

Courtney Fugate\*

# Kant's World Concept of Philosophy and Cosmopolitanism

<https://doi.org/10.1515/agph-2019-4003>

**Abstract:** The goal of this paper is to better understand Kant's conception of philosophy as a "world concept" (*Weltbegriff*), which is at the heart of the Architectonic of Pure Reason. This is pursued in two major parts. The first evaluates the textual foundation for reading Kant's world concept of philosophy as cosmopolitanism and concludes that he most probably never himself equated philosophy as a world concept with any form of cosmopolitanism. The second major part of the paper clarifies this concept of philosophy through the specific role it plays in the argument of the Architectonic. Kant's unique concept of science is examined and compared with several specific applications of it found elsewhere in Kant's writings. From this it is concluded that Kant's intention in the Architectonic was to derive his world concept of philosophy from its logical counterpart, namely the scholastic concept of philosophy, and that its function there is to provide the idea from which the entire structure (schema) of Kantian critical metaphysics can be derived. Philosophy as a world concept, it is further argued, is the complete system of critical or Kantian metaphysics in application and the philosopher in this sense is the ideal critical metaphysician who fully realizes its laws through her own understanding and will.

## 1 Introduction

The distinction Kant draws in the Architectonic of Pure Reason (A832/B860–A851/B879) between a scholastic concept of philosophy and a cosmic or world concept of it (*Weltbegriff*, *conceptus cosmicus*), as well as his subsequent claim that the latter alone expresses the full and genuine character of philosophy, are no doubt familiar to most of Kant's readers. Indeed, this distinction deserves to be familiar to all historians of modern thought, since it is evidently fundamental to the way Kant understands both the structure and the goal of philosophy. A misconstrual of this distinction will be tantamount to the misconstrual of what

---

\*Corresponding author: Courtney Fugate, American University of Beirut, Department of Philosophy and Civilization Studies, P.O. Box 11-0236, CVSP, Riad El-Solh, Beirut 1107 2020, Lebanon; Courtney.fugate@gmail.com

Kant really thinks philosophy, and indeed rational human life, is all about. Many will, naturally, also be familiar with a slightly different formulation of this same distinction, one that contrasts philosophy in a scholastic sense more specifically with philosophy in a cosmopolitan one. We need not look far into the literature to find scholars drawing on this second formulation to motivate an identification of Kant's notion of philosophy as a world concept with a form of cosmopolitanism, thereby making out the latter, with its specifically political and this-worldly concerns, to be the unifying *teleos* of philosophy in what Kant takes to be its single genuine sense.<sup>1</sup>

I am not alone in being deeply skeptical of this move and of its implications for how we interpret Kant's philosophy generally and the Architectonic of Pure Reason in particular. A significant minority of scholars have expressed discomfort with what Kant says about philosophy as a world concept in the Architectonic of Pure Reason and his apparent identification of it with cosmopolitanism in other contexts.<sup>2</sup> They have also been concerned that emphasis on this apparent connection may be used to impart an unjustified privilege to certain of Kant's writings and to certain ways of reading his work as whole that overestimate his social, political, naturalist, secularist, international or multicultural interests.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 The way such a line of thought goes is well illustrated by Ypi 2011, 136 f. For further evidence of the currency of this view, consider both the English and the German text from the 11<sup>th</sup> International Kant Congress: (<http://www.kant2010.it/index.php/kantkongress/kant2010/schedConf/overview>). Wilson 2013 takes this approach to its logical conclusion, arguing that philosophy as a *Weltbegriff* is really only found in Kant's anthropology and especially in his physical geography (764). As we will see, however, this is exactly *not* what Kant has in mind, because the *Weltbegriff* is the idea of the legislation of *pure* reason. To quote Ferrarin 2015, 84: "The cosmos of the *Weltbegriff* of philosophy, as it were, is not mundane at all." For interesting variations of this view see also Kresse 2008, Höffe 2006, esp. 223–227, and Manchester 2003, 205–207. Höffe 2006 in particular uses the single reference to cosmopolitanism in the logic to motivate several conclusions about Kant's concept of philosophy with which I cannot agree, the main one being that the word "*Welt*" in "*Weltbegriff*" refers us to the world around us (224). Höffe's use of cosmopolitanism in other writings is very complex, and ranges from political to merely epistemic conceptions. A critical discussion of this other work is beyond the scope of this paper.

2 Makkreel 2013 astutely detects that "cosmic" and "cosmopolitan" cannot simply be equated as is so often done, but does not question the authenticity of the supposed textual evidence for such an equation, as I will here, and so is forced to find some other way to understand the connection. Ferrarin 2015, 85, writes: "This is another terminological vacillation [by Kant] which perhaps threatens, certainly obscures the consistency of his thought." Cf. also Ferrarin 2015, 84. This is a common pattern: Those who realize a close reading of the Architectonic conflicts in many ways with any straightforwardly cosmopolitan reading still feel forced by the apparent evidence of the logic lectures to find some way to accommodate it.

3 See, Ameriks 2012, Ferrarin 2015, esp. 84, and Kaldis 2013. The interpretation developed in this paper also agrees in many respects with such anti-naturalist readings of Kant as Uleman 2010.

I share these concerns, but my reasons for doing so run deeper still. Specifically, I believe that the identification of Kant's concept of philosophy in a cosmic or world sense with cosmopolitanism has no actual textual basis and that oversight of this fact has obscured the real nature and role of this concept in his philosophy.

It is not my intention here to enter into the thicket of debates in Kant studies regarding the importance of his political or cosmopolitan thought or the precise balance of the this-worldliness or other-worldliness in his moral thought. It is also not to cast doubt upon, let alone to provide reasons for rejecting, the readings of Kant's philosophy that take the final goal of reason to be both broadly and deeply cosmopolitan in some specified sense. My sole intention is to examine the supposed textual foundation for such a reading that is so often located specifically in those passages where Kant defines philosophy in the two senses described above, with the aim of clearing the way for a more focused interpretation of this distinction and its role in the Architectonic. The importance of the question of textual authenticity with regard to Kant's use of "cosmopolitan" in this context must not be underestimated. Of the great many who have written on this topic, no one aside from Hinske has even raised it (Hinske 2013, 268), although, as we will see, there is every reason to raise it. Indeed, the matter stands far worse: the evidence in favor of reading Kant's world concept of philosophy as cosmopolitan often not only fails to be carefully assessed, but is usually treated as unquestionable common knowledge. Of course, it goes without saying that if the texts in this case are in fact unreliable, then the interpretations based upon them will be even more so.

I will make my argument in five sections. Section 2 introduces the general textual problem by examining the English translations of the *Critique of Pure Reason* and points us towards a way of resolving this problem. Section 3 provides an overview of the primary texts relevant to our investigation, namely Kant's *Logic* and several sets of transcripts from his lectures on logic, and establishes a few key facts about their interconnection. Section 4 makes use of these facts to outline four criteria by which to assess the authenticity of the primary texts, and then applies these criteria to reach the conclusion that Kant most likely never referred to his own concept of philosophy as cosmopolitan. Section 5 examines a final textual question, which concerns the relationship between Kant's world concept of philosophy and the four famous questions: *What can I know? What ought I to do? What can I hope for? What is man?* In Section 6, I turn finally to a close reading of the text of the Architectonic of Pure Reason, in part to show that it does not support a cosmopolitan reading either, but mainly in order to suggest a new understanding of what Kant means by a world concept of philosophy. While many of the specific points of my reading are shared by a few previous interpretations, several key results are not and my overall argument and conclusion are

largely unprecedented: Philosophy in the world sense, I argue, is the complete system of critical or Kantian metaphysics in application, and the philosopher in this sense would be the ideal critical metaphysician who fully realizes its laws through her own understanding and will.<sup>4</sup>

## 2 Cosmopolitan Philosophy in the *Critique of Pure Reason*?

The suggestion that Kant may not have put forward a cosmopolitan concept of philosophy in the Architectonic might seem surprising to anyone who has read the Cambridge translation of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* without consulting the original. In it we read:

Until now, however, the concept of philosophy has been only a *scholastic concept*, namely that of system of cognition that is sought only as a science without having as its end anything more than the systematic unity of this knowledge, thus the *logical* perfection of cognition. But there is also a *cosmopolitan concept* (*conceptus cosmicus*) that has always grounded this term [...]. From this point of view, philosophy is the science of the relation of all cognition to the ends of human reason (*teleologia rationis humanae*), and the philosopher is not an artist of reason but the legislator of human reason. [...] Him alone we must call the *philosopher*; however, since he himself is still found nowhere, although the idea of his legislation is found in every human reason, we will confine ourselves to the latter and determine more precisely what philosophy, in accordance with this cosmopolitan concept, prescribes for systematic unity from the standpoint of ends.

To this is appended an important explanatory note:

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

We will have occasion to analyze the precise meaning of these and related passages in Section 6 below. For the moment, we can notice that the term “cosmopolitan” occurs three times in the space of only a few lines to describe the perennial inner core of philosophy itself (which “has always grounded the term [...]”) as well as what Kant takes to be the genuine idea of what a philosopher is supposed to be (“Him alone we must call the philosopher [...]”). And initially, at least, this must be somewhat surprising; up to this point in the *Critique of Pure Reason* Kant

---

<sup>4</sup> Ferrarin 2015, 86 f., however, comes very close this view and may actually espouse it.

has not so much as spoken of the human being as a citizen or of a world-citizenry, let alone stressed the importance of one's assumption of responsibility from the point of view of the world as such, of other peoples, cultures or nations, which is most often what was implied by the term "cosmopolitan" in Kant's own era, just as it is today.<sup>5</sup> A cosmopolite or "*Weltbürger*," the Grimm brothers remind us, is "a person of worldwide sensibility or attitude, who feels himself to be the citizen not only of a city, a land or a state, but rather feels himself to be a citizen of the entire world and a fellow citizen of the whole of humanity" (*Deutsches Wörterbuch*).

Perhaps, however, the worry caused by Kant's silence on such issues in the text finds an answer in the explanatory note quoted above. There we read that a "cosmopolitan" concept "is one that concerns that which necessarily interests everyone," which at least initially point us in the direction of everyone, thus presumably to the world, thereby providing a link with the normal sense of the term. Or so it seems on first inspection.

But what does this English term, "cosmopolitan," actually serve to translate from Kant's original text? In all three instances, the term in question is "*Weltbegriff*," thus literally "world concept," which makes Kant's gloss of it with the Latin "*conceptus cosmicus*," i.e. "cosmic" or "world" concept, perfectly understandable, if also rather unhelpful. But even here, without having yet reached any real understanding as to what a world concept might be for Kant, there must arise some doubt about whether "cosmopolitan" is at all an accurate translation; for the original term contains no trace of one of its essential elements, namely "-politan," the citizen. And as strange as the term "*Weltbegriff*" is,<sup>6</sup> Kant does use it elsewhere in the *Critique of Pure Reason* to designate a "transcendental idea, insofar as it concerns the absolute totality in the synthesis of the appearances," (A407 f./B434) and where the Cambridge Edition translates it literally as "world-concept." Here the term quite obviously has no connection to cosmopolitanism. So why should it in the context of Kant's concept of philosophy?

---

5 I focus on this political concept of cosmopolitanism, because it is most relevant to how Kant has been interpreted more recently. However, Nussbaum 1997, Hinske 2013 and others have argued for the influence of various other forms of cosmopolitanism, particularly the Stoic, on Kant's thought. For a discussion of the varieties of cosmopolitanism in Kant's age, see Kleingeld 1999.

6 Kant uses the term in no other context than in speaking of the cosmological ideas, thus rarely. It is not found in Grimm, and I have not been able to find any relevant instances prior to Kant. "*Weltbürgerlich*," on the other hand, was quite common. For instance, as in the title of: Johann Bernhard Basedow, *Practische Philosophie für alle Stände: Ein weltbürgerlich Buch*. 1777. Kant corresponded with Basedow in the 1770s and reviewed positively his *Für Cosmopoliten Etwas zu lesen, zu denken und zu thun: In Ansehung eines Anstalt-Dessau errichteten Philanthropins oder Pädagogischen Seminars in "Zwei Aufsätze, das Philanthropin betreffend"* (1776).

At this point one might suspect the translators of the Cambridge Edition have taken just a bit too much license in trying to render an admittedly awkward term, which anyone involved in translating eighteenth century German, not to mention Kant's often strained version of it, knows is done easily enough.<sup>7</sup> Other translators have indeed chosen safer, potentially less misleading, but also less clearly meaningful options, such as “cosmical conception” (Haywood), “universal or cosmical concept” (Müller), “cosmical conception” (Meiklejohn), “cosmical concept” (Kemp Smith), and more recently “world concept” (Pluhar).

But this is no oversight or simple error by the translators; the choice also appears to have a solid textual foundation, if not in the *Critique of Pure Reason* itself, then at least in Kant's published textbook on logic and at least one other set of transcripts from his lectures. In the *Logic* prepared by Kant's former student, Gottlob Jäsche, and published in 1800, we find essentially the same distinction between a scholastic and world concept (rendered by the translators of this volume in the Cambridge Edition as “worldly concept”) and in much the same language. There is the small addition that Kant glosses the phrase “according to the world concept” with “*in sensu cosmico*” (“in a cosmic or world sense”), but we also find a single but very significant reference to “the field of philosophy in this cosmopolitan sense” (“*in dieser weltbürgerlichen Bedeutung*”), which if correct, must indicate that all along Kant meant the cosmic to be identical with, or at last closely related to, the cosmopolitan. One set of transcripts from Kant's lectures seems to lend further support to this suggestion. The relevant passage is printed in the Akademie edition of Kant's writings (hereafter, AA) as part of the metaphysics transcripts prepared and published by Karl Pölitz in 1821 (hereafter, PM). In it Kant appears to be making exactly the same distinction between two concepts of philosophy as we find in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. However, very curiously, the passage contains not a single instance of “*Weltbegriff*,” “*conceptus cosmicus*” or “*in sensu cosmico*.” Rather, it opposes philosophy “in the scholastic sense” (“*in sensu scholastico*” or as a “*Schulbegriff*”) to philosophy “in a cosmopolitan sense” (“*in sensu cosmopolitico*”), using the Latin locution four times and no other in the space of just two pages (AA 28:532 f.).

So is “cosmopolitan concept” a correct rendering for “*Weltbegriff*” after all? In the following four sections I will examine these two texts and explain why

---

<sup>7</sup> According to Paul Guyer, the choice was made on the reasonable ground that 1) other translations of “*Weltbegriff*” seemed poor or too literal and 2) “cosmopolitan” seem to make sense in context, probably because of the practical intent of this kind of philosophy. My thanks to him for sharing this with me.

they do not support any such conclusion. After this, I will provide an alternative account of what Kant likely means by philosophy as a world concept through a close reading of the Architectonic of Pure Reason.

### 3 The Jäsche *Logic* and the Transcripts: Preliminary Overview

The relevant passages in Kant's *Logic* prepared by Jäsche (hereafter, the Jäsche *Logic* or JL) are as follows:

So philosophy is the system of philosophical cognition or rational cognition from concepts. That is the school concept [*Schulbegriff*] of this science. According to the world concept [*Weltbegriffe*] it is the science of the final ends of human reason. This higher concept gives philosophy dignity, i. e. an absolute worth.  
[...]

As for what concerns philosophy according to the world concept (*in the cosmic sense*) [*Weltbegriff (in sensu cosmico)*]: it can also be called *a science of the highest maxims of the use of our reason*, insofar as under maxim is understood the inner principle of choice among various ends.

For philosophy in the latter sense is indeed the science of the relation of all cognition and use of reason to the final end of human reason, to which, as the highest, all other ends are subordinated and in which they must be unified into a unity.

The field of philosophy in this cosmopolitan sense [*in dieser weltbürgerlichen Bedeutung*] can be brought down to the following questions:

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

The first question is answered by *metaphysics*, the second by *morals*, the third by *religion* and the fourth by *anthropology*. At bottom one could, however, account all of these to anthropology, since the first three questions relate to the latter.

So the philosopher must be able to determine

- 1) the sources of human knowledge,
- 2) the extent of the possible and useful employment of all knowledge and finally
- 3) the boundaries of reason. (JL:23–25)

In all except the last instance in these passages, Kant uses language that is similar but not identical to what we found in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. As noted above, “*in sensu cosmico*” occurs here in place of the *Critique*'s “*conceptus cosmicus*,” but otherwise everything stands the same. It is only in the last instance, as introduc-

tion to Kant's four famous questions, that we find this Latin locution replaced by the German "in dieser weltbürgerlichen Bedeutung."

So how much authority should we give to this single instance? We will address the authority of this specific set of passages further below. But at the outset it should be noted that generally speaking it is quite reasonable to doubt evidence drawn from Kant's *Logic*. According to Jäsche's own admission, the textbook was based upon Kant's personal copy of Meier's *Excerpts from the Doctrine of Logic*, its marginalia and the rough notes Kant took on its blank interleaved pages (JL:VII). These notes, which survived long enough to be included in *Akademie* volume 16, are very rough, often telegraphic and clearly unfinished. Jäsche never claims direct knowledge of Kant's logic lectures, and evidence presented by Stark shows convincingly that he was never in a position to have attended them. So he would not have had first-hand familiarity with the material he was collating and re-writing.<sup>8</sup>

More importantly, comparison of these notes with Jäsche's *Logic* shows that "he manipulated his materials considerably, omitting, rearranging, combining, translating" (Boswell 1988, 197) and indeed that he must have extensively supplemented these by the addition of material from one or more sets of lecture transcripts (Erdmann 1880; Boswell 1988, 198), although which transcripts has never been established. Considering the roughness of all this material, we must also agree with Boswell's suggestion that some, perhaps even much of the text of the Jäsche *Logic* stems from Jäsche's own hand (Boswell 1988, 199). Finally, although Kant did indeed personally entrust the composition of the *Logic* to Jäsche, there is no evidence to suggest that Kant ever checked the final product. Indeed, given his advanced age at the time and his self-reports of being incapable of prolonged concentration, this would probably have been impossible.

This brief sketch of the sources of Jäsche's *Logic* makes it perfectly clear that the single occurrence of "cosmopolitan" found in the passage above must not be trusted uncritically. To determine its authenticity, we must therefore compare the text in detail with other closely related sources. These are two: the notes from Kant's copy of Meier's textbook and the surviving logic transcripts that derive from notes taken by Kant's students in the lecture hall. As it turns out, none of the notes in the *Akademie* edition correspond even roughly to the passages quoted above. However, several sets of logic transcripts contain strikingly similar material. The Vienna, Warsaw, and Hechsel transcripts all contain text that corresponds closely to everything *prior to* the sentence in which the Jäsche *Logic* uses "cosmopolitan," but *none* contain this sentence or the four famous questions that

---

<sup>8</sup> Stark 1987, 128 n12. Cited also in Boswell 1988, 199.



follow. Both are however found in the Pölitz transcripts, indeed notably *only* in them, as are many further references to philosophy in a cosmopolitan sense.

In order to assess the authenticity of the Jäsche *Logic* and the Pölitz transcripts on this issue, we must now establish a few basic pieces of background information. In general, it is important to note that there was clearly a thriving practice of taking, transcribing and compiling notes from Kant's lectures for sale to students. We have no clear idea as to how many sets of transcripts were produced and can generally say very little about the origins of the ones that survive. The most that we can usually establish is that some of the lectures belong in groups, presumably because they go back to a common original or are the product of a specific group of copyists. When two sets of transcripts overlap in the general flow of ideas, but greatly differ in precise wording, we can perhaps assume that they stem from two different originals taken during the same course, and so belong to different groups. It is less likely, but very possible, that in such cases this correspondence is due to compiling or rewriting of the notes by different groups of copyists. By examining the kinds of obvious errors found in a set of transcripts, we can also determine the extent to which the copyist was acting mechanically. This is useful information, because it indicates that overall the text has not been reworded and so is a generally faithful copy of an earlier text.

Several specific points have been established regarding the relationships between the logic transcripts in particular. The editors of the Kant-Index have shown convincingly that the Warsaw and Pölitz transcripts generally belong to one group, and the Vienna and Heschel transcripts to another (Hinske 1995a, XXXII f.). It has also been shown that the Warsaw transcript is a compilation, which – although closer to Pölitz – sometimes contains material from the Vienna transcript as well (Hinske 1995a, XXIX). Indeed, sometimes it even includes versions from each that cover the same material, but with a different wording. Otherwise, the specific errors found in the Warsaw transcripts, such as the skipping of words or even whole lines, show these to have been copied in a very mechanical manner. Somewhat more is known about the Pölitz transcripts. Karl Pölitz, after which they are named, never attended the University of Königsberg, and there is no evidence to suggest he ever met or even corresponded with Kant.<sup>9</sup> He acquired these transcripts from an unknown third party, and silently cut from them an entire section, which he then edited and inserted as introduction to a set of Kant's metaphysics transcripts published in 1821. Pölitz lost the originals of this section soon afterwards so that there is no way to check directly whether his editorial manipulation went still further. It is quite obvious that large portions of the Pölitz

---

<sup>9</sup> See Friedrich 2001.

transcripts are identical to material in the Jäsche *Logic* and that on the whole, if the original Pölitz transcripts could not have served as a basis for Jäsche's *Logic*, then an immediate predecessor to it, identical nearly to the word, must have. This is true in particular of the sections in each that concern the two senses or concepts of philosophy.<sup>10</sup> Just a couple of examples will show how close the two texts often are:<sup>11</sup>

Jäsche: Wir haben die Vernunftkenntnisse für Erkenntnisse aus Principien erklärt; und hieraus folgt: daß sie *a priori* seyn müssen. Es giebt aber zwey Arten von Erkenntnissen, die beide *a priori* sind, dennoch aber viele namhafte Unterschiede haben; nemlich Mathematik und Philosophie. (JL, 21f.)

Pölitz: Wir haben von Vernunftkenntnissen geredet, daß sie Erkenntnisse *ex principiis* sind, sie müssen also *a priori* seyn. Es giebt zwei Kenntnisse, die *a priori* sind, dennoch aber viele namhafte Unterschiede haben: nämlich Mathematik und Philosophie. (PM:2)

Again:

Jäsche: Denn Philosophie ist die Idee einer vollkommenen Weisheit, die uns die letzten Zwecke der menschlichen Vernunft zeigt. (JL:24)

Pölitz: Philosophie ist die Idee einer vollkommenen Weisheit, die mir die letzten Zwecke der menschlichen Vernunft zeigt. (PM:4)

Such examples could be multiplied. This is important for several reasons, but presently because it means that the only two texts in which we find mention of cosmopolitanism, namely the Jäsche *Logic* and the section of the Pölitz transcripts found in the published metaphysics lectures, are not originals even of student notes, let alone from Kant's own hand, and that where they overlap both must be based upon a common source.

---

**10** One cannot generalize from specific passages to an entire set of transcripts, because the parts are often compiled from different sources. For this reason, my comments here must be restricted to the brief section in question, and it is from this that I have drawn all of my examples.

**11** I have retained the spelling of the original manuscripts here and below.

## 4 Assessment of the Evidence from the Jäsche *Logic* and the Transcripts

To gain a deeper understanding of the complex relations between these different sets of transcripts, consider the following parallel passages:

Jäsche: Der Philosoph muß also bestimmen können 1) die Quellen des menschlichen Wissens, 2) den Umfang des möglichen und nützlichen Gebrauchs alles Wissens, und endlich 3) die Grenzen der Vernunft. – Das letztere ist das nötigste, aber auch das schwerste, um das sich aber der Philodox nicht bekümmert. (JL:25 f.)

Pölitz: Die Philosophie im Schulbegriff ist bloß ein Organon der Geschicklichkeit. Der Philosoph *in sensu cosmopolitico* ist der, der die Maxime des Gebrauchs unserer Vernunft zu gewissen Zwecken hat. Der Philosoph muß bestimmen können: 1) Die Quellen des menschlichen Wissens; 2) Den Umfang des möglichen und nützlichen Gebrauchs desselben; 3) Die Grenzen der Vernunft. (PM:5)

Warsaw: Philosophie in Schulbegriff ist bloß ein Organon der Geschicklichkeit. Der Philosoph *in sensu Cosmico* ist, der die maximen des Gebrauchs unserer Vernunft zu gewissen Endzwecken hat. Der Philosoph muß bestimmen können. a, Die Quellen des menschlichen Wissens b, den Umfang des möglichen und nützlichen Gebrauchs desselben c, Die Grenzen der Vernunft, welches das wichtigste und schwerste ist, warum sich der Philodox aber gar nicht bekümmert. (Kant 1998b, 521 f.)

Vienna: Philosophie im Schulbegriff (Philodoxie) ist ein Organon der Geschicklichkeit, und Philodox verhält sich zum Philosophen, wie der, der im Staate Gewerbe treibt, zum Gesetzgeber. Wenn der Philosoph den Zusammenhang aller Vernunft-Erkenntnissen mit den letzten Zwecken erkennen soll, muß er 1. die Quellen des menschlichen Wissens, 2. den Anfang ihres Gebrauchs, 3. ihre Gränzen bestimmen. Dies ist eins der schwersten, aber auch der erhabensten dinge in der Philosophie, die gegenwärtig noch Wenige erreicht haben. (AA 24:799)

Hechsel: Der philosoph, nach dem Schulbegrif, würde also Phylodoy heißen können: d: i: ein solcher der viel Gelehrsamkeit und Kentniße besitzt, und die philosophi würde nach dem Schulbegrif ein Organon der Geschicklichkeit seyn. Ein philosoph nach dem Weltbegrif ist derjenige, der Maximen in sich hat, nach welchen ein Geschicklichkeit die er hat, gebraucht und angewendet wereden kann. Es kann Jemand ein guter Phylodix seyn ohne ein Gesezgeber der Vernunft zu seyn. Zum Phylosophen wird erfordert (weil er die höchsten Zwecke der menschlichen Vernunft bestimmen soll) daß er bestimmen könne 1) Die Quelle des menschlichen Wissens 2) Der Anfang des möglichen und nützlichen Gebrauchs der Vernunft. 3) Auch die Grenzen der menschlichen Vernunft. Dies 3 Stüke sind eins der schwersten und erhabensten Begrife, und sind bis jezt wenig erreicht worden. (Kant 1998b, 293 f.)

Superficially, it is quite obvious that all of these texts concern roughly the same material. As we would expect given Hinske's earlier observations, Jäsche, Pölitz and Warsaw clearly represent different versions of the same basic text, whereas Vienna and Hechsel together seem to have a distinct origin and to share distinctive features. In particular, Vienna and Hechsel both contain the mistaken "*Anfang*" instead of the correct "*Umfang*," and share the nearly identical final sentences, which also differ in a parallel way from the final sentences of both Jäsche and Warsaw. Despite this, however, the similarities between all the texts printed here are great enough to think that they originated from the same or very similar lectures.<sup>12</sup> And this suggests that we can generally regard the Vienna and Hechsel transcripts together as providing a relatively independent source of evidence regarding the actual content of the lectures.

Comparing the first three passages more closely, we find that these stand in a very interesting relationship to one another. The first two sentences shared by Pölitz and Warsaw are missing from Jäsche. Since Pölitz is nearly identical with Jäsche throughout the section, this difference can be explained reasonably as an editor's omission. After this, the first sentence of the Jäsche passage, including the three points, is found almost identically in Pölitz and Warsaw. The final sentence of Jäsche, however, is found in the Warsaw passage, but not in Pölitz. From all of this we can conclude with a measure of confidence: Neither Jäsche nor Warsaw are based upon Pölitz.<sup>13</sup> We already know that Jäsche is not based upon the Vienna or Hechsel transcripts. Warsaw also cannot be a compilation of Vienna or Hechsel with Pölitz or a text closely related to it, because of the differences in the last sentence and more generally because Pölitz contains a large amount of material that is not found in the Warsaw transcripts, but is found in Jäsche. Since Jäsche is almost certainly not a compilation of transcripts, we can conclude that it is based upon some lost text that was nearly identical to Pölitz, but also contained elements found only in the Warsaw transcripts. Pölitz would

---

**12** This judgement is based on two considerations: First, Kant did not work from a continuous set of lecture notes, and so the close parallel in the progression of the argument in the two groups of transcripts suggests strongly that they originate in the same lecture course. Second, this suggestion is corroborated by the fact that we do not find such close correspondences between lecture transcripts we know to originate from different courses or years, e. g. in the various transcripts of Kant's lectures on metaphysics. The fact – however – remains that we have no direct evidence by which to determine this issue. But, notably, the argument made here is not significantly weakened if it should be the case that the two sets do in fact stem from different courses, since the close correspondence of material and language remains.

**13** Hinske thinks that we cannot exclude the possibility that Jäsche based his text on the original Pölitz transcripts. He does not say whether he considered this kind of evidence, but I do not see how we can account for it otherwise than as I have suggested. See, Hinske 1995, XIV.

then be related to this lost text as to a nearly identical copy with occasional omissions.<sup>14</sup>

We can summarize these results under four criteria of further interpretation: 1. Jäsche and Pölitz are related closely enough in language that they cannot be cited as independent sources of evidence. 2. Vienna and Hechsel, by comparison, are different enough from the others to provide a relatively independent source of evidence. 3. Jäsche and Pölitz are related closely enough that their differences must be attributed to the errors, omissions or intentional changes made by one or both their editors. 4. In such cases, if similar text is found in the Warsaw transcripts – which, to repeat, are clearly mechanical copies from an earlier set of transcripts that were not edited for publication – then this should provide us with strong evidence in favor of the text with which it more closely agrees.

We are now prepared to evaluate the specific sentences in which cosmopolitanism appears. I should note that all of these examples come from a single section of about four pages in length and occur originally in the order here printed. I have italicized the key phrases to facilitate comparison.

1.

Jäsche: Philosophie ist also das System der philosophischen Erkenntnisse oder der Vernunftkenntnisse aus Begriffen. Das ist der Schulbegriff von dieser Wissenschaft. Nach dem *Weltbegriffe* ist sie die Wissenschaft von den letzten Zwecken der menschlichen Vernunft. (JL:23)

Pölitz: *In sensu scholastico* ist also Philosophie das System der philosophischen Vernunftkenntnisse aus Begriffen; *in sensu cosmopolitico* aber ist sie die Wissenschaft von den letzten Zwecken der menschlichen Vernunft. (PM:3f.)

Warsaw: Das System der Philosophischen Erkenntniße ist Philosophie in sensu scholastico. *In sensu Cosmico* aber ist sie die Wißenschaft von den letzten Entzwecken der menschlichen Vernunft. (Kant 1998b, 520)

Vienna: Philosophie ist das System der philosophischen Erkenntniß. Hier laße ich speculativ weg, den Vernunft-Erkenntniß unter einem System muss durchaus speculativ seyn. Denn System ist aus principiis a priori. Dies ist die Philosophie im scholastischen Sinne. Man hat aber auch eine Philosophie nach einem *conceptu cosmico*, und denn ist sie eine Wissenschaft von den letzten Endzwecken der menschlichen Vernunft. (AA 24:798)

Hechsel: Was ist nun phylosophi? Das System der mathematischen Kentniße. Das ist nun die philosophie in der scholastischen Bedeutung: Wir können uns aber auch eine phylosopho-

---

<sup>14</sup> This original could of course just be the original of the Pölitz transcripts now lost, if we assume Pölitz himself made such omissions for the published edition. One can imagine a few other permutations, but these seem very unlikely.

phie nach einem *Welt Begriff* machen, d: h: wo die phylosophi nicht bloß nach den Regln der Schule, sondern auch der Welt betrachtet wird, und da ist sie die Wißenschaft von den letzten Entzwecken der menschlichen Vernunft. (Kant 1998b, 292)

Analysis: Jäsche and Pölitiz disagree. We can say that Jäsche and Warsaw agree, because we know Jäsche commonly took the editorial license of translating Latin phrases into German. Both Vienna and Hechsel support Jäsche. All four criteria lead us to conclude that the instance of “cosmopolitan” found in Pölitiz does not originate from Kant.

## 2.

Jäsche: In dieser scholastischen Bedeutung des Worts geht Philosophie nur auf Geschicklichkeit; in Beziehung auf den *Weltbegriff* dagegen auf die Nützlichkeit. (JL:23)

Pölitiz: Philosophie *in sensu scholastico* geht nur auf Geschicklichkeit, *in sensu cosmopolitico* aber auf die Nützlichkeit. (PM:4)

Warsaw: Philosophie *in sensu scholastico* geht nur auf Geschicklichkeit *in sensu cosmico* auch auf die Nützlichkeit.<sup>15</sup> (Kant 1998b, 520)

Vienna: Die scholastische Philosophie ist eine Unterweisung zur Geschicklichkeit, die wahre eine Lehre zur Weisheit, die das höchste Gut unsres Bestrebens seyn muß. (AA 24:798)

Hechsel: Die phylosophi ist also ein SchulBegrif, nicht anders, als eine Lehre (Unterweisung) der Geschicklichkeit. Im *Welt Begriff* aber eine Weisheits Lehre. (Kant 1998b:292)

Analysis: Jäsche and Pölitiz again disagree. Jäsche and Warsaw agree. No reference is found in Vienna, but Hechsel supports Jäsche. All four criteria again lead us to conclude that the reference to “cosmopolitan” in Pölitiz does not originate from Kant.

## 3.

Jäsche: Was aber Philosophie nach dem *Weltbegriffe* (*in sensu cosmico*) betrifft: so kann man sie auch *eine Wissenschaft von der höchsten Maxime des Gebrauchs unserer Vernunft* nennen, so fern man unter Maxime das innere Princip der Wahl unter verschiedenen Zwecken versteht. (JL:24 f.)

Pölitiz: Wenn wir das innere Princip der Wahl unter den Verschiedenen Zwecken Maxime nennen, so können wir sagen: *die Philosophie ist eine Wissenschaft von der höchsten Maxime des Gebrauchs unserer Vernunft*. (PM:5)

---

**15** The original text reads “[...] auch auf Geschicklichkeit.” This seems clearly to be a copying error and is corrected by Pinder. I follow his correction here because the content is not relevant, but the corrected text makes it clearer here that this is the same sentence.

Warsaw: Wenn wir das innre Prinzipium der Wahl der verschiedenen Endzwecke; die Philosophie sey eine Wissenschaft von der höchsten maxime des Gebrauchs unserer Vernunft. (Kant 1998b, 521)

Vienna: Wenn wir das innere principium der Wahl der verschiedenen Zwecke Maximen nennen: so können wir sagen, daß Philosophie *in sensu cosmico* eine Wissenschaft von den höchsten Maximen des Gebrauches unserer Vernunft ist. (AA 24:799)

Hechsel: Wenn wir die innern subiectiven Prinzipien der Wahl, unter verschiedenen Zwecken Maxime nenen: so werden wir auch sagen können, daß die Philosophi nach dem *Welt begrif* eigentlich eine Maxime wäre von dem höchsten Gebrauch der Vernunft. (Kant 1998b, 293)

Analysis: Here we find an unusually large range in formulations of the same idea along with a striking similarity in content across all the texts, particularly between Vienna, Pölitz and Jäsche. Overall, these lines provide strong evidence that the language used in the lecture hall was that of "*Weltbegriff*," particularly in view of Hechsel, which looks very much like an alternative paraphrase of the same statement. We could conjecture that the gloss "*in sensu cosmico*" was added by Jäsche in view of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, but the occurrence of the same phrase in Vienna seems to suggest Jäsche may have had access to a set of lecture transcripts from the same group.

4.

Jäsche: –

Pölitz: Der Philosoph *in sensu cosmopolitico* ist der, der die Maxime des Gebrauchs unserer Vernunft zu gewissen Zwecken hat. (PM:5)

Warsaw: Der Philosoph *in sensu Cosmico* ist, der die maximen des Gebrauchs unserer Vernunft zu gewissen Endzwecken hat. (Kant 1998b, 522)

Vienna: Und hier bezeichnet der Philosoph mehr durch die Maxime seiner Denkungsart, als durch den Zusammenhang seiner Erkenntniße. (AA 24:799)

Hechsel: Ein philosoph nach dem *Weltbegrif* ist derjenige, der Maximen in sich hat, nach welchen eine Geschicklichkeit die er hat, gebraucht und angewendet werden kann. (Kant 1998b, 293f.)

Analysis: The evidence is strong but not as conclusive here. It is likely that Jäsche has omitted this line by choice, since it is found in both Pölitz and Warsaw. As we saw above, the Warsaw transcripts contain material omitted in the Pölitz transcripts, which can be taken as indicating that it stems from an earlier set. Since we know the Pölitz text was edited for publication, whereas Warsaw is a

mechanical copy, the latter would seem to be more reliable. Furthermore, since all other instances of Pölitz's "*in sensu cosmopolitico*" have been found to be inauthentic so far, it seems reasonable to suppose that this instance is as well. Finally, the Hechsel text, which is only vaguely similar to the others (though it occurs in exactly the right location), provides weak, but still significant support for the Warsaw reading.

## 5.

Jäsche: Das Feld der Philosophie *in dieser weltbürgerlichen Bedeutung* läßt sich auf folgende Fragen bringen: (JL:25)

Pölitz: Das Feld der Philosophie *in sensu cosmopolitico* läßt sich auf folgende Fragen zurückbringen: (PM:5)

Warsaw: –

Vienna: –

Hechsel: –

Analysis: These lines plus the famous four Kantian questions that follow them will be discussed further below. At present we can note that they are not found in any of the transcripts aside from Jäsche and Pölitz. Here we find the single instance of "cosmopolitan" in all of the Jäsche *Logic*. Since all other instances in Jäsche follow the language of the *Critique of Pure Reason* (viz. *Weltbegriff* and *conceptus cosmicus*) very precisely, it seems probable that it is an editorial slip or was introduced into the text when Jäsche integrated a separate note into the text of the lecture transcripts he was relying on. But more on this below. The instance in Pölitz, notably, follows with remarkable consistency the pattern of all earlier ones in the same text. As noted in our criteria, the agreement of the Jäsche and Pölitz texts cannot be taken as evidence for the authenticity of either.

## 6.

Jäsche: –

Pölitz: Philosophie im Schulbegriff ist Geschicklichkeit; wozu aber diese dient, lehrt die Philosophie *in sensu eminenti*. (PM:6)

Warsaw: Philosophie im Schulgebrauch ist Geschicklichkeit wozu sie aber dient, lehrt die Philosophie *in sensu eminenti*. (Kant 1998b, 522)



Vienna: Und die Philosophie in sensu cosmico wird deswegen auch Philosophie in sensu eminenti genannt. (AA 24:799)

Hechsel: –

Analysis: Again, there is great similarity between texts from different groups. None refer to cosmopolitanism, but the Vienna transcripts provide yet another instance of the phrase “*in sensu cosmico*.”

Because the case is often assumed to be otherwise, it bears stressing that the above encapsulates all instances in which either “*weltbürgerlichen*” or “*in sensu cosmopolitico*” occur in any text concerning Kant’s conception of philosophy. These locutions are not found in any text known to be from Kant’s own hand, including the many thousands of pages of notes and marginalia that make up his vast *Nachlass*. As we have just seen, these instances are not only few, but they are only found in two related texts that we know originated from student notes, unchecked by Kant, and passed through the hands of countless copyists. They were then edited, sometimes carelessly and deceptively, for publication. We have seen that Jäsche and Pölitz, neither of which attended Kant’s logic lectures, both made extensive editorial decisions that went well beyond what they openly admitted. Not only are the instances of “cosmopolitan” found in these final texts corroborated by no other set of lecture transcripts, but they are even contradicted by those closest in origin to them as well as those that were possibly taken in the same lecture hall by different listeners. We can thus conclude, with nearly overwhelming evidence, that Kant never actually referred to a cosmopolitan concept of philosophy or connected cosmopolitanism directly with his concept of philosophy as a world concept. This is a far cry from the received view that Kant explicitly and frequently refers to a cosmopolitan concept of philosophy, which is shared even by those who, on other grounds, are puzzled by this apparent fact.

## 5 Kant’s Four Famous Questions

There remains one important textual issue to address. Under point four in the last section, we saw that there is exactly one instance where parallel sentences in Jäsche and Pölitz both refer to cosmopolitanism, although the former does so in German and the latter in Latin. This seems to require an explanation, particularly if, as our analysis suggests, these were copied from some earlier set of transcripts in which such locutions do not occur. In fact, if we look only at the Jäsche *Logic*, the single instance of “*weltbürgerlichen*” is something of a mystery, since in all

other cases he uses the language of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Why this single inconsistency?

If we look back at the text from Jäsche quoted at the beginning of Section 3, and then compare this with what is found in the lecture transcripts, we find something very striking. The key sentence along with the four famous Kantian questions, which it serves to introduce, are found in *none* of the sets of lecture transcripts aside from the section Pölitz extracted and silently inserted into the metaphysics lectures in 1821. Let us compare the passage in Jäsche more closely with the Vienna transcripts. Jäsche:

Denn Philosophie in der letztern Bedeutung ist ja die Wissenschaft der Beziehung alles Erkenntnisses und Vernunftgebrauchs auf den Endzweck der menschlichen Vernunft, dem, als dem obersten, alle andern Zwecke subordinirt sind und sich in ihm zur Einheit vereinigen müssen.

Das Feld der Philosophie in dieser weltbürgerlichen Bedeutung läßt sich auf folgende Fragen bringen:

- 1) Was kann ich wissen?
- 2) Was soll ich thun?
- 3) Was darf ich hoffen?
- 4) Was ist der Mensch?

Die erste Frage beantwortet [...].

Der Philosoph muß also bestimmen können

- 1) die Quellen des menschlichen Wissens, [...]

This is followed by two further points, just as this is quoted in Section 4 above. Now compare this to Vienna:

Wenn der Philosoph den Zusammenhang aller Vernunft-Erkenntnißen mit den letzten Zwecken erkennen soll, muß er

1. die Quellen des menschlichen Wissens,
2. den Anfang ihres Gebrauches,
3. ihre Gränzen bestimmen.

If we compare this with the other existing transcripts then it becomes clear that Kant's idea, in its original form, was that *because* the philosopher in the world or cosmic sense is to relate all rational cognition to the final ends of reason, she must *therefore* be able "to determine 1) the sources of human knowledge, 2) the extent [again correcting "Anfang" to "Umfang"] of its use, and its boundaries."

If we look now at Jäsche's text, we can see that this connection has been broken by the insertion of a quite foreign piece of text introducing, stating and explaining the four famous questions. The first sentence of Jäsche quoted above corresponds to the first sentence of Vienna, but the three points only follow after

this foreign piece of text. That this text should be inserted by Jäsche is not surprising. His *Logic* was constructed from all kinds of disparate materials, including lectures and notes. Furthermore, there is much evidence to suggest that whatever lectures Jäsche employed, they would have dated from the early 1780s. But in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant formulates only the first three questions, and does not mention anthropology at all. The first and only time we find Kant himself stating that the interests of reason can be summed up in four rather than three questions is in a letter to Carl Friedrich Stäudlin in May 1793 (AA 11:429). So on this basis it seems impossible that Jäsche would have found this formulation in transcripts of lectures delivered possibly even before the publication of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, unless we assume that it was added to a late transcript by the copier. All the evidence thus points to the fact that the passage in question was inserted into an older set of transcripts, either by Jäsche or by a copyist.

Now, regardless of who inserted the four questions into the text, it is evident that their specific placement in the context of Kant's discussion of philosophy as a world concept was a more or less arbitrary decision taken by someone other than Kant. Do they even belong here? If the *Critique of Pure Reason* is any indication, then the answer is that they do not. In the *Critique*, the three questions are located in the Canon of Pure Reason, which concerns reason's final end, i. e. the highest good, whereas the discussion of philosophy as a world concept is a central piece of the Architectonic of Pure Reason, which concerns the systematic unity of philosophy. Moreover, the two discussions have quite different, though related, functions. The three questions of the Canon unify all of reason's interests and include metaphysics, moral philosophy and religion; in the Architectonic, philosophy as a world concept is defined as "the *science of the relation* of all cognition to the essential ends of human reason" (A839/B867; emphasis added). On this reading, philosophy as a world concept cannot be "brought down to" (Jäsche) three or even four questions.<sup>16</sup> It is not merely the cognition of certain interests or ends, but is specifically the *science* that investigates and correctly outlines the *relation of all knowledge* to these interests. This explains how Kant can state that "the metaphysics of nature as well as morals, but above all the *preparatory* (propaedeutic) critique of reason [...] alone constitutes that which we call philosophy in a genuine sense" (A850/B878), although this is emphatically not the same as what is summarized in the three questions of the Canon. As we will see in Section 6, the distinction between the four questions and Kant's notion of philosophy as a world concept is even more radical: in the Architectonic all merely empirical sciences, such as anthropology, are explicitly excluded by its concept (A848/

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Höffe 2006, 224.

B877–A851/B879). This is not to undermine the importance of Kant’s famous questions, or even anthropology, but to underscore the fact that they have a significantly different function than does Kant’s world concept of philosophy.

So if the four questions were a late and arbitrary insertion, why are they also found in the section of text edited by Pölitz and published in 1821 as part of the metaphysics transcripts? A clue lies in the Pölitz text itself: The passage containing the four questions is not located in exactly the same place as it is in Jäsche, but rather a few lines later where it does not disrupt the flow of Kant’s original idea. Still, by comparison with Warsaw, Vienna and Hechsel, it is clear that this too is a later insertion. This suggests two possibilities:

- 1) The four questions were a late insertion into a set of transcripts that were used by both Jäsche and Pölitz to construct their editions. This would explain why the language they use is almost the same and why they both contain the reference to cosmopolitanism. That Jäsche uses the German rather than the Latin could easily be explained by reference to other instances where he translates the Latin of his sources into German.
- 2) The four questions were contained in a note, now lost, that Kant gave to Jäsche along with the materials for the composition of the *Logic*. The note was then edited and inserted by Jäsche. Later, when Pölitz was editing the section of the logic transcripts for inclusion in the metaphysics lectures, he took the passage from Jäsche’s *Logic*, and adapted it to his own purposes. However, in doing so, he noticed that the questions were misplaced and so inserted them a few lines further on where there seemed to be a more natural break in the text. While the Pölitz text, as we have seen, is certainly not based on Jäsche generally, there is no reason he could not have lifted this single passage.

It is very hard to say which of these is more likely. The first seems most natural, but is pure speculation. The second, however, presupposes a rather extraordinary degree of tampering by Pölitz. It would not be surprising if he inserted a paraphrase of the text from Jäsche, but he also would have had to translate Jäsche’s “*in dieser weltbürgerlichen Bedeutung*” to “*in sensu cosmopolitico*.” As unlikely as this might initially seem, it does however cohere with our earlier finding that Pölitz most likely changed “*in sensu cosmico*” to “*in sensu cosmopolitico*” (a phrase not found in Kant’s writings at all) throughout the text. What is more, it would explain why he might have felt justified in doing so: If he found a reference to cosmopolitan philosophy in Jäsche, then he may have simply thought he was making more explicit what Kant meant by philosophy *in sensu cosmico* earlier in the text, thereby helping out the reader. Since Pölitz was evidently willing to cut up original texts and to publish this part of the logic transcripts without comment, as

if it were part of a metaphysics course, it does not seem unreasonable to think he would have made such extensive editorial changes.<sup>17</sup>

## 6 Philosophy as a World Concept in the Architectonic of Pure Reason

So what is Kant's understanding of philosophy as a world concept? And where are we to find it elucidated if not in his political, historical or anthropological writings? With only a few exceptions, previous studies have relied centrally on Jäsche's *Logic* or on the transcripts of the logic lectures for filling out Kant's account. But as we have just seen, these sources cannot be employed without considerable care and strong corroboration from other texts. Any treatment of Kant's concept of philosophy as a world concept must therefore base itself primarily, if not exclusively, on a close reading of the *only* text about it we know to be from Kant's own hand, namely the Architectonic of Pure Reason. So we will attempt here to arrive at a clearer understanding of Kant's world concept of philosophy by examining the precise function it plays within the argument of the architectonic as a whole.

Unfortunately, for a text devoted to systematic unity, the Architectonic appears, at least on first inspection, to be very poorly constructed. It indeed looks as if it has been composed hastily and in an almost mechanical fashion through the concatenation of separate blocks of text. Most troublingly, in these Kant seems to jump from one topic to the next without explicitly stating their precise connection within one sustained argument. I believe it is a lack of clear signposts along the course of the argument, combined with the confusions created by the conflicting evidence of the Jäsche and Pölitz lectures, that has led most commentators to seek an understanding of Kant's world concept of philosophy in a collation of other, often less reliable texts, and to overlook the possibility that the Architectonic itself is actually written in a very deliberate fashion, one that points us to a precise, if not fully worked-out, concept of philosophy in this spe-

---

<sup>17</sup> It is not necessary to consider what motives Pölitz might have had for the changes he made, but it is not irrelevant to note that he had a deep interest in extending the historical and cosmopolitan aspects of Kant's philosophy. See, e. g.: Karl Heinrich Ludwig Pölitz, *Geschichte der Kultur der Menschheit, nach kritischen Principien*, 1795; *Die Erziehungswissenschaft, aus dem Zwecke der Menschheit und des Staates*, 1806. In the second he speaks of both the "cosmopolitan unification [*kosmopolitischen Vereinigung*] of the whole of mankind" as the end of reason, and of the "cosmopolitan education [*weltbürgerliche Erziehung*]" that this requires (306 ff.).

cific sense. In my view, the only way to get to the primary intention behind Kant's world concept of philosophy is therefore to reconstruct its basic idea by closely following the development of the text itself under the assumption that it is not just a collection of loosely related paragraphs, but indeed a gradually unfolding argument.

It will be helpful to provide at this moment a preliminary outline of the structure of the architectonic as it will emerge in the course of our analysis. The real key to this structure, on my view, lies in recognizing that it consists of three related stages of argumentation. Its first, preparatory stage consists in the brief passage that runs from AA 3, 538.20–540.23. In this stage Kant aims to provide a precise plan for the argument of the rest of the chapter through an explanation of the essential form that *any* investigation into architectonic must take because of the nature of architectonic unity itself. In particular, Kant argues here generally that the goal of architectonic, or the “art of systems,” which is to exhibit the intrinsic structural unity of a certain body of cognitions, can be achieved only once we have determined precisely the distinctive idea (in the technical Kantian sense of this term) of the science in question. With this in place, he explains, one can then for the first time demonstrate in detail that the science is complete as well as how it is to be internally structured, divided and combined back into a unity through what he calls the “schema” of the science. In the second stage, Kant then executes the first part of this general plan in the specific case of pure reason, thereby articulating a precise definition of the idea of a science of pure reason. This he does in two steps: In the first he determines the logical idea of philosophy as science in general, while in the second he uses this idea to build up his fully determinate idea of philosophy as a world concept. After completing this second stage, Kant uses the idea of philosophy as a world concept to derive the complete schema or structural outline of the system of pure reason's cognitions. Since this third stage is not essential to my goal in this paper, my treatment of it will be only cursory.

With this preliminary outline in hand, I will now turn to my close reading of the Architectonic. I will provide only the B-edition pagination, along with the pagination and line numbers of *Akademie Ausgabe*, volume 3, to facilitate a finer anatomization of the chapter.

## 6.1 Stage One: Architectonic Unity, Idea and Schema

To get at the heart of Kant's deeper argument we must begin with the most basic question: What is the central goal of the chapter entitled “The Architectonic of Pure Reason”? Its “business,” Kant informs us, is “simply to outline the *architec-*

*tonic* of all knowledge from *pure reason*" (B863, AA 3:540.24 f.).<sup>18</sup> This announcement, however, is first made midway through the fifth paragraph, which indicates that the previous discussion running from AA 3:538.20–540.23 has a more general purpose and is intended to provide a framework for the execution of this specific task. This supposition is corroborated by Kant's speaking in these early paragraphs only of architectonic *in general*, as the "art of systems" (*Kunst der Systeme*), and in a way that makes it as applicable to other sciences as to that of pure reason treated later in the chapter itself. Regarding architectonic in general, Kant explains that to be a system or to possess "systematic unity" is what it means for any group of cognitions to constitute a "science" and for this reason one can say that "architectonic is the doctrine of what is scientific in our cognition *in general*" (B860, AA 3, 538.23 f.; emphasis mine). In order to possess architectonic unity, he further explains, a collection of cognitions must stand under an idea or "rational concept [*Vernunftbegriff*] of the form of the whole," which determines the "extent [*Umfang*] of the manifold, as well as the positions of the parts with respect to one another" (B860, AA 3, 538.29–31). That is to say, the idea of the science is supposed to express both the *boundary* and the *internal structure* of a certain species of cognition as such. This is precisely what Kant means when he then goes on to conclude that the idea of a science is therefore to be understood as containing "the end [*Zweck*] and the form of the whole that is congruent to it" (B860, AA 3:539.1 f.). The idea, in other words, contains the measure of the perfection and completion of a particular science – precisely the dual meanings of *telos* as explained by Aristotle<sup>19</sup> – by reference to which it is possible to judge the current state of the science and to correct its flaws.<sup>20</sup>

---

**18** This expression contains an ambiguity. It could be taken to refer to an architectonic of all pure rational knowledge or to a pure rational architectonic of all knowledge (thus of both pure and empirical knowledge). However, since Kant understands the complete system of pure knowledge to be just the form of all possible knowledge, both pure and empirical, the two meanings in fact coincide. In any case, several passages in the Architectonic itself indicate that the architectonic also governs empirical knowledge (e. g. A848/B876, A850/B877). For a fuller discussion of the way Kant understands pure philosophy as providing the form of knowledge and in particular of issues stemming from his conception of empirical knowledge, see Fugate 2015. Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for raising this issue.

**19** See *Metaphysics* 1021b13–1022a13.

**20** Kant provides no further explanation in the *Critique* for his usage of the term "end" (*Zweck*) or its relation to boundaries. However, other texts suggest two reasons for this association. First, in the *Prolegomena*, Kant explains that the ideas, as "ends" towards which reason strives, also "show us the boundaries of reason's pure use" (AA 4:353). Thus a proper conception of the end of pure reason leads to a correction of its proper use, which includes a conception of its limitations. Second, in the third *Critique*, Kant explains that the concept of an end is precisely that of the

It is important to recognize, however, that for Kant architectonic unity must guide the practice of the scientist only because it is already intrinsic to the structure of the science itself. Thus, to be sure, that the idea is an “end” of a science means in part that it contains the law, or standard of judgment, through which the genuine expert in a science is to construct the completed science. To be, for example, a genuine logician it is not sufficient that one deal with a certain subject matter, but rather that one also engage in a kind of lawful activity or work *guided by the specific idea* of what that work ought to be, of what does and what does not belong to the science. But, more fundamentally still, the unity treated in the “art of systems,” what Kant also calls “architectonic unity,” is not to be one that is imposed by us on a previously given manifold of cognitions because of the external similarity of the parts, or because the parts serve as means to a goal that we adopt for reasons external to them; it is rather a unity that internally unifies these parts through intrinsic affinity or kinship (*Verwandtschaft*) due to their common “derivation from a single supreme and internal end that first makes the whole possible” (B861, AA 3:539.22–24; emphasis added). In this respect, the form of the whole contained in the idea is said by Kant to *precede* the parts of the whole essentially by first making them possible at all.

How can we understand the whole as preceding the parts that compose it? Kant would have us think here, as he does in other instances, of a living being or an organism (see, e. g., Bxxiii). In an organism, on Kant’s interpretation, the whole is understood to precede and make possible the parts through the thought that the parts are produced by *activities* that are themselves internally guided, not by the actual whole itself (which does *not* precede, but rather follows from its parts at any actual moment), but by the *idea* of the whole. It is not that the actual whole in an organic body precedes and makes possible the actual parts, but that the idea of the whole somehow guides the activities through which the parts are first produced, i. e. through a specifically guided intentional activity (AA 5:399, 407f.). Analogically, the whole of a science can precede the parts composing it if these parts or individual cognitions are generated intentionally such that: 1) the act of thought through which they are generated is one specifically guided by a concept or idea of the *kind* of cognition to which it is to belong; 2) these cognitions are such that they can arise in no other way. Since the cognitions that compose a science are themselves concepts and judgments, i. e. functions of unity in thought, it seems at least

---

concept of the whole through which alone the parts are regarded as first possible (AA 5:219f.). As a concept of the whole, such an end would naturally also delimit what belongs within the whole and what does not, thereby determining its boundaries. It is perhaps notable that “*Zweck*” can also be translated as “purpose.”



reasonable that these can be of such a kind that a more general idea of the kind of cognition to which these belong is essential to them. That is to say, a certain cognition may itself necessarily presuppose an understanding of the general kind of cognition it is supposed to be, which is just what Kant in these passages takes to be an understanding of the idea of the science to which it belongs. The upshot is that – unlike the accidental unity found in a mere collection of similar things – the unity provided by the idea is both internal and necessary to the things it unifies; for only through cognition of the idea do they first become possible.

To return to the flow of the text at hand, Kant further explains that the idea of a science can only relate to the body of cognitions comprising it through a “schema” of the science, that is, “an essential manifoldness and order of the parts determined *a priori* from the principle of the end” (B861, AA 3, 539.11f.). As in other cases throughout Kant’s writings, the role of a schema here is one of mediation, by means of “a general procedure” (*allgemeine Verfahren*) (B179, AA 3, 135.36), between a universal and the particular falling underneath that same universal. For example, just as the schema of a category of the understanding is “a product and as it were monogram of pure *a priori* imagination, through which and in accordance with which the images first become possible” (B181, AA 3, 136.24–26), the schema of the idea of a science contains “the outline (*monogramma*) and the division of the whole into members according to the idea” (B861 f., AA 3, 539.25f.) and is such that only through it and according to it do the individual cognitions within the science “first become possible.” In the case of an idea, the schema plays the unique role of providing a general procedure for specifying individual members or determining specific activities of a science, and thus also for relating these back to the whole.<sup>21</sup>

In the secondary literature the question has been raised whether Kant attributes such scientific unity to all individual sciences, or only to philosophy.<sup>22</sup> Although it will be confirmed by examples in Section 6.2 below, it is important to

---

<sup>21</sup> Kant’s doctrine of schematism is notoriously obscure, and undoubtedly underwent significant development between first and second *Critiques*. In the case of the categories, Kant takes the schematism to be a “general procedure of the imagination” (AA 5:69), but in respect to the ideas of reason it must rather constitute something like a general procedure for the understanding, as this is explained in the Typic of the second *Critique*. In that text, however, Kant states that although the procedure in the case of ideas is analogous to a schema, it is distinct in essential respects and should not be called a “schema.” Since Kant indeed uses the term “schema” in the Architectonic in the case of ideas, we must assume that he had not yet reached a settled view on this matter. To avoid confusion, I will also use the term “schematism” to refer to such a general procedure.

<sup>22</sup> See Gava 2014. Actually, the answer is subtler than this, because Kant regards all genuine sciences, apart from mathematics, as belonging to philosophy understood as rational cognition

notice that in the very next passage, which runs from AA 3:539.28–540.23, Kant leaves no doubt that he attributes it to every science as such. Here he speaks generally of the historical founding of certain sciences and of their “systems” (notice the plural), in a way that clearly recalls and elucidates his earlier discussion of the foundation of mathematics among the Greeks and physics among the Moderns in the B-edition Preface (Bx–xiv). Towards the end of the passage from the Architectonic just mentioned we read that:

[...] although they [i. e. the systems] altogether had their schema, as the original seed, in the mere development of reason and because of this not only was each individually [*für sich*] structured according to an idea, but rather in addition all are in turn unified purposively among themselves in a system of human cognition as members of a whole and permit an architectonic of all human knowledge [...]. (B863, AA 3:540.15–20)

These lines are crucial to a correct interpretation of this stage of Kant’s argument. First, they clearly indicate that he regards each individual system or science as possessing by itself its own internal idea. Second, these lines also first announce a relation between the ideas of the individual sciences and a final idea, which makes possible the interconnection of each into a totality of all knowledge. Drawing again on the notion of an end, this relation can be understood along the lines of the subordination of particular ends under a supreme end in regular practical activities (see also AA 3:543.7–10). Kant’s view seems to be that just as playing an instrument can possess its own internal goal and measure of perfection, but also at the same time be subservient to the further external goals of gaining pleasure or making money, so likewise a science such as logic can be defined and guided by an internal idea of what it is supposed to be, but at the same time brought in relation to all sciences under a broader idea at which human knowledge in general aims. This would happen precisely through the subordination of the idea of logic itself to the wider idea of which it constitutes a part or division. Third, although barely noticeable, these lines also indicate an even closer connection between the ideas of the individual sciences and the idea of the whole; the many ideas, Kant says here, permit of being brought under and organized through one common idea, *precisely because* they all have a common origin in the development – and thus in the overall form or idea – of human reason itself. This indicates that the sciences are different from the example of playing music just cited in that the interrelation between the sciences is not an external one (as is the relation of playing music to making money), but rather an internal

---

from concepts (i. e. in the scholastic sense), and regards all individual sciences as applications of the pure idea of science that arises from pure reason.

one. As we will see more fully below, this deeper and more embracing unity of reason is in the first instance simply the form of science as such, i. e. architectonic unity; for “human reason is by its nature architectonic” (B502). In a word, particular sciences will be able to stand together in architectonic unity, at least in part, because they all share the common form of science itself, which has its source and original idea in reason *a priori*. So just as in an organism, the parts will be able to belong to the whole because they all share the form of the organic. But their complete and necessary subordination into a single actual system will require in addition that their specific founding ideas themselves stand in a higher systematic relationship, i. e. in a higher science, determined by a single supreme internal end or idea. This, as we will see, is the true function of the world concept of philosophy.

## 6.2 Digression: Idea and Schema in Kant's Conception of a Science

To further confirm key aspects of the above interpretation and in part also to flesh out the details of Kant's model of scientific knowledge, it is necessary to look at a few other key texts in which he puts this conception of science to work.<sup>23</sup> These, as it turns out, are quite numerous and each instance poses unique interpretive difficulties which preclude a full treatment in this paper. For this reason, I have chosen to focus in this section only on examples that I also deem essential to understanding the Architectonic and its relation to Kant's world concept of philosophy.

Kant's first and perhaps most central application of this model of science lies in his explanation of the very idea and structure of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. The two parts of the exceedingly brief Introduction to the A-edition of the work discharge exactly the functions of determining “The Idea of Transcendental Philosophy” (A1) and presenting the schema or “Division of Transcendental Philosophy” (A13). In the former, Kant begins by explaining the nature and demonstrating the existence of synthetic *a priori* knowledge. He then uses this to develop the “idea of a special science” called the “critique of pure reason,” which would “uncover the ground of the possibility of synthetic *a priori* judgments with appropriate generality [...] to determine it completely and adequately for every use in a

---

<sup>23</sup> I should state at the outset that I can do no more here than provide a few rough examples; for, as ambitious as Kant is in describing this conception and in claiming directly or indirectly that he has employed it, he is by no means as clear about the details of its application to specific cases.

system in accordance with its primary sources, domain, and boundaries” (A10). This leads him in the second part to draw a most general division (schematization) of the *Critique* into a Doctrine of Elements and a Doctrine of Method, each of which he says will have its own divisions which must be justified later in the work (A15).

Now this same science, Kant explains, is itself the foundation for a further, separate science called “transcendental philosophy.” The science of critique has for its end the establishment of the “complete idea of transcendental philosophy,” and aims to “outline the entire plan [i. e. schema] *architectonically*, i. e., from principles, with a full guarantee for the completeness and certainty of all the components that comprise this edifice” (A14). The difference between the science of critique and transcendental philosophy lies in the difference in their purposes or ends: Critique “does not aim at the amplification of the cognitions themselves, but only at their correction, and is to supply the touchstone of the worth or worthlessness of all cognitions *a priori*” (A12, AA 4:23.19–22), and so “its utility would really be negative [...] for the purification of our reason, and our keeping it free from errors” (A11, AA 4:23.7 f.). Transcendental philosophy, by contrast, is supposed to be the complete system of all knowledge from pure reason or from pure concepts *a priori*, both analytic and synthetic (A11 f.). The mixing of these two separate sciences, Kant explains, would not be in accordance with their purposes or the plans as set out in their respective ideas (A14, AA 4:24.12–19). Hence, just as we saw in Section 6.1 above, Kant takes the end of these sciences to be a measure of the completeness and perfection of any science constructed according to an idea.

Much of this discussion is expanded and clarified in the B-edition Introduction. Here Kant adds several sections to clarify his conception of synthetic knowledge *a priori* and its significance for mathematics, physics and metaphysics. But he also makes an important correction to his earlier text. As we saw above, the titles of the two parts of the A-edition Introduction spoke respectively of the idea and division of transcendental philosophy. Now, although Kant did explain the idea of transcendental philosophy in that text, he did not elaborate its particular schema, and indeed it is clear that his real reason for doing the former was actually to define the idea and then derive the schema for a different science altogether, namely, for that of a critique of pure reason. Kant seems to have noticed this mistake while making revisions, and so in the B-edition Introduction he combines the corrected text of these two sections under the title “The idea and division of a special science under the name of a *critique of pure reason*” (B24; emphasis added). This leads us to ask: If the critique of pure reason, as Kant clearly states, is to contain or even to be not only the idea but also the “entire plan” or schema for the science of transcendental philosophy, then where is this schema to be found? Since transcendental philosophy is supposed to be the complete system of cognition from pure reason, the answer is obvious: Its schema must be found

in the “*architectonic* of all cognition from pure reason,” which is the topic of the very chapter of the *Critique* in which we find Kant's world concept of philosophy. His goal in the Architectonic must therefore be to recapitulate the concept of science that already lies at the basis of the entire critique of pure reason, and then, by the specific application of this to the cognition of pure reason, to define the particular idea of a transcendental philosophy and derive the schema of all the transcendental sciences.

If we look now to the body of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, we notice that Kant further distinguishes the transcendental aesthetic, as the “science of all principles of *a priori* sensibility,” from transcendental logic, as the science of the “principles of pure thinking” (A21/B35 f.). In the Introduction to the latter, under the heading of “The Idea of Transcendental Logic,” he formulates “the *idea of a science* of pure understanding and of the pure cognition of reason, by means of which we think objects completely *a priori*,” thus of “a *science*, which would determine the origin, domain, an objective validity of such cognitions” (A57/B81; emphasis added). To formulate this idea of transcendental logic, which defines its “end,” Kant proceeds again by the method of division, starting with the genus and proceeding to add further differentia. So in the first section, he determines the idea of the science of logic in general, while in the second he uses this to determine the more specific idea of a logic that is also *transcendental*. He does the former first by distinguishing sensibility from thinking and so the idea of the “science of the rules of sensibility in general” from the idea of “the science of the rules of understanding in general,” and then distinguishes the idea of general logic from that of a particular logic. Within the idea of general logic, he then distinguishes between that which is pure and that which is applied. In this way, Kant reaches the conclusion that “a *general* but *pure* logic therefore has to do with strictly *a priori* principles, and is a canon of the understanding and reason, but only in regard to what is formal in their use, be the content what it may” (A53/B77). With this result in hand, Kant proceeds in the second section to argue that, due to the discovery of the pure forms of sensibility in the transcendental aesthetic, it is now possible to form the idea of a logic that is both general and pure, but which is such not because it abstracts from all consideration of objects, but because it concerns only “the origin of our cognitions of objects insofar as that cannot be ascribed to the objects” (A55/B80). This is the idea of transcendental logic which Kant uses in the two immediately following sections to ground the division (i. e., schematization) of transcendental logic into transcendental analytic and transcendental dialectic (A57–64/B82–88).

The Transcendental Analytic itself opens with one of Kant's most forceful summaries of his conception of scientific unity outside of the Architectonic. He first restates in more detail the main features of the idea of a transcendental ana-

lytic, emphasizes that it must provide a complete account of transcendental concepts of the understanding, and then continues:

Now this completeness of a science [...] is possible only by means of an *idea of the whole* of the *a priori* cognition of the understanding, and through the division of the concepts that such an idea determines and that constitutes it, thus only through their *connection in a system*. [...] Hence the sum total of its cognition will constitute a system that is to be grasped under one idea, the completeness and articulation of which system can at the same time yield a touchstone of the correctness and genuineness of all the pieces of cognition fitting into it. (A64 f./B89 f.)

As the text unfolds, it becomes clear that the idea Kant has in mind here is the “common principle, namely the faculty for judging (which is the same as the faculty for thinking)” from which “this division is systematically generated [...] and has not arisen rhapsodically from a haphazard search for pure concepts” (A80 f./B106). Just as he had in the Introduction to the *Analytic*, Kant here first clarifies the idea of a purely *logical* faculty for judging (which abstracts from all relation to objects), summarizes its moments in the table of the logical functions of judgment, and then uses this to define a *transcendental* faculty of judging, which abstracts from all but its relation to the pure manifold offered by the *a priori* forms of sensible intuition (A78 f./B103–5). It is from the definition of this idea that Kant claims to then derive systematically the division and order (i. e. the schema) of all its moments in the twelve categories.

It is important to recognize that this application of Kant’s concept of science is central to his understanding of science as such. Indeed, this scientific treatment of the categories is itself intended by Kant to provide the scientific foundation for the structure of all genuine science and thus to constitute an essential part of the idea or form of science in general. The table is “indispensable,” Kant tells us, “for drawing up completely *the plan for a science as a whole* insofar as this science rests on *a priori* concepts, and for *dividing* it systematically *according to determinate principles*.”<sup>24</sup> This is because “the table lists completely all the elementary concepts of the understanding; indeed, it contains even the form of a system of them residing in the understanding” (B109 f.). Kant expands on this point in the *Prolegomena*, writing that:

---

<sup>24</sup> In a letter to Heinrich Jung-Stilling, Kant praises his attempts to set up a “system of civil law” according to the system of the categories, explaining similarly that this “must indeed be the *a priori* foundation for any classification of the principles of scientific knowledge based on concepts” (AA 23:494). The same idea is repeated in the *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science* (AA 4:474) and other texts.

This treatment of the categories makes all treatment of any object of pure reason itself systematic in turn, and it yields an undoubted instruction or guiding thread as to how and through what points of inquiry any metaphysical contemplation must be directed if it is to be complete; for it exhausts all moments of the understanding, under which every other concept must be brought. (AA 4:325)

It is on the basis of the scientific establishment of the categories alone, Kant further explains, that he has been able to establish the system of the principles, the table of the concepts of something and nothing, the paralogsms, the antinomies, and indeed to enumerate completely and scientifically all the possible errors into which pure reason can fall.

The Transcendental Dialectic provides an equally important part of Kant's most general conception of science. As we have previously seen, on Kant's view every science must be founded on an *a priori* idea, one which therefore has its source in pure reason alone. Now the Dialectic contains precisely the scientific treatment of the complete system of all the ideas that can arise originally from pure reason. As Kant explains, this text follows the same path as did the Analytic, using the idea of the *logical* use of reason (in syllogisms) as the basis for discovering the idea of its pure or *transcendental* use (A299/B356; A305–9/B362–6). The latter has at least two features: First, although the transcendental use of reason abstracts from everything empirical, it does not abstract from the relation of this faculty to the pure understanding and its cognitions. Second, it provides concepts of the absolute completeness of the use of reason in respect to objects, and thus of the unconditioned principle of every series of conditions (A307 f./B364). Therefore, the single idea of such a use, combined with a systematic enumeration of the "inferences of reason, when applied to the synthetic unity of intuitions in accordance with the categories" allows Kant to discover "special *a priori* concepts that we may call pure concepts of reason or *transcendental ideas*, and that will determine according to principles the use of understanding in the whole of our experience" (A321/B378).

Insofar as it establishes the systematic science of all ideas through pure reason, the Dialectic therefore simultaneously provides the founding ideas for all the special sciences falling within the system of pure reason, which as we saw before, is the same as the complete system of transcendental philosophy. Even the further divisions of these sciences, Kant explains, can be "set forth completely" in several moments, since "they run along the course of the categories" (A335/B392). So these ideas, combined with the categories, are supposed to provide the full schema for the science of pure reason, its division into a number of sub-sciences, as well as for the internal divisions of each of these insofar as they have a scientific or *a priori* basis. This also means that if the real purpose of the Architectonic

of Pure Reason is to outline the schema for the science of pure reason (i. e. the system of transcendental philosophy), as I suggested before, we should expect the schematization in that chapter to follow the system of transcendental ideas. We will see below that this is indeed the case. But Kant himself already adumbrates this result in the first part of the Dialectic stating that “among the transcendental ideas themselves there can be seen a certain coherence and unity, and that by means of these ideas pure reason beings all its cognition into a system” (A337/B394).

Turning from Kant’s speculative to his practical philosophy, we see that the Introduction to the *Critique of Practical Reason* is itself entitled “On the Idea of a Critique of Practical Reason,” and as in the parallel case of the A-edition of the first *Critique*, it consists of just two paragraphs, the first of which explains this idea and the second of which outlines its schema. Its idea is that of a science that “determines whether pure reason is sufficient by itself alone to determine the will, or whether reason can be the determining basis of the will only as empirically conditioned” (AA 5:15). And as regards its schematism, Kant explains that the divisions of this science will be the same as those of the first *Critique* since it too is determined by the structure of pure reason, but the divisions will in part follow a reverse ordering since moral science concerns the relation of reason to the determination of the will and not to theoretical objects (AA 5:16). This same set of thoughts is directly and specifically applied to the Analytic in a section entitled the Critical Examination of the Analytic of Pure Practical Reason (AA 5:89–106; esp. 89–92). “By the critical examination of a science, or of a section thereof that by itself amounts to a system,” Kant explains,

[he means] the investigation and justification as to why it must have precisely this and no other systematic form when it is compared with another system that has a similar cognitive power as its basis. (AA 5:89)

In stating this, Kant directly indicates that the Analytic by itself constitutes a special system or science within the *Critique of Practical Reason*, just as was the case with the Analytic in the first *Critique*. Both consider all cognitions originating from the pure understanding, but they differ in that the understanding’s pure concepts in the practical case are applied for the determination of the will based upon a law given immediately, and from which the effect on sensibility must follow, whereas in the theoretical case the same concepts could be validly employed only in laws required for the unification of the *a priori* manifold of pure intuition, thus where sensibility serves as a prior condition (AA 5:89f.). Here again we find that, despite a profound structural similarity, the two sciences are distinguished essentially through their respective ends.



As we should now expect, this general parallel between theoretical and practical reason also applies to the Dialectic of the same work, which Kant says is intended to determine the idea of the highest good, and based upon this, “*a doctrine of the highest good* insofar as reason endeavors therein to attain to a science” (AA 5:108). But since this will concern us further below I will presently leave it aside.

The following general conclusions can be drawn from our examination: (1) We have confirmed that, for Kant, the founding of a science requires the definition of its idea or end, which states the distinctive nature and purpose of the cognition involved, along with the articulation of a schema or “general procedure,” which indicates the further special classes of cognition falling under it. This end provides a model by comparison with which the incompleteness of any actual system can be judged or determined, e. g. the absence of any category in the table of the transcendental concepts of the understanding or of any idea in the system of the ideas of pure reason. (2) We have also confirmed that, for Kant, there exist multiple sciences, which compose a kind of organic whole by being nested inside of one another to form a system of sciences within sciences. (3) We can now see, in addition, that the most general pattern for articulating any and every science, both with respect to its idea and its schema, lies in the categories of the understanding and the system of the ideas of pure reason, for these articulate the universal structure of pure reason and so also the form of every one of its specific applications insofar as it is to be a perfect systematic whole of cognitions. (4) The critique of pure reason is itself a special science that is to establish the idea of transcendental philosophy or of the complete system of knowledge from pure reason. (5) The Architectonic of Pure Reason, of which Kant's world concept of philosophy is the centerpiece, has the purpose of explaining the idea and deriving the schema for this complete system. (6) An essential component of the science of pure reason that Kant seeks to establish is the practical “science” of the highest good.

Finally, to this list of conclusions I would add the key observation that in every case we have examined Kant has sought to determine the transcendental idea of a science by first defining the idea of its general logical counterpart. The idea of transcendental logic was built in part from the idea of a general logic; the idea of the system of categories, from the idea of the system of logical functions in judgments; the idea of the real use of pure reason, from the idea of its logical use in syllogisms, and so on. In all of these cases, Kant moves from the idea of something logical, which is pure because it abstracts from all relation to objects, to the idea of something structurally analogous but transcendental, which is pure because it considers the relation only to those objects given *a priori* through pure reason. This, I will suggest, is precisely the way Kant understands the relation in

the Architectonic of the (logical) scholastic concept of philosophy to the (real) world concept of it.

### 6.3 Stage Two: The Idea of a Science of Pure Reason

Let us now return to the text of the Architectonic. In Section 6.1. above we saw that on Kant's view, the system of all cognition from pure reason, and thus of all genuine sciences, must itself possess architectonic unity, and so constitute one supreme science. From this it followed that the system of pure reason must be based upon a single inner idea. Moreover, this idea must precede and make possible even the individual sciences, while containing a single end at which they all must be directed and in relation to which they must be judged with regard to their perfection (completeness) and proper use. As before, this idea will itself require a schema, i. e. some kind of general procedure for dividing and arranging all sciences in their proper or lawful relation to the whole of all human knowledge. But what is the idea that unifies all knowledge and where will we find its schema? It is only here at AA 3:540.24 f. and in raising this question, that Kant first announces that his real "business" in the chapter is "simply to outline the *architectonic* of all knowledge from *pure reason*." This, as we have noted, signals a turn from a general discussion of architectonic unity to a more specific determination of the idea and schema at the basis of all knowledge in general and provides our guiding clue: we are concerned in this chapter with elucidating an architectonic "of all knowledge from *pure reason*." If our reading to this point is accurate, then Kant's task now is to determine more specifically the distinctive concept or *idea* of this kind of knowledge or its "end" (stage two), and then to outline its schema (stage three).

Kant sets about defining this idea, *via* the method of division, by stating that the special task of the architectonic "begins only from the point at which the general root of our power of cognition separates and throws out two stems, of which one is reason" or the "entire higher faculty of cognition" (B863, AA 3:540:26–28). It is a faculty of rational as opposed to empirical cognition (B863, AA 3:540.29). But what then is "rational cognition"? In the text, Kant in fact uses two synonymous expressions for such knowledge, calling it both "rational cognition" (*rationale Erkenntnis*) and "cognitions of reason" (*Vernunfterkennnisse*). He also creates difficulties by freely alternating between calling the cognition principally opposed to it by the titles "empirical" and "historical." With this in mind, we can see that what Kant means to explain in this passage is that cognitions can be rational or historical in a twofold sense, namely objectively or subjectively. First, a given cognition is objectively either rational or historical depending

on the nature of its content (*Inhalt*). Objectively rational cognition, has a content that could have arisen originally only from pure reason itself, not from experience, while objectively historical cognition concerns what could only be learned through experience (AA 3:541.12–14). We can, however, abstract from the content of a cognition and focus only on the subjective *manner* or *form* in which a particular person has arrived at it. If she has received it passively, i. e. from immediate experience, the testimony of others, or academic instruction, then Kant says the cognition is in fact subjectively historical (B864, AA 3:541.36 f.); if, however, she has derived it from her own creative or “generative” (*erzeugende*) faculty of reason, actively from the pure and “universal sources of reason,” then alone is it also subjectively rational (B864 f., AA 3:540.8–15). As Kant further explains, a person can have complete objectively rational knowledge that nevertheless subjectively remains merely historical. Such a person merely “has grasped and retained well, i. e. learned, and is a plaster cast of a human being” (B864, AA 3:541.11 f.).<sup>25</sup>

In the paragraph immediately following this twofold definition of rational cognition, Kant makes use of it to define, again *via* logical division, the idea or rational concept of philosophy as a science by first determining the concept of philosophical knowledge. Now the genus, Kant explains, is rational cognition from pure reason, which embraces precisely two species, namely, philosophical and mathematical knowledge. Importantly, this means that all rational sciences, e. g. natural science and logic, except for mathematics, belong to philosophy as parts (see especially, B867, AA 3:542.33–35). The specific difference between philosophy and mathematics, however, concerns their sources in pure reason: philosophy is “from concepts”; mathematics, “from the construction of concepts” in pure intuition (B865, AA 3:541.18 f.).

At this point Kant draws the preliminary conclusion that:

[T]he system of philosophical cognition is *philosophy*. One must take it objectively, when one understands under this the archetype for the judgment of all attempts to philosophize, which should serve to judge each subjective philosophy, the edifice of which is often so manifold and changeable.

Despite initial appearances, in these lines Kant is *not* drawing on the distinction he has just explained between objectively and subjectively rational cognition,

---

<sup>25</sup> Still, for Kant there is evidently an intimate connection between these two senses of “rational,” which has so far been overlooked in the literature. As we have just seen, even objectively rational cognition is such that it “can originally arise only from the human being’s own reason” (B864, AA 3:541.13 f.). This means that whenever and wherever it does originally arise, it must do so in a subjectively rational way.

which, as we saw, concern respectively the *content* of cognition and the *manner or way* in which one first obtains it. Rather, he is reminding the reader that in defining philosophy, he aims to outline its idea, i. e. what philosophy *ought to be*, rather than what actually is or has been called “philosophy” in the past.

Most importantly, however, Kant has now arrived by means of his discussion of rational cognition at a determinate idea or rational concept of philosophy itself, which is exactly what my hypothesis regarding the purpose of this passage would have us expect. It is the “system of all philosophical cognition,” i. e. the complete and perfect collection of rational cognitions from concepts, or what is the same, the systematic unity of all discursive cognition from pure reason. This is the “mere idea of a possible science that is never given *in concreto*, which, however, one seeks to approximate by many paths” (B866, AA 3:542.7–9). It is also the idea that must guide the philosopher *as idea* in all her activities, precisely because it is the single idea that originally grounds the architectonic unity of all rational cognitions in general, and so of all sciences. In this sense, philosophy is the idea of a science that organizes all sciences in view of the archetypal idea of the specific kind of cognition they are to contain, namely objectively and subjectively (as to content/form) rational cognition from pure reason. Just as the transcendental philosopher or the logician, to take just two instances, must work and assess their works under the idea of what a critique of pure reason or a general logic is to be, so the philosopher as such must work under, and assess all science by the idea of a perfect whole of all rational cognition as such, the structure of which must run along the course of the ideas of pure reason and the categories of the understanding as we saw in Section 6.2.

Having arrived at the idea of philosophy in general, one would expect Kant to proceed immediately to an articulation of its schema, and to thereby bring the task of the Architectonic to completion. Instead, Kant now for the first time introduces his world concept of philosophy, writing:

Until now [*Bis dahin*], however, the concept of philosophy has been only a *scholastic concept*, namely of a system of cognition that is only being sought as a science, without having as an end anything more than the systematic unity of this knowledge, and hence the *logical* perfection of cognition. But there is yet also a *world concept* (*conceptus cosmicus*), that has always grounded this title, especially when it is, as it were, personified and represented in the ideal of the *philosopher*. (B866 f., AA 3:542.19–26)

We will consider below what this means for Kant’s world concept of philosophy itself. But let us first examine what it can tell us about the scholastic concept just outlined and its relation to the world concept it serves to introduce. Taken in isolation, the German “*bis dahin*” above is clearly ambiguous. Kant could be claiming that up to this point *in history* the concept of philosophy has been merely

scholastic, indicating that the world concept to follow is his own discovery. Or, he could just be saying that the idea of philosophy outlined to this point in the *Architectonic* is merely scholastic.<sup>26</sup> However, the context leaves no doubt that the second is his intended meaning. The definition of scholastic philosophy here as concerned with system, science and the logical perfection of cognition, corresponds precisely to the content of the immediately preceding passages. Also, it would make little sense for Kant to claim the world concept of philosophy as his own discovery and then to immediately state, as he does in the lines above, that in the past this idea has always grounded the title. Moreover, just two paragraphs later, Kant elaborates on this by explaining that the ancients always “understood” the term ‘philosopher’ in this sense (B868, AA 3:543.12–15). This is confirmed in the *Critique of Practical Reason*, where he again states that the world concept is “the meaning in which the word [philosophy] was understood by the ancients” (AA 5:108; emphasis added). So by “*bis dahin*” Kant cannot be suggesting that he is the first to understand philosophy in this way. He must therefore mean to equate philosophy in a scholastic sense exactly with his idea of philosophy as the “system of all philosophical cognition” (i. e. subjectively rational knowledge) that it has been the purpose of the *Architectonic* up to this point to elucidate. This idea is scholastic, then, precisely because one who takes it as the end and thus the measure of his or her philosophical activities will be essentially concerned with achieving a logically perfect cognition of all rational cognitions, i. e. all cognitions from pure reason. This is the vocation of the scholar and it is shared by all

---

<sup>26</sup> Ferrarin 2015, 75 n65, emphasizes this ambiguity as well, but does not consider my interpretation. He thinks Kant means until the idea of philosophy has been fully achieved, thus as parallel with the “*bis dahin*” in the paragraph just prior. Although his textual reasons for holding this view are very reasonable, I cannot see the sense in such a claim. In the paragraph preceding, Kant has made it clear that philosophy cannot even be taught in principle, emphasizing this by calling it the “mere idea of a possible science, which is never given *in concreto*.” Ideas as such can never be given *in concreto*. Thus, when Kant goes on in the next lines to say that until it is given *in concreto*, philosophy cannot be taught, this must be interpreted as an indirect way of just saying again that it can never be taught. Similarly, to say philosophers will be kings when pigs fly is just another way to say philosophers will never be kings. Thus, if Ferrarin were right, when Kant uses “*bis dahin*” to introduce his world concept of philosophy, he would have to be saying that philosophy will remain a scholastic concept, not a world one, until its idea is achieved *in concreto*, thus presumably never. But it is not even clear to me what that could mean, since the difference between the scholastic and the world concept of philosophy is not about what philosophy we possess, but of the way we have conceived philosophy. And Kant clearly intends to define philosophy as a world concept in this very text, while still admitting that such is and will always remain a mere idea.

those concerned with philosophical cognition, thus also by the natural scientist and the logician (B867, AA 3:542.33–36).

It has been suggested in the literature that Kant wants to undermine or even reject philosophy in a scholastic sense, that what he has in mind here is the traditional metaphysics of the schools, or the method of instruction sometimes found therein,<sup>27</sup> or, sometimes even, his own critical or transcendental philosophy.<sup>28</sup> But the texts we have examined so far simply do not sustain any of these readings. Kant is evidently using “scholastic” here to mean study that is devoted to the logical perfection of a science, i. e. the precise, clear and distinct articulation of all fundamental concepts and principles distinctive to a certain science and in accordance with the rules of the logical perfection of knowledge.<sup>29</sup> It is for this reason that Kant most often treats the term “scholastic” as synonymous with “philosophical” and “scientific” (cf. AA 8:138n., 10:17, 10:47, 10:48).<sup>30</sup> Kant’s central concern up to this point in the text has only been to explain what science is and what philosophy is: it is cognition from pure or *a priori* concepts. This is the *general and logical idea* of philosophy. It is shared by all scholastic philosophies (logic, natural science, moral philosophy, etc.) which – Kant is very clear –

---

**27** The suggestion is sometimes made that Kant means to identify philosophy in the scholastic sense with that taught by the historical method, which is not properly philosophical (see e. g. Manchester 2008). However, this does not agree with a closer reading of the text. Kant does discuss the difference between historical and philosophical cognition, and in other contexts he does charge the schools with relying too much on the former mode of teaching. But for Kant historical knowledge is not science and is not genuinely systematic, so it cannot be what he means here by the “scholastic concept.” It is also true that in some texts Kant contrasts scholastic and popular philosophy, but in those cases he is concerned with a distinction in the *manner of instruction*, not in the *kind of philosophy*, as is the case here. See Ferrarin 2015, 83–85, who agrees on this point.

**28** See, e. g., Ypi 2011.

**29** A scholastically perfect science would thus presumably base itself on a complete definition of its own founding idea, enumerate completely its internal divisions in accordance with the categories and satisfy the desiderata set out in Kant’s *Logic*.

**30** Cf. see Kant’s logic reflection 2051 (AA 16:214): “The adequacy of knowledge to the object is scholastic perfection (groundedness).” It is also important to note that Kant’s continuous reference to philosophy in a scholastic sense as that of the “*Vernunftkünstler*” (artist of reason) in the *Architectonic* (e. g. A839/B867) must be understood in relation to the definition of architectonic itself as “*Kunst der Systeme*” (the art of systems) (A832/b860) and more specifically within the German tradition that identifies science in general as the “artificial” or “skilled” crafting of our natural rational capacities, by means of reflection, into clear and distinct system of cognitions. See Baumgarten 2013, 29 f., 99; Wolff 2005, 50–53. This again rules out interpretations that would equate scholastic philosophy with historical knowledge, or would see the distinction between the scholastic and world concepts of philosophy as having to do with the nature of the cognition involved rather than merely the scope.

have established and now follow their own essential ideas as their ends, and so contain architectonic and not merely technical unity.<sup>31</sup>

According to the world concept of philosophy, by contrast, Kant tells us that it is now the “science of *the* relation of all cognition to the essential ends of human reason (*teleologia rationis humanae*)” (B867, AA 542.26 f.; first emphasis added). As a *science* embracing all cognitions, it must naturally fall under and so include within itself the scholastic idea of philosophy; for wisdom too must take “the path of science” (B878, AA 3:549.17; cf. AA 5: 108, where Kant says “the *doctrine of wisdom*, and this in turn as *science*, is *philosophy*,” which includes the “love of *science*”). But we now learn that it also completely determines this idea by representing it in relation to *the specific* ends given entirely *a priori* through pure reason itself, thus as *both* subjectively and objectively rational cognition. This pure object is found in the philosopher thought of as an *ideal*, i. e. in the image of the philosopher as an individual congruent to the idea, who therefore embraces in every way a life according to its model. If there are also ends prescribed as necessary by pure reason itself (thus essential ends) – and Kant indeed believes that there are – then they will be included in the science of all cognition from pure reason as object, and the philosopher’s *entire use* of reason will necessarily be in the service of these specific ends. Furthermore, since such a “genuine” philosopher would indeed exhibit the archetype in relation to which all other philosophers are to be measured and judged, she would not be represented as working under the idea for the improvement of science, but as already necessarily in complete possession of it, thus not as an “artist of reason, but rather the legislator of human reason” (B867, AA 3:542.29 f.; see also, AA 5:108 f.).

So the contrast between scholastic and world philosophy is initially neither one between manners of cognizing,<sup>32</sup> nor between kinds of content cognized,<sup>33</sup> but rather between the logical form of philosophy in general as a way or form of knowing (subjectively rational) and the specific or determinate content of this same philosophy (also objectively rational). With the addition of the world concept

---

<sup>31</sup> Tonelli 1994, 272, and Ferrarin 2015, 81, disagree.

<sup>32</sup> Ferrarin 2015, 69, seems to disagree, but his reasons are not clear to me. He seems to base his view on what he takes to be Kant’s claim that scholastic but not world philosophy can be taught. But Kant makes this point before ever introducing the distinction between a scholastic and a world concept of philosophy, and so it is clearly meant to apply to both.

<sup>33</sup> By this I mean that there are no new objects; for even the ends of pure practical reason are considered in a particular scholastic science, namely moral philosophy. There are of course many new relations introduced between these objects and the sciences which treat them. So the extension of scope and determinacy does, in another sense, introduce an additional content, though no new objects.

of philosophy the scope has shifted from the form of scientific disciplines, their systematic perfection and their relation to one another simply as parts of science as such, to the *necessary* systematic unity of *all possible disciplines* under a single ultimate and unifying *end* that is uniquely moral *due to the practical nature of pure reason itself*; the move is from the general idea of philosophy as science to the completely determined idea of single and absolutely complete philosophical science that has all its ends given systematically and *a priori* through pure reason. What the focus on the ideal philosopher captures is that since the final end provided by pure reason is in fact practical in nature, in the fully determinate science of philosophy all the individual sciences must finally be taken up in and subordinated to a nexus of *use*, under a final end of action. Critical philosophy, for instance, will not only have its own internal idea and perfection, but will also have a proper function in relation to our necessary moral end, a fact to which Kant points often, e. g., when he says that it “relates everything to wisdom, but through the path of science” (B878, AA 3:549.16).<sup>34</sup>

If we step back from the text for a moment and recall the observation we made at the end of the last section, then it seems very likely that Kant’s sudden move from the idea of the scholastic concept of philosophy to the idea of the world concept of philosophy is intended to parallel the other cases we examined in Section 6.2. It seems reasonably clear that Kant’s whole purpose in this part of the text is to arrive at the proper idea of a philosophy based on pure reason so that he can turn to the derivation of its schema. But as in the other cases, Kant here first defines the idea of something like a logical counterpart, namely the general idea of philosophy as science, which is devoted precisely to the *logical* perfection of knowledge in a way that abstracts from the specific kind or object. And when he turns from this to the world concept, he does so, just as in the other cases, by taking this same idea and relating it to the possible system of objects *given a priori* by pure reason itself. If this is correct, then the scholastic concept of philosophy relates to the world concept just as the logical relates to the transcendental.

Before going forward, two further clarifications will be helpful at this point to avoid confusion. First, it is clear that the distinction Kant draws between scholastic and world philosophy is also not identical to that between theoretical and moral philosophy, though it is closely related to it. While it is true that moral philosophy for Kant is the discipline concerned with the ultimate end, it is itself only one discipline among many, and the moral philosopher, say the author of the *Metaphysics of Morals*, is from this point of view just another scholastic or scientist. But philoso-

---

<sup>34</sup> This idea, particularly for what it means for the relationship between transcendental philosophy and wisdom, becomes most explicit in the *Opus posthumum* (e. g., AA 21:121, 132).



phy as a world concept also essentially concerns more than what belongs to the metaphysics of morals in the strict sense, namely, the perfection of each and every science as such (which makes them suitable for a belonging to one system in the first place) as well as the systematic relation of absolutely all scientific cognition to this final end, and so also to what is cognized by moral philosophy. Second, we must be careful to note both the relation and the distinction between the ideal philosopher and the idea of philosophy in the world sense. The two are not identical; rather, as Kant explains, philosophy as a world concept is the idea of the philosophy or rational doctrine that would be known and taught by the ideal philosopher.

It follows from the preceding that philosophy in the world sense is and remains a scientific doctrine, although this is now fully understood, as Kant says, to be the single *doctrine of wisdom* prescribed by pure reason (B878, AA 3:549.17). If we allow ourselves to draw on some of Kant's other pronouncements regarding the nature of wisdom, we can see even more clearly why he should make this connection. Earlier in the first *Critique*, but more fully in many of his handwritten notes, Kant explains that wisdom is found in the rational idea of the necessary unity of all ends (A329/B385), and in particular in the idea of a faculty for determining one's actual ends from this idea.<sup>35</sup> However, he is also reported to have explained in his *Lectures on Philosophical Theology* that a necessary system of ends is not possible based on empirical principles, and that the human being is incapable of knowing all *empirically* possible ends in their systematic unity. This seems to be his basic reason for discounting the possibility of a rational idea of happiness and so a science or system based exclusively upon it in his key moral writings (see, e. g., AA 4:417 f.). So for us, Kant says, wisdom is located only in the derivation of ends from the pure rational concept of such a system of possible ends, the rule for which is found in the moral law alone (AA 28:1057). In his essay, *On the Use of Teleological Principles in Philosophy*, Kant similarly explains that although for us a systematic knowledge of empirical ends is impossible, the *Critique of Practical Reason* nevertheless shows that the end of reason is determined *a priori*, so that there is in fact possible "a pure doctrine of ends (which can be no other than that of *freedom*), the principle of which contains *a priori* the relation of reason in general to the whole of all ends and can only be practical" (AA 8:183). Finally, in a key passage from the *Critique of Practical Reason* that is strikingly similar to the passage of the Architectonic in question, Kant states that "to determine this idea practically [i. e. the unconditioned totality of the *object* of pure practical reason, under the name of the *highest good*], i. e. sufficiently for the maxim of our rational

---

<sup>35</sup> See in particular elucidations 3643–3651 (AA 17:172–5), reflections 4843 (AA 17:744), 6432 (AA 18:714) and 6444 (AA 18:719).

conduct, is the *doctrine of wisdom*, and this in turn as *science* is *philosophy* in the meaning in which it was understood by the ancients [...]” (AA 5:108). So we can see that philosophy as a world concept is made possible as a science by pure moral philosophy, or by what Kant also calls the metaphysics of morals, because the latter *alone* provides a pure and therefore necessary doctrine of the final end and so also the only possible ground for the highest architectonic unity of all philosophical cognition in one whole. Furthermore, we can now see that the knowledge of the *necessary relation* of all cognition to this final end is what Kant means by a doctrine of wisdom that would be suitable to the human being.

Returning to the text of the Architectonic, Kant’s further identification of the ideal philosopher with the legislator (*Gesetzgeber*) expressed at AA 3:542.29 is clearly central to his understanding of philosophy as a world concept and deserves fuller attention than it has yet received in the secondary literature. First, it should be noted that the sense in which Kant means this is fairly clear from the text itself: The philosopher according to the world concept is nothing but the idea of philosophy personified in an ideal person, thus as completely determinate both with respect to knowledge, speculative and practical, and with respect to the use or relation of this knowledge to the final moral end (i. e. pursuit of the highest good). Hence just as the idea determines the necessary rule, i. e. *law*, by which every use of reason is to be judged, so the philosopher as ideal determines the law of pure reason as applied to every aspect of the person. If such a human being could exist, then her knowledge and will would at the same time be the pure law for all other philosophers, indeed all other rational beings. She would appoint them to their tasks, “using them as instruments for furthering the essential ends of human reason” (B867, AA 3:542.36–543.1). Far from being an arbitrary rule, such a will would be nothing but the personification of the essential and necessary law of the pure reason possessed by every human being *qua* rational.

Second, the ideal of the philosopher as a legislator helps to emphasize several essential features of the idea of philosophy as a world concept. One is that it not only provides a rule for the use of reason, but indeed a rule that is absolutely necessary, i. e. a law. As a law it must be intrinsically necessary and so also universal. And insofar as it prescribes ends, these ends will likewise be necessary and universal. It is in this sense that Kant can now explain philosophy as a world concept to be “that which concerns what *necessarily interests* everyone” (B868n, AA 3:543.31f.; emphasis added). The point is not that this philosophy is concerned with the interests actually shared by all human beings (an easy misinterpretation), but rather that it is concerned with what *necessarily interests* every human being because it is prescribed *a priori* by reason as the end of the will of every *rational* human being. By contrast, philosophy as a scholastic concept, though it indeed concerns the ends that internally define the individual sciences insofar as this is

tied to the perfection of philosophical science, does not as such concern itself with the use of these sciences in respect to the human being's complete vocation. The scholastic philosopher therefore simply cultivates his own science, as science, for whatever use might be made of it by another (B868n, AA 3:543.32–34).

Combined, these points also make it clear that Kant's world concept of philosophy is not as closely related to the idea of *Weltkenntnis* or "acquaintance with the world" (*Kenntnis der Welt*), found in Kant's anthropology and physical geography, as their morphological similarity might suggest. The latter contains a reference to the world because it is concerned with an empirical knowledge of the *actual world*, the earth, and of the human being's physical situation within it as a certain species of living and acting being. This can be merely theoretical, or also pragmatic, Kant explains, if "it contains knowledge of the human being as a *citizen of the world*" (AA 7:120). So whatever Kant's rationale for calling the genuine philosophy of the Architectonic a "world" concept might be, it cannot be the same as that for his calling physical geography and anthropology "knowledge of the world." Also, unlike philosophy as a world concept, Kant evidently does not regard *Weltkenntnis* as sharing the scientific form of scholastic philosophy and as going beyond this merely in scope to include the ends of pure moral philosophy, but rather says that it "must come after our *schooling*," because it concerns not what we must learn for school, but rather what we must learn about ourselves as a species of earthly beings for the use of these sciences and skills in life (AA 2:443).

The deep importance of attending to this difference between empirical *Weltkenntnis* and the philosophy grounded in pure moral philosophy is stressed by Kant himself in the preface to the *Groundwork*, where he lays out a division of philosophy strikingly similar to that in the Architectonic. Here in two long paragraphs, Kant chides those who would cater "to the public taste by mixing up the empirical with the rational in all sorts of proportions," suggesting instead that "the nature of the science" requires "a careful separation of the empirical from the rational part be made, with [...] metaphysics of morals before practical anthropology." "Each branch of metaphysics," he continues, "must be carefully purified of everything empirical," since the confusion of them prevents either from achieving their goals (AA 4:388). So it "is of the greatest necessity to construct a pure moral philosophy which is completely freed from everything which may be only empirical and thus belong to anthropology" (AA 4:389). As we have seen, philosophy as a world concept is the idea of the legislation of pure reason, and ultimately of *pure* practical reason. So it is distinct in kind from physical geography and anthropology, i. e. *Weltkenntnis*, which can be the source of no laws.<sup>36</sup>

---

36 Ferrarin 2015, 83 n74, reaches the same conclusion by other means.

## 6.4 Stage Three: The Schema of the System of Pure Reason

Returning to the text at AA 3:542.27, we can see that with the world concept of philosophy Kant has finally reached the complete idea of philosophy which is to provide all philosophical cognition with genuine architectonic unity. To complete the task of the chapter, he must now outline the schema for this idea. And indeed, at this point in the text Kant turns abruptly to such an outline, writing that “we shall [now] determine more closely what kind of systematic unity is prescribed by philosophy according to this world concept from the standpoint of ends” (B867 f., AA 3:543.4–6). As we saw above, the schema of an idea describes “an essential manifoldness as well as order of the parts that is determined *a priori* from the principle of the end” (B861, AA 3:539.12–14). Consistent with this, Kant explains here that the essential ends of reason (i. e. the “essential manifoldness”) are systematically unified by being subordinated as means to a single highest end (i. e. “the principle of the end”), which is the “entire vocation of the human being, and the philosophy concerning it is called moral” (B868, AA 3:543.10–12). Moral philosophy, insofar as it is legislative, rests entirely on its pure part, and so it is the legislation of pure reason in its practical function that provides the unifying idea of philosophy as a world concept.

Descending from this highest point of unity, Kant now turns to the individual parts of the schema. As he explains, the “legislation of human reason (philosophy) now has two objects, nature and freedom, and contains therefore natural law as well as moral law, first in two particular systems, but finally in a single philosophical system” (B868, AA 3:543.18–21). These belong to pure philosophy, or “the philosophy of pure reason,” which can be divided as follows:

1. Propaedeutic or Critique	2. Metaphysics or the “system of pure reason (science), the (true as well as apparent) philosophical cognition in systematic connection” (B869, AA 3:543.30–544.2)	
	2.1. Metaphysics of Nature or the legislation of speculative use of reason, which “contains all pure rational principles from mere concepts of the <i>theoretical</i> cognition of all things” (B869, AA 3:544.11 f.)	2.2. Metaphysics of Morals or the legislation of the practical use of reason, which is also <i>a priori</i> or “pure morals” (B869, AA 3:544.17)

Kant remarks, quite significantly, that the whole of the above, including critique, could properly be called metaphysics in a broad sense, because this term can be thought to embrace all philosophy from pure reason.<sup>37</sup>

The further details of Kant's attempt to provide a schema are rather obscure, but need not concern us here, since our only goal in this paper is to properly understand the role and hence the nature of his world concept of philosophy. For this purpose, it is instructive to examine only what Kant says about the schema he provides, namely that:

The original *idea of a philosophy of pure reason* itself prescribes this division; it is therefore *architectonic*, in conformity with its essential ends, and not merely *technical*, in accordance with contingently perceived affinities and, as it were established by good luck, and for that very reason it is unchangeable and legislative. (B875, AA 3:547.16–20; first emphasis added)

In light of this text and our preceding analysis, it now seems unquestionable that Kant has introduced the idea of philosophy as a world concept solely in order to derive from it this schema for the division of metaphysics, both of morals and of nature. Everything in the text points to this conclusion, as does the parallel with all of the other cases where Kant employs his conception of science, some of which we examined in Section 6.2 above. The world concept of philosophy, the notion of the philosopher as legislator, the idea of a system of cognition from pure reason, and metaphysics in all its necessary divisions – these are not separate topics that the Architectonic takes up rhapsodically, but rather stand unified at the core of what Kant takes to be philosophy in its most genuine and oldest sense.

Furthermore, the legislation of the philosopher according to the world concept is simply “metaphysics” taken in this new Kantian sense and the division of metaphysics is the schema of this legislation. This is the idea behind Kant's well-known but rarely understood encomium regarding metaphysics with which he concludes the Architectonic:

---

<sup>37</sup> Kant remains silent on how the schema, and in particular the division into a metaphysics of nature and one of morals, is precisely determined from the end or idea of the moral vocation of the human being. One possible suggestion in this regard, supported by the Introduction of the second *Critique* (AA 5:15f.), would be that the entire vocation of the human being (the ultimate end of which is moral and is set by pure practical reason) requires the use of both theoretical and practical reason, and indeed in harmony, both of which rest on different uses of pure reason itself (and so have parallel structures). So in subordination to the entire use of reason, we find unified two different uses of pure reason, one founding a science of morals and one founding a science of nature. Ultimately, the specific difference will lie in the use of pure reason to either cognize given objects or alternatively to determine the will, and so ultimately in the distinction between the faculties of understanding and willing.

Thus the metaphysics of nature as well as morals, but above all the *preparatory* (propaedeutic) critique of reason [...] alone constitute that which we can call philosophy in a genuine sense [i. e. as a world concept]. This relates everything to wisdom, but through the path of science, the only one which, once cleared, is never overgrown, and never leads to error. Mathematics, natural science, even the empirical knowledge of humankind, have a high value as means, for the most part to contingent but yet ultimately to necessary and essential ends of humanity, but only through the mediation of a rational cognition from mere concepts, which, call it what one will, is really nothing but metaphysics.

Just for this reason metaphysics is also the culmination of all culture of human reason, which is indispensable even if one sets aside its influence as a science for certain determinate ends. For it considers reason according to its elements and highest maxims, which must ground even the *possibility* of some sciences and the *use* of them all. (A850f./B878f.)

The philosopher according to the world concept is precisely the “legislator” of human reason because she is in possession of the pure *a priori* science through which the territories of all the sciences of human reason are first established and controlled in their essential systematic relation under the ultimate end given by pure reason itself (A839/B867). And though Kant’s reference to “rational cognition from mere concepts” might sound austere, we must remember that it includes our pure moral cognition of the final end of all rational life, which indirectly makes it a duty to cultivate, among other things, also a cosmopolitan outlook.

## 7 Conclusion

It is important to stress that in the *Critique of Pure Reason* – which turns out to be the only work from Kant’s own hand in which he explicitly defines philosophy in what he takes to be a genuine sense – he avoids the very natural term “cosmopolitan,” opting instead for the strange and far less perspicuous “world concept.” This is unlikely to have been a mistake. Rather, it indicates that Kant must have felt the former term to be inappropriate for capturing the unique sense of philosophy he wanted to get across in the Architectonic. That editors who did not exactly understand what Kant meant would replace this with the seemingly obvious and highly topical term “cosmopolitan” is also not surprising.<sup>38</sup>

From our analysis in Section 6, we can conclude that the philosopher in the world or cosmic sense is not *immediately* the idea of a politically engaged

---

<sup>38</sup> In this respect, it is important to note the growing topicality of cosmopolitanism in the latter part of the nineteenth century (see Hinske 2013, 271–275, Kleingeld 1999). In regard to Karl Pölitz specifically, see also note 13 above.

citizen of the entire world, or even of one who thinks of themselves as of the world in a weaker sense, but of the critical metaphysician of nature and also ultimately of morals, who is concerned with the world of all possible pure cognitions in their systematic connection as well as with the foundational relation of this to all other human knowledge, both theoretically and practically, both as science and as wisdom. In formulating this sense of philosophy and contrasting it with the *merely* scholastic, Kant means neither to contrast a philosophy that is merely of the schools with one that engages the actual world, nor to contrast transcendental or theoretical philosophy with practical philosophy. The key contrast is rather that between a philosophical science that concerns itself with the rational perfection of the individual sciences simply, or as such, and the single philosophical science that also concerns itself with the intrinsic and lawful relation between all rational sciences and the final (moral) end prescribed by pure reason. The critique of pure reason belongs to this latter kind of philosophy “above all,” as Kant states, because it investigates the sources, nature and especially the boundaries of all cognition from pure concepts, thereby articulating scientifically the very idea of metaphysics, which first makes it possible as a true science.

If it should seem surprising that Kant finds it so important to establish the proper boundaries and relations of different sciences, so much so that he would think it definitive of philosophy in a genuine sense, it should be recalled how central this theme is to every aspect of his thought.<sup>39</sup> Boundaries, which are fixed by ideas, not only distinguish for Kant the territory of one science from that of another, but they also point towards the end or goal of that science (AA 4:354). The several metaphysical sciences outlined in the Architectonic in particular, on Kant's view, serve as essential critical tools for showing that the true end of reason is not speculation, but the purification of moral philosophy from any claims to knowledge, which would always be unacceptably anthropomorphic (AA 4:362–5). And the same ideas, as purified, thereby become suitable for the first time for their proper moral employment.

---

<sup>39</sup> In truth, when we look at the great body of Kant's work we find that all of his major writings, indeed even the bulk of his minor ones, are concerned precisely with the drawing of boundaries between philosophical disciplines and with expressing the view that the greatest of our problems result from a blurring of boundaries. For specific statements see, e. g., AA 4:265; 4:473; 8:162; 20:242.

- AA Kant, I. 1900–. *Kants Gesammelte Schriften*. Ed. Königlich-Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften. 29 vols. Berlin.
- PM Kant, I. 1821. *Vorlesung über die Metaphysik*. Ed. K. Pölitz. Erfurt.
- JL Kant, I. 1800. *Logik: Ein Handbuch zu Vorlesungen*. Ed. G. Jäsche. Königsberg.

- Ameriks, K. 2012a. *Kant's Elliptical Path*. Oxford
- . 2012b. “Kant's Ambivalent Cosmopolitanism”. In Ameriks 2012a, 145–161.
- Bacin, S./Ferrarin, A./La Rocca, C./Ruffing, M. 2013. *Kant und die Philosophie in Weltbürgerlicher Absicht: Akten des XI. Kant-Kongresses 2010*. 5 vols. Berlin/Boston.
- Baumgarten, A. 2013. *Metaphysics: A Critical Translation with Kant's Elucidations, Selected Notes, and Related Materials*. Trans./ed. C. Fugate/J. Hymers. London/New York.
- Bianco, B. 2001. “Schulbegriff und Weltbegriff der Philosophie in der Wiener Logik”. In *Vernunftkritik und Aufklärung: Studien zur Philosophie Kants und seines Jahrhunderts*. Ed. M. Oberhausen in collaboration with H. P. Delfosse/R. Pozzo. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 41–57.
- Boswell, T. 1988. “On the Textual Authenticity of Kant's Logic”. *History and Philosophy of Logic* 9, 193–203.
- Ferrarin, A. 2015. *The Powers of Reason: Kant and the Idea of Cosmic Philosophy*. Chicago.
- Friedrich, M. 2001. “Pölitz, Karl Heinrich Ludwig”. In *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 20, 562 f. Also available online at: <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd11624870X.html>.
- Fugate, C. D. 2015. “The Unity of Metaphysics in Kant's Lectures”. In *Reading Kant's Lectures*. Ed. R. Clewis. Berlin/Boston, 64–87.
- Gava, G. 2014. “Kant's Definition of Science in the *Architectonic of Pure Reason* and the Essential Ends of Reason.” *Kant-Studien* 105, 372–393.
- Grimm, J./Grimm, W. 1854–. “Weltbürger,” in *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Edited by the Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Berlin and maintained online at <http://dwb.uni-trier.de/de/> by the Kompetenzzentrums für elektronische Erschließungs- und Publikationsverfahren in den Geisteswissenschaften an der Universität Trier.
- Hinske, N. 1995. *Forschungen und Materialien zur deutschen Aufklärung. Abteilung III: Indices. Kant-Index. Section 1: Indices zum Kantschen Logikcorpus. Band 6.1: Stellenindex und Konkordanz zur ›Logik Pölitz‹*. Prepared in collaboration with T. Boswell/H. P. Delfosse/R. Pozzo and assistance by S. Ganz/S. Harwardt/M. Oberhausen/M. Trauth. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.
- . 2013. “Kants Verankerung der Kritik im Weltbegriff”. In Bacin 2013, vol. 1, 263–275.
- Höffe, O. 2006. *Kant's Cosmopolitan Theory of Law and Peace*. Trans. a. Newton. Cambridge.
- Kaldis, B. 2013. “Worldhood: Between Scholasticism and Cosmopolitanism.” In Bacin 2013, vol. 1, 589–601.
- Kant, I. 1800. *Logik: Ein Handbuch zu Vorlesungen*. Edited by Gottlob Jäsche. Königsberg.
- . 1821. *Vorlesung über die Metaphysik*. Ed. K. Pölitz. Erfurt.
- . 1998a. *Logik-Vorlesung: Unveröffentlichte Nachschriften I – Logik Bauch*. Ed. T. Pinder. Hamburg.
- . 1998b. *Logik-Vorlesung: Unveröffentlichte Nachschriften II – Logik Hechsel, Warschau Logik*. Ed. T. Pinder. Hamburg.
- Kleingeld, P. 1999. “Six Varieties of Cosmopolitanism in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany”. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 60, 505–524.



- Kresse, K. 2008. "Can Wisdom Be Taught? Kant, Sage Philosophy, and Ethnographic Reflections from the Swahili Coast". In *Teaching for Wisdom*. Ed. M. Ferrari/G. Potworowski. Dordrecht, 189–206.
- Lindgren, J. R. 1963. "Kant's *Conceptus Cosmicus*". *Dialogue* 2, 280–300.
- Makkreel, R. A. 2013. "Differentiating Worldly and Cosmopolitan Senses of Philosophy in Kant". In Bacin 2013. vol. 1, 644–652.
- Manchester, P. 2003. "Kant's Conception of Architectonic in its Historical Context". *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 41, 187–207.
- . 2008. "Kant's Conception of Architectonic in Its Philosophical Context". *Kantstudien* 99, 133–151.
- Nussbaum, M. C. 1997. "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism". *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 5, 1–25.
- Stark, W. 1987. "Neue Kant-Logiken: Beobachtungen, Überlegungen und Daten zu gedruckten Kollegheften nach Kants Vorlesungen über Logik". In *Kant-Forschungen I*. Ed. R. Brandt/W. Stark. Hamburg, 123–164.
- Tonelli, G. 1994. *Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" within the Tradition of Modern Logic*. Ed. D. H. Chandler. Hildesheim.
- Uleman, J. K. 2010. *An Introduction to Kant's Moral Philosophy*. Cambridge/New York.
- Wilson, H. L. 2013. "Is Kant's Worldly Concept of Philosophy really 'Regional Philosophy'?" In Bacin 2013, 763–772.
- Wolff, C. 2005. *Erste Philosophie oder Ontologie: Lateinisch-Deutsch*. Hamburg.
- Ypi, L. 2011. "Practical Agency, Teleology and System in Kant's Architectonic of Pure Reason". In *Politics and Metaphysics in Kant*. Ed. H. Williams/S. Baiausu/S. Philstrom. Cardiff, 134–151.