a flux is immediately intuited, and as such is infallibly known. Does this not make it a mark of the real, and so furnish the firmest possible anchor for our inferences of a reality beyond our perceptions? Similarly, the acts we witness our minds carrying out all the time — retaining perceptions no longer present, comparing them with those now present, relating them in various ways, abstracting, reflecting, and otherwise working up the data into consciousness of an external world, a self, substances, and even God — can we possibly doubt the existence of these acts, our knowledge of them, and so too our knowledge that they merely discover, but do not introduce, the affinity of appearances?

However, all these certainties go out the window as soon as we factor in transcendental idealism. In setting temporal appearances on a par with spatial, they, and everything known in inner sense — mental actions, events, states, the mind itself — are one and all products of apprehension and reproductive imagination — just like everything in outer sense — shape, motion, interaction, force, etc. We no longer get these objective determinations for free, and so longer can use them to explain external objectivity (physical and other minds); instead, we have to explain all objectivity generally, the very possibility of such determinations as 'event', 'state', 'enduring thing', etc. Put another way, for Kant, the appearances and relations of outer appearances are just as empirically immediate and indubitable as those of inner sense were supposed to be — no more, no less. But in neither case is the objectivity ascribed to appearances intrinsic. That is, the pre-Kantian psychologist presupposes all manner of objectivity in order to explain objectivity: he presupposes that appearances occur in consciousness as *events* or *states*, as if there were no problem with speaking of "events" without being able to state where they occur or of "states" without being able to tell us of what they are the states. These descriptive categories — states, events, acts — are already objective categories; they are what has to be explained by cognitive psychology, not what can do the explaining in it (cf. Hume: for all involve necessary connections, i.e. existential dependence, and this is what has to be explained). This is true in the case of the first

causal aspect of representationalism traced to the object in distinction from the subject, the existence of one kind of state in us rather than another, plus the determination of the sequence of such states: this presupposes representation of a subject that is in effect already itself an object, i.e. something capable of taking on states in successive sequence. It presupposes the subject as an identity persisting through time, as a something capable of being characterized by various properties/states/modifications (i.e. an alterable object), with faculties like memory and association. But above all the traditional problem of representations misunderstands affinity. Since consciousness itself, as persisting through time and alterable, can, like any cognized object, never be cognized directly but only through the subordination of the synthesis of appearances to a rule, to the ground of necessary unity in terms of which consciousness of an object is alone possible, the affinity must already be present from the start, long before we can get to the point where it is invoked as the target for psychological activity that itself could never be brought to consciousness except on the ground of affinity.

This admittedly is where things start to get confusing in Kant. Familiar problems like that of affinity are transformed into something else, posed in much more primitive contexts, before the differentiation of a subject from an object is even possible. Or rather, in the Kantian posing of the problem, the subject, psychologically understood, has yet to be distinguished from its object, and it is not pre-judged whether the subject is the more immediately and perfectly known, the object being known only through inference from gaps in the grounding provided by the subject. And of course Kant will, in the Refutation of Idealism in the Second Postulate, deny that the object is known only by means of inference from the immediately known subject, deny that temporal existence is privileged cognitively over spatial.

In the context of our present concern, the point might be put this way: in the traditional structuring of the causal theory of representation, there is the subject, and then the subject's own object, such that the object is inferred from certain features of the subject which it is believed the subject itself cannot account for. From Kant's perspective, however, this subject is already an object, an objectified subject, a subject-object (as a thing with states, modifications — a thing in time with existential dependence relations of its states to an unchanging substratum that supports their existence), and philosophers have ignored or misunderstood the whole problem of the emergence of this subject-object, by assuming it to be the condition of the subject's object, or what one might call the object-object. What Kant advocates is a retreat to a more remote, elementary starting point never before glimpsed (due to the universal commitment to transcendental realism), so as to pose the problem of cognition before there is any divergence between a subject-object and an object-object before any temporally determinate existential relations (cause/effect, modification/substratum) are even possible, and thereby confining the inquiry to a search after *the object in general and as such*; for only after that has been understood is one in a position to pose the question, which is the condition for which, the subject-object for the object-object, or vice versa? That is, the object in space or the object in time? — the questions not of transcendental philosophy but of metaphysics, as Kant understands the terms.

Of course, the real significance of this shift is that the whole question of the ground of the qualities and affinity of perceptions has to be completely re-thought. For it is no longer the same phenomenon, the same state of affairs, that needs to be explained. To grasp why this is so, we need to appreciate more fully the transformative element of transcendental idealism. Since, according to it, space and time come from us, we cannot look to the object to account for the temporal and spatial forms of appearances, nor for the order of their appearance. The affection of our senses by things in themselves is not in time, our sense faculties not in space. It is only in and through the apprehension of these data, their perception, that such orderings first come into existence, and they have, and can have, no existence except in and through imagination (human consciousness).

(i) Affinity must have an a priori basis since a consciousness of it is necessary to become aware of one's own empirical self no less than of an object external to one. But a priority implies a subjective origin, and the existence of a subjective condition to which anything that may exhibit affinity (objects) must conform. (ii) Subjective grounding also follows from the fact affinity is fundamentally a matter of the ordering/positions of appearances in space and in time, and space and time are our own productions; so, at least at the most basic, primitive, undifferentiated level of the object in general, prior to the distinction of empirical subject from object. (iii) Ideal space and time are pure, thence imperceptible. Hence, appearances originally lack existence in space or time. Since only that which has existence in space and time can be termed "event", "state", "act" (including mental events states and acts), no appearance can be qualified by these terms. Ideal space and time are *pure* \emptyset *imperceptible* \emptyset *absent from the field of appearances (lack empirical reality)* \emptyset *appearances neither occupy nor contain space or time* \emptyset *appearances are not empirical objects (events, states, enduring things, etc.:* the role the categories fill is to give objective reality to space and time, and, at the same time, give appearances determinate existence in space and time; this makes possible both experience and its objects while at the same time secures the necessary a priori objective validity of the categories themselves.

For it is only in and for the apprehending consciousness that they appear temporally and spatially arrayed. But apprehension is not the cause of the appearances, not the basis of their reality as representations in the mind; this basis is indeed the object in itself as the ground of the affection of our senses. So, a problem arises: if the world of experience is not to be merely an imagined world, in the bad sense of "imagine" (i.e. a mere fiction), then appearances must be given temporal and spatial reality, and, more, they must be endowed with spatial and temporal existence, that is, situated in a network of objective, real relations to one another. For what is affinity, is it not — a determined position in the space and time nexus?³

³This means that we can no longer look to the object to explain why we perceived the appearances we do when we do, and in the sequences we do, for this has nothing whatever to do with the affect of the object, as thing in itself, on us. Having such an affect presupposes that, independently of our apprehension of them, appearances already exist in space, or at least in time (from Kant's perspective, it is completely inconsistent to single one out from the other — but all philosophers do it none the less). Only if this is assumed can it be supposed that the object in itself is the ground of affinity of appearances, for then we naturally picture the object as in effect punching in data on the keyboard of our sensibility, with the computer screen being the equivalent of our consciousness: the object enters the data sequentially which

The full account of these issues is given in the *Analytic of Principles*: the principle of the Anticipations of Perception explains the reality of appearances, and the three Analogies of Experience accounts for a dimension of their existence in a network of time and space relations (according to the three modes of time: duration, succession, and simultaneity). These principles thus explain the affinity of appearances; but the important thing to note about them is that this affinity is grounded entirely in the representing subject, not the object in itself; more specifically, it is not the subject of traditional philosophical psychology, but the transcendental logical ego, the principle of the I think, or transcendental apperception: it alone, in Kant's view, is the basis of all temporal and spatial intuition, and all affinity therein.

Transcendental Apperception: A107-10

"All necessity, without exception is founded on a transcendental condition. There must therefore be found a transcendental ground of the unity of consciousness in the synthesis of the manifold of all our intuitions, hence of concepts of objects in general as well, and consequently also of all objects of experience, without which it would be impossible to think any object at all for our intuitions. ¶This original and transcendental condition is none other than *transcendental apperception*." Trans. apperception, to put it extremely crudely, is a kind of *super-object*, or rather *super-concept*, in which all reproduction of all apprehended manifolds is given the unity of affinity — a grand, all-embracing transcendental affinity of representations. More precisely, transcendental apperception is a pure principle, or better still, a faculty-ground, of transcendental affinity. Every concept, every object, every synthesis on a ground of unity, instantiates (expresses, actualizes) this ground, but of them all the most perfect representational expression of transcendental apperception is space and time: that is, we should understand space and time as conjointly signifying a single synthetic a priori unity of the manifold of intuition. This indeed is Kant's justification for terming it transcendental apperception: "That it deserves this name is clear from this: even the purest objective unity, namely that of a priori concepts (space and time) are possible only through the relation of intuitions to it." So, apperception's is a ground on the basis of which all of consciousness is unified into one, a single grand sphere of appearances which, when all pure forms of representation have discharged their constitutive role (including the categories), we call the *natural world*, the *universe*, the "bounds" of which are none other than infinite space and infinite time, which, according to Kant, are nothing more than principles of the original synthetic

the computer translates into sequences of 0s and 1s, and then reproduces the original order in the analogue manner of appearances on a screen; moreover, the data the object punches supposedly has a sense and significance, and it is the job of the understanding to reconstitute the message, to read the data of the senses as objects in space and time (= affinity). This picture has to be discarded forthwith when we appreciate the implications of transcendental idealism. Neither the punching of the keys of sensibility by the affecting object nor the data entered in (the manifold) is as such ordered in spatial or temporal sequences; it has no temporal or spatial being whatsoever. On the contrary, the data of affection are put into this ordering only insofar as they are apprehended in perceptual consciousness; and since apprehension is a function of the imagination, this means the appearances, are spatial or temporal not as they are themselves but only as they are in and for intuitive consciousness, i.e. synthesizing imagination. And since the appearances do not receive their form — the subjectively apprehended successiveness and juxtaposition — from the object, it follows, *a fortiori*, that the object cannot be sending a message through them which it is the task of the understanding merely to decipher.

unity of the manifold in intuition. And since the world too is only representations, if we speak of it also as having an object, it must be the **transcendental object** = X.

Kant is careful to distinguish this literally universal consciousness of transcendental apperception from empirical self-consciousness, that is, the subject-object of empirical psychology, in relation to which the traditional problem of representation was framed: "The consciousness of oneself according to the determinations of our state in inner perception is merely empirical and ever changeable; there can be no standing or abiding self in this flux of inner appearances. Such consciousness is usually named *inner sense*, or *empirical apperception*. That which is supposed to be thought *necessarily* to be numerically identical cannot be thought through such empirical data. For any such transcendental presupposition to be rendered valid, it must be a condition which precedes all experience and makes experience itself possible." So long as we station ourselves philosophically in the shoes of empirical psychological apperception, we will never be able to comprehend how the affinity of representations can come from ourselves, how we can ourselves be its source. Instead, we will find ourselves obliged always to transgress the limits of possible explanation by referring affinity to an object in itself that transcends our representations, completely beyond the ken of consciousness (something we can only do plausibly by assuming the truth of transcendental realism, that is, putting appearances, independently of their perception, in relations of time and space, so that the object in itself becomes the typist on the keyboard of the senses). Kant's transcendental self-consciousness precedes all cognition (be it of our own empirical subject or of objects outside us) and first makes it possible: "No cognitions could take place in us, no connection and unity of cognitions among one another, without this unity of consciousness which precedes all data of intuitions and in relation to which all representation of objects is alone possible."

A cautionary note: transcendental apperception replaces the traditional object in itself as ground of affinity only in the most global framework of experience as a whole, the formal unity that is space and time and the nexus of objects which occupy them. If we ask for the ground of affinity of any particular set of experiences; in other words, if we enter into the empirical sphere, distinguish some experiences from others, and ask what is their ground, e.g. the affinity of the perceptions whose unity I call the table, trans. apperception cannot provide the answers; it concerns only the most general sort of affinity, one not expressed by the determinate affinities determined by specific objects, but the general, transcendental affinity signalled by universal conformity to law, the existence of a lawful order to which appearances are subject. Accordingly, specific affinities, of individual objects, remain as mysterious as before, especially the sort that evince organic unity, like living bodies; this is a question Kant takes up only in the third critique, the *Critique of Judgment*, where the answer is, in essence: these grounds of affinity lie in the supersensible substrate of representations, in the transcendental object, which cannot be cognized; however, while the subject cannot account for these affinities, it is constituted always to seek them out, and the third *Critique* is an inquiry into this constitution and its principles.

With this understood, we make sense of an important remark that occurs near the end of section 2: "How is association itself possible? The ground of the possibility of the association of the manifold, so far as it lies in the object, is named the *affinity* of the manifold. I therefore ask, how are we to make comprehensible to ourselves the thorough-going affinity of appearances, whereby they stand and *must* and under unchanging laws? On my principles it is easily comprehended [!!!!!!]. All possible appearances, as representations, belong to the whole of possible self-consciousness. From this, as a transcendental representation, numerical identity is inseparable and a priori certain, because nothing can

come into cognition except by means of this original apperception. Now since this identity must necessarily enter into the synthesis of all the manifold of appearances insofar as it is to become empirical cognition, the appearances must be subordinated a priori to conditions to which their synthesis must always conform. Now the representation of a universal condition according to which a specific manifold can be posited (hence in a uniform manner), is called a rule, and it is called a law if it *must* be so posted. Thus, all appearances stand in a thoroughgoing connection according to necessary laws, and thence in a *transcendental affinity*, of which the *empirical* sort is merely the consequence." The difficult thing to see here is that, when Kant supplants the traditional concept of affinity, with his own transcendental one, he is nevertheless referring to exactly the same thing: the constancy, the coherence, the lawful determination of appearances, in virtue of which alone they may be supposed to relate to an object. Yet, with the shift away from the empirical, the abandonment of the entire psychological doctrine on which his predecessors built their theories of ideas, the paradoxical result is that the understanding ceases to be confined to the task of merely reproducing or replicating the text of the message (affinity) punched in by the object via the senses, and instead becomes itself, at least at the most primitive, undifferentiated level, the law-giver. Thus, as Kant says, right after the passage I just read, "That nature should direct itself according to our subjective ground of apperception, and should indeed depend upon it in respect of its conformity to law, sounds very strange and absurd. But when we consider that this nature is not a thing in itself but is merely an aggregate of appearances, so many representations of the mind, we shall not be surprised that we can discover it only in the radical faculty of all our cognition, namely, in transcendental apperception, in that unity on account of which alone it can be entitled object of all possible experience, that is, nature." And, at the end of the Deduction, at A126, the same thought is spelled out yet more clearly: "the understanding is something more than a power of formulating rules through comparison of appearances; it is itself the lawgiver of nature."

With this in mind, let us go back to A108, the culmination of Kant's analysis: "From all possible appearances capable always of being together in one experience, this transcendental unity of apperception yields (*macht*) a **nexus (*Zusammenhang*) according to laws** [comprised] of all these representations. For this unity of consciousness would be impossible if the mind, in the cognition of the manifold, could not become **conscious** of the **identity** of the **function** through which it (*sie* = function?) combines the manifold synthetically in one cognition. Thus the original and necessary consciousness of the identity of oneself is at the same time a consciousness of a no less necessary unity of the synthesis of all appearances according to concepts, i.e. according to rules, which rules not only make the appearances necessarily reproducible but thereby also determine an **object for their intuition, i.e. a concept of something wherein they necessarily cohere** (*zusammenhängen*). For it would be impossible for the mind to **be able to think the identity of itself** in the manifold of its representations, and to do so a priori, if it did not have before its eyes the identity of its action [= *function*] whereby all synthesis of apprehension (which is empirical) is subordinated to a transcendental unity and the interconnection (*Zusammenhang*) of the representations according to rules first becomes possible a priori." This is *echt* Kant, the Kant we both revere and hate. So many ideas packed densely into such a short paragraph, yet not without characteristic Kantian repetition, with meanings seeming subtly to shift from phrase to phrase, with logical order in near disarray (whether the condition conditions the ground or the ground grounds the condition), and words like necessary, universal, identity, law, and function used with little concern for clarity. In broad lines, the claims are these: (i) appearances conform to transcendental apperception insofar as they belong to one experience, and so conforming means that all, necessarily and a priori, fit together in a single law-governed nexus of perceptions. What kinds of laws he means he only begins to explain at A111. But the important point is that this nexus of appearances according to laws be thought of as a unity of representations in consciousness bound with the identity of consciousness (i.e. of the I think). This of course is already a difficult claim

to swallow. For obviously he is not saying that this or that consciousness, say, that I am having at this moment, unifies all appearances according to laws. That would be absurd; not the consciousness of any given moment, not an aggregate thereof, nor the sum total of all such that I have had or will ever have, is the consciousness Kant has in mind. But then what is it? Is it God's consciousness? Is it that infinitely complex web of obscure perceptions present in each of Leibniz's monads? Or what? We do not get the answer here, but the gist of it is clear from what was said earlier, namely, that the kind of consciousness concerned is not perception, not apprehension, and so not the contents present to me in intuition now or throughout my lifetime, but conception, judgment, discursivity: since it is the thought of an object, the affinity of intuitions recognized through judgment, that is here at stake, it is clear that transcendental apperception is not an affair of intuition but of conception, of a *logical* identity of consciousness, a form of general representation, and the possibility at stake is that of exercising our capacity to judge, i.e. understanding as defined by logical functions.

(ii) Thus, when Kant proceeds to state that a condition for this unity of consciousness is consciousness of the identity of function to which the synthesis of the manifold conforms, it should at least be apparent to you that the sort of function he means us to be conscious of is the same he introduced earlier, in the metaphysical deduction of the categories, namely, the logical functions of judgment (you will recall that he there defined the category as the universal, conceptual consciousness of the unity of pure synthesis, a unity which he then traced to the logical function of judgment; that is, a category *is* this consciousness of the identity of function). The point then is that cognition of the manifold entails consciousness of the identity of the logical function in the synthesis of the manifold, for this alone can make possible the lawful nexus of appearances; and this is just a convoluted way of saying that cognition entails the categories.

(iii) Kant is thus ready to state his all important double-thesis that "**the original and necessary consciousness of the identity of oneself is at the same time a consciousness of a no less necessary unity of the synthesis of all appearances according to concepts**, i.e. according to rules, which rules not only make the appearances necessarily reproducible but thereby also determine an object for their intuition, i.e. a concept of something wherein they necessarily cohere (*zusammenhängen*)." I will consider the part dealing with objects shortly; now let us just look at the self-identity portion of the claim. This is the crux of the transcendental deduction, and of all Kantian nuts the hardest to crack. Kant gives the following reason for predicating self-identity on a necessary unity of the synthesis of all appearances according to concepts: "it would be impossible for the mind to **be able to think the identity of itself** in the manifold of its representations, and to do so a priori, if it did not have before its eyes the identity of its action whereby all synthesis of apprehension (which is empirical) is subordinated to a transcendental unity and their interconnection (*Zusammenhang*) according to rules first becomes possible a priori." To understand this, remember first that there is no intuition of self except empirically in time; that is, personal identity already presupposes transcendental affinity. So, the identity of self here in question is one that can only be thought, discursively, by means of concept, in a judgment (the *cogito*, the I think). It is not just the possibility of thinking an I in connection with every apprehension of a manifold that is at stake, since that does not imply that it is the same I one thinks in connection with them; rather, it is the claim that every apprehension must be relatable to every other in such a

way that one and the same I is involved in their relation, one I think in relation to which all apprehension stands.

Since this self-cannot be intuited, it has no manifold; if it can be represented at all, it can only be as a pure unity. Now, the only unity presented to consciousness, and representable in consciousness, is the identity of function through which the manifold is synthetically combined in one experience. The logical function and the unity of consciousness must therefore be one and the same; that is, the logical function must be the form of our identity of consciousness, of our I think. This identity of logical function is the identity of the self, understood as the numerical unity in virtue of which all representations are bound together in a single nexus of consciousness. Thus, thinking this identity of function is what thinking the numerical identity of self is; nothing more, nothing less; the self just is the thought of this logical function as such, the form of judgment, or, as Kant says in other texts, the copula of judgment (since the concepts, or matter, united by the copula depend on the manifold only the senses can present).

What this means, more concretely, is spelled out a little later, at A111-12: "The possibility, nay even the necessity, of these categories rests on the relation which the entire sensibility, and with it all possible appearances as well, have to original apperception, in which everything is necessarily in conformity with conditions of the thoroughgoing unity of self-consciousness, i.e. stand under universal functions of synthesis, namely, synthesis according to concepts [= *judgment*], as that in which alone apperception can demonstrate a priori its thoroughgoing and necessary identity a priori. Thus the concept of cause is none other than a synthesis *according to concepts* of that which follows in the time-series with other appearances. Without this unity, which has its a priori rule and subjects appearances to itself, no thoroughgoing and universal, hence necessary unity of consciousness would be met with in the manifold of perceptions. In that case, these perceptions would not then belong to any experience, hence would be without an object, nothing but a blind play of representations, less even than a dream." The law of cause and effect is a perfect example of affinity. Through its universal applicability to appearances, each and every one of these has a determinate place in the time order. That is, it is not merely that we perceive a flux of appearances, but that the appearances we perceive have a time order among themselves, independently of our intuition, such that if one is cause and the other effect, even if the effect is perceived before the cause in intuition, the appearances themselves are in the reverse time-order, the cause preceding the effect (e.g. if I see smoke before I see any fire, I still presume that there was a fire there and that the fire, as cause of the smoke, preceded it in the time-series). This has the effect of expanding my sensibility infinitely far beyond what is or was present to me immediately in intuition (i.e. the senses and memory), and extends the scope of my consciousness out to causes in most distant parts of space and time. In other words, my consciousness now acquires the scope of space and time themselves, since space and time are nothing other than this endlessly farreaching causal nexus; space and time are products of this law, this function of unity, based in me, and this is just to say, as transcendental idealism requires, that space and time are in me. Thus is my identity of consciousness, my thinking self, extended into the remotest regions of space and time, even though my empirical self — this pitiful soul you see before you groping with this monstrous text — am restricted to the here and now, together with the remembered here and now.

More importantly, Kant's transcendental idealism allows him to break with his predecessors and place the subject of experience outside not only of space but of time; it

does not exist in time, it has no temporal duration, its actions are not occurrences (events), and its states not subject to change (and so not really “states” at all). So what does this tell us about the nature of this subject? Certainly, although standing outside of time, Kant did not mean for it to supplant God as an eternal being; yet, he did not mean for it to be conceived as a purely logical construct, since he does accord it reality (though neither that of an appearance nor of a thing in itself). Rather, as Hegel recognized and expressed so well in the introduction to the subjective portion of his *Science of Logic*, it represents pure intellectual being par excellence, its acts having only atemporal logical import; as Hegel said, it is nothing but the concept's own existence, *Dasein des Begriffs*.

(iv) To conclude the analysis of A108, I just want to take note of the other element in the claim, the Kantian definition of object: "the original and necessary consciousness of the identity of oneself is at the same time a consciousness of a no less necessary unity of the synthesis of all appearances according to concepts, i.e. according to rules, which rules not only make the appearances necessarily reproducible but thereby also determine an **object for their intuition, i.e. a concept of something wherein they necessarily cohere** (*zusammenhängen*)." This asserts that the necessary synthetic unity of appearances according to concepts is the basis of all affinity, and thus of the relation of representations to an object; concepts are then to be understood always as rules which necessitate the reproduction of the manifold so as to determine — which here means constitute, not discover — an object for their intuition, the object being nothing more than the concept in which the intuitions cohere, interrelate, have affinity. To get this right, one has to appreciate that concepts have now to be understood in a quite special manner, that will allow us to make sense of them as the sources of the affinity of representation, rather than just psychological contrivances that help us discover and reproduce an affinity that supposedly is given to us elsewhere. And that brings us back to our initial problem: the problem of the concept.

Section 3: A115-118

The beginning of section 3, from A116-18, is the core of the objective transcendental deduction, the portion which, more than any other, is the definitive formulation of Kantian doctrine. It begins straightaway with apperception, as the ground on which alone we can pursue the connection of representations to "the point upon which they have all to converge in order that they may therein for the first time acquire the unity of cognition necessary for a possible experience."

Why is apperception necessary for cognition? Why should the question of self-consciousness, the identity of self, be supposed fundamental to the possibility of cognition, and so finally to the objective validity of the categories? Kant's answer is this: "All intuitions would be nothing for us, and would not concern us in the least if we could not take them up into consciousness, if they did not figure either direct or indirectly therein, and only in this way is cognition possible. We are conscious a priori of the thoroughgoing identity of ourselves in respect of all representations which can ever belong to our cognition, as a necessary condition of all representations (because these represent something in me only in that they belong to one consciousness with all others, and so must at least be capable of being connected therein. This principle (*Prinzip*) is certain (*feststehen*) a priori, and can be termed the *transcendental principle* of the *unity* of all the manifold of our representations

(hence also **in intuition**). Now, the unity of the manifold in one subject is synthetic; hence, pure apperception furnishes a principle of the synthetic unity of the manifold in all possible intuition.⁴

What is significant about perceptual consciousness is that it not only lacks a consciousness of an object determining the synthesis of representations, but also consciousness of an identical subject doing the synthesizing. There is mental activity, and of course awareness of this activity, but not consciousness of a numerical identity. And why should there be? Is it not enough for the representations to be united by the objects, to have their affinity from them? That still is the question we do not yet have an answer to. On the one hand, one may ask, why should we not be able to be conscious of the identity of ourselves even in the absence of cognition of objects, just so long as there is an associative unity in our representation. For example, when Hume came to explain the identity of the mind, he did so without supposing there to be any cognition of objects, any awareness of an external world at all; all he thought necessary for identity of self was identity of the associating act, as when, successively, we causally relate our ideas to impressions of which they are copies (memory), our passions to the ideas that give rise to them, and so forth. As Hume describes it, the mind is a system of causally related perceptions, and the identity of self is just this identity of relation, the same associative act relating perceptions near and remote. You may remember his commonwealth analogy: "Our impressions give rise to their correspondent ideas; and these ideas in their turn produce other impressions. One thought chases another, and draws after it a third, by which it is expell'd in its turn. In this respect, I cannot compare the soul more properly to any thing than to a republic or commonwealth, in which the several members are united by the reciprocal ties of government and subordination, and give rise to other persons, who propogate the same republic in the incessant changes of its parts. And as the same individual republic may not only change its members, but also its laws and constitutions; in like manner the same person may vary his character and disposition, as well as his impressions and ideas, without losing his identity. Whatever changes he endures, his several parts are still connected by the relation of causation." The identity of the relation between the perceptions is the identity which is me, the self; and is not that in essence Kant's idea too? Yet, as I noted, Hume explains without presupposing or being obliged to posit an external world; yet, the explanation is empirical.

On the other hand, just as it is difficult to see why self-consciousness should be supposed to entail cognition of objects, it is no more obvious why cognition of objects should be supposed to entail self-consciousness. Why should perceptions not all be quite

⁴The claim about only that of which we are conscious can be anything for us at all, compresses two steps into one. For mere apprehension in intuition, perception, is, after all, a species of consciousness; it may be blind until combined with concepts to yield full-blown cognitive consciousness, but it is consciousness nonetheless. For Kant repeatedly insists, most recently on A111, that appearances do not require thought (concepts, judgment) in order to be perceived. True, he characterizes it as a merely blind play of representations, less even than a dream; but it is awareness, and capable of high order association, such as that demonstrated in the behavior of higher animals (association without affinity). Indeed, in the footnote to the passage we are considering, he makes something like this distinction: "All representations have a necessary relation to a *possible* empirical consciousness. For if they did not have this, and if it were altogether impossible to become conscious of them, this would practically amount to the admission of their non-existence. But all empirical consciousness has a necessary relation to a transcendental consciousness which precedes all special experience, namely, the consciousness of myself as original apperception. It is therefore necessary that in my cognition all consciousness should belong to a one consciousness, that of myself."

capable, one and all, of being related to one another, and an object be thought through them, even while one remains completely un-selfconscious? Indeed, this is how every philosopher before Kant regarded matters: the objects themselves are the cause of our sense impressions and their affinity; the mind's job is simply to sift through the data and try to decipher the message secreted in it by the objects, our own contributions to the process being limited to our psychological functions and certain innate laws of thought. Certainly, rationality was invoked; but rationality does not of itself entail consciousness of the numerical identity of the self throughout all representations, especially where, as in Kant, the phrase "all representations" has to be taken to encompass not just my own perceptions but the whole of space and time and everything in them (since the transcendental idealist supposes that space and time are in us, not the reverse). So, why should it be supposed that cognition of an object, or of nature as a whole, entails pure self-consciousness?

In the footnote to the paragraph we are presently considering, Kant seems to back away from this claim, asserting that not actual self-consciousness, only the possibility of it, is entailed in cognition: "It ought not be forgotten that the sheer representation *I* in relation to all others (whose collective unity it makes possible) is transcendental consciousness. This representation may be clear (empirical consciousness) or obscure, for on this nothing here depends, indeed not even does it depend on the actuality of the *I*. But the possibility of the **logical form of all cognition rests necessarily on the relation to this apperception as to one capacity** [*zu urteilen?*]." But does this really help? Why should even the *possibility* of pure self-consciousness be entailed in the actuality of cognition of objects? Why, to put it another way, should the shift from ascribing merely association to the subject to ascribing affinity as well, entail even so much as the ability to say *I* think, *I* am, in conjunction with every object thought?

People scratch their heads over these two questions: why should pure self-consciousness (the *cogito*) entail cognition of an external world, on the one hand, and why should cognition of an external world entail pure self-consciousness, on the other? The basic answer is, in my opinion, all too clear, and Kant never made any attempt to hide it (on the contrary!). But those reading him are so eager to forget that Kant advocated that absurd doctrine of transcendental idealism, that they even manage to convince themselves that Kant too could not have taken it all that seriously, and it certainly cannot be an essential premise of the transcendental deduction. But it yet so obviously is. Transcendental idealism states, quite simply, that "The whole of the objects of intuition — the world — is merely within me." (AA 22, p. 97) Space, time, and everything in them are but my own representations, and since no representation can be anything for me except insofar as it is apprehended in consciousness, this is just to say that the universe is nothing but an identical consciousness. *I* am the universe; and when I represent simply the identity of it, as distinct from all the manifold, what I thereby represent is me, the pure *I*, transcendental self-consciousness. And what is this identity that binds together the universe? It is, as we shall see directly, the logical function.

But before proceeding, there is still something unsettling here. For even given transcendental idealism, even supposing the world is nothing other than the synthetic unity of the manifold in one consciousness, what kind of consciousness can this be, and, more particularly, to harp yet again on this one point, why should it be termed self-consciousness, the *I* who thinks? Why not an *it*, or a *them*, or nothing at all? For is there

still not a whiff of the arbitrary surrounding the claim that consciousness of this identity of function is the consciousness not of this identity, or that one, or some other, or none, but mine — the true meaning of the words "I think"?

It is my suspicion that Kant forgot to answer the question in the A Deduction. It is not that he did not have an answer, or even that he did not believe he had furnished it; but rather it is that he failed to make it quite clear enough for his reader to get hold of it. The answer concerns the possibility of judgment, and, in particular, how SUA makes possible concepts in the logical sense of universal representation (only in the Paralogisms does Kant make this point explicit in A). There are indeed frequent references in Deduction A to the logical functions, and the possibility of thought (not merely cognitive thought, but thought itself as such), but it is really only in Deduction B, where Kant introduces the distinction between the *synthetic* unity of apperception and the *analytic* unity of apperception, that one can at last begin to understand Kant's warrant for equating the identity of function in the synthesis of the manifold with the identity of the self (i.e. with pure self-consciousness). And indeed it is again exactly as Hegel said: the I is prototype of the concept, the *Urbegriff*, the very form of universality itself.

Since this is only made clear in Deduction B, we will have to postpone its consideration for the time being. For the present, let us resume our consideration of Deduction A where we left off, just after the A117 footnote: "This synthetic unity, however, presupposes, or includes, a synthesis, and if the unity is supposed to be a priori necessary, then so too must the synthesis be. Hence, the transcendental unity of apperception is related to the pure synthesis of the faculty of imagination as an a priori condition of the possibility of all composition of the manifold in one cognition. But only the *productive synthesis of the faculty of imagination* can take place a priori, for the reproductive rests on conditions of experience. Thus, the principle of the necessary unity of pure (productive) synthesis of the faculty of imagination is, prior to apperception, the ground of the possibility of all cognition, especially of experience." Apperception is a synthetic unity, that is to say, a combination of the manifold in one consciousness. Such combination involves synthesis, the act of putting together the manifold representations that together become the manifold of that one consciousness. Hence, there cannot be synthetic unity except on the condition of a synthesis; and since that synthetic unity is supposed to be pure, completely a priori, so too must the synthesis be. The claim, then, is that the *empirical* synthesis of the manifold in any cognition of an object must be subordinated to a pure synthesis if the products of empirical synthesis are to conform to the condition of a possible pure self-consciousness.

The question then becomes, what kind of pure synthesis must this be? Kant's answer follows directly: "Now we call the synthesis of the manifold in the faculty of imagination transcendental if, without distinction of the intuitions, it concerns nothing more than the sheer combination of the manifold a priori, and the unity of this synthesis is called transcendental if it is represented as necessary a priori for the original unity of apperception. Since the latter is the foundation of the possibility of all cognitions, the transcendental unity of the synthesis of the faculty of imagination is the pure form of all possible cognition, through which all objects of possible experience must thence be represented a priori." This paragraph is the heart of the argument of the Transcendental Deduction, and contains the central thought of Kant's entire theoretical philosophy (Kant's *Grundgedanke*). He starts off by defining a pure synthesis as transcendental if "without distinction of the intuitions, it concerns nothing more than the sheer combination of the manifold a priori." The point of the definition may elude you, but it is not difficult to figure out: since Kant believes mathematics too essentially involves a pure synthesis of the imagination, he

defines its transcendental synthesis in such a way as to exclude the mathematical. Now, mathematical synthesis is itself only an instance of what, in the B Deduction, Kant will call figurative synthesis (*synthesis speciosa*). To bring out the difference between pure synthesis in general and the transcendental type specifically of concern here, a passage from the Schematism chapter, at A142/B181, may be of some help: "the *image* is a product (*Produkt*) of the empirical capacity (*Vermögen*) of the productive faculty of imagination; the *schema* of sensible concepts, as of figures in space, is, as it were, an a priori monogram of the pure faculty of imagination, whereby and in accordance with which images becomes possible in the first place. Images must however be connected with the concept by means of the schema which relates them, and in themselves images are never fully congruent with concepts. By contrast, the schema of a pure concept of the understanding is something which can be brought into no image at all, but is only the pure synthesis, in conformity to a rule of unity in accordance with concepts in general, which the category expressed [*in the form of a universal representation, i.e. a concept*], and is a transcendental product of the faculty of imagination which concerns the determination of inner sense in general according to conditions of its form (time) in respect of all representations, insofar as they are supposed to cohere together a priori in one concept in conformity with unity of apperception." This is reaffirmed in simpler terms at A722: "The mathematical concept of a triangle I may construct, i.e. give a priori in intuition, and in this way obtain a synthetic, yet rational cognition. But if what is given to me is the transcendental concept of a reality, substance, force, etc., then it signifies neither an empirical nor a pure intuition, but simply the synthesis of empirical intuitions (which thus cannot be given a priori). Accordingly, because the synthesis cannot proceed to the intuition which corresponds to the concept, no determinate synthetic proposition but only a principle of the synthesis of possible empirical intuitions can arise." Transcendental synthesis neither is nor yields any image, anything intuitable either a priori or a posteriori. In other words, it does not produce this or that particular unity, such as a triangle, a line, a unit of counting, etc. The unity it produces in intuition is absolutely general, and so absolutely indeterminate; there is nothing that stands outside it, nothing with which to contrast it, demarcate it, limit it; it rather is the unity that must be limited, determined, divided up into a positive and negative, in order for distinct unities, distinct objects of cognition that might be thought in a concept, to become possible in the first place. One way to think of the transcendental synthesis is as the construction of space and time (the hendiadys again), where this is understood, as in the Aesthetic, as connoting that which is prior to and a condition for all parts of space and time, all particular, determinate spaces and times. For space and time together signify an absolute general unity, outside which there is nothing, before which there is nothing (where it is not even meaningful to speak of an 'outside' or a 'before'). Pure space and time in this sense are not really intuitions at all, but rather principles thereof; for what is space in itself, or time in itself, other than merely the *possibility* of the succession or juxtaposition of perceptions? If we ask what space is, or what time is, independently of particular spaces and times, or the things filling them, there is nothing but this sheer possibility, this sheer capacity for ordering representations. Space and time, in fact, signify only aspects, or ways of looking at, the same synthetic unity of the manifold we are considering now; in the Aesthetic because there Kant's prime concern was the *manner* in which the manifold is synthetically combined a priori in one consciousness, viz. by juxtaposition and succession. But here his concern is the oneness of the consciousness in which the manifold is combined, irrespective of the manner of combination. Here we are intended to abstract from the specific sensible content of this synthesis, that is, that in virtue of which these are not just abstract systematic unities but specifically space and time. But

the unity is the same: absolutely general, prior to and a condition for any and all particular unities, those unities which gain be produced in images in pure or empirical imagination. Transcendental synthesis is, as it were, the construction which takes all intuitions, without differentiation, and relates all of them to a single, all-embracing, grand object, by virtue of bestowing on them universal affinity, the affinity which unites all to form a single system of representations, one sufficient to make possible an equally absolutely general self-consciousness. Pure self-consciousness is, as it were (indeed is literally), the concept (in Kant's sense) of of this object, the source of the necessity of the unity of the synthesis of the manifold of which affinity consists (an object being defined as "a concept of something wherein intuitions necessarily cohere [*zusammenhängen*]"). The I of the I think is like the most general concept, a concept so general as to be wholly indeterminate, occupying a place comparable to that of the transcendentals of the Medievals, e.g. being *qua* being; only here the notion is not empty and abstract but develops directly out of the transc. idealistic analysis of the possibility of cognition, which demands the synthetic unity of all the manifold in one representation. So, when Kant says the I is the consciousness of that one representation, he is characterizing it on the model he adumbrated earlier of the concept of an object. The object in this case is the absolutely universal of all our representations without differentiation among them, a unity effected by means of a transcendental synthesis in the faculty of imagination. But what concept can possibly represent anything so general? Obviously, no determinate concept can, indeed no concept of any kind whatever; nevertheless, a non-manifold consciousness which yet has the form of a concept, its universality, could at least give expression to this grand, all-encompassing objective unity of transcendental synthesis (affinity) simply by the fact of maintaining its identity throughout all our specific, determinate representations: an identity constant throughout all the variation in our representations, would, as it were, outline the objective unity of transcendental consciousness, serve in the stead of an actual concept of it (which is impossible), and this identity, with only the form of a concept, is of course the I, the copula of judgment.

What is it we are representing when we represent space and time if we cannot even conceive them? What is this idea we have of them? In fact, our only actual consciousness of them is not a consciousness of space or of time at all, but merely an identity that tracks them, as it were, like a siesmometer graphs the unfelt unseen rumblings of the earth below. This identity is the I of the I think, pure apperception, which represents the objective unity of space and time as such and alone. This unity, Kant holds, derives not from the senses but from the understanding, for its consciousness has the form of a concept, that is, universality. From this point it is but a short step to Kant's objective: we need first only to recognize that the I's have the form of a concept and the I's being the form of all concepts are one and the same (unfortunately this idea is only developed, given concrete sense, in the footnote at B133; still, the basic point is clear enough). For what indeed are the forms of all concepts if not the logical functions of judgment? And what are these, when related to the pure synthesis of the imagination, but the categories? And if the pure synthesis is conceived of as the transcendental synthesis through which pure apperception is possible, what is this but to say that the I is, as it were, the embodiment of the forms of judgment, the consciousness, the identity, the gives expression to these forms in our representation? In this way transcendental

synthesis and unity apperception give Kant just the toe-hold in intuition he needed to complete the picture he sketched in the metaphysical deduction of the categories: (i) the I represents nothing other than the unity of transcendental synthesis in imagination, and all synthesis, and thence all the manifold, is subject a priori, and thence necessarily, to this synthesis; (ii) to say that all synthesis conforms to transcendental synthesis is just to say that all objects of cognition conform to it, since every particular object's affinity must conform to and derive from the transcendental affinity, just as all the manifold must conform to and derive from conditions of pure space and time; (iii) and since pure self-consciousness, the I, is the representation, or expression, of this unity, and such a representation has the form of a concept, it follows that the logical forms of judgment likewise express this unity, and so are valid a priori not merely of our thought of objects (as Hume would admit) but of all objects as such, a priori (as Hume defied anyone to prove). Thus concludes his demonstration, his transcendental deduction of the categories, as follows: "*The unity of apperception in relation to the synthesis of the imagination is the understanding; and this same unity with relation to the transcendental synthesis of the faculty imagination is the pure understanding.* There thus are pure cognitions a priori which contain the necessary unity of pure synthesis of the imagination in respect of all possible appearances. These, however, are the *categories*, i.e. pure concepts of the understanding; consequently the empirical faculty of cognition in humans necessarily contains an understanding which relates to all objects of the senses, albeit only by means of intuition, and the synthesis of intuitions through the faculty of imagination, under which all appearances, as data of a possible experience, therefore stand. Since this relation of appearances to possible experience is in any case necessary (because we could obtain no cognition through them otherwise, and they would not concern us in any way), it follows that the pure understanding, by means of the categories, is a formal and synthetic principle of all experiences, and the appearances have a *necessary relation to the understanding.*" Here we get first a new definition of pure understanding, though it is still really only the capacity to judge in a different, transcendental guise: it is the pure consciousness of the unity of the transcendental synthesis in imagination. The transcendental synthesis, again, is that to which all objective unities, all specific affinities, must conform, if conditions for possible cognition, like unitary space and time, are to be satisfied. Since to say this is to say that all objects, and not merely the representation of objects, must conform to conditions of a possible pure apperception, this shows that the understanding is the author of these objects and their lawful unity. But more precisely, once the nature of the pure self-consciousness is grasped, and it is recognized that it has the form of a concept, it follows that it is subject to the logical forms of judgment; but since the object, that is, in this case, the unity of the transcendental synthesis of imagination, is nothing but that in the concept in which representations cohere, this is just to say that the unity transcendental synthesis derives from understanding can be none other than that of the logical functions of judgment. This means that all objects, as subject to transcendental synthesis and transcendental affinity, conform to the logical forms of judgment. This makes possible pure cognitions of that unity, that is, universal representations of appearances subordinated under each of the logical forms as a predicate; and logical forms considered as predicates, that is, concepts (universals), are none other than the categories. Thus, the categories have a priori validity with respect to all possible objects of experience. *QED.*