

**-- OUR HUMAN, RELIGIOUS AND CONSTITUTIONAL PREROGATIVE
RIGHT TO SHABBAT SHALOM**

(c) 2019 Dolf Leendert Boek, Revision: 2 February 2019



<<http://www.grapple369.com/images/Shabbat-Shalom.jpeg>>

SHABBAT SHALOM@[

ש , {@1: Sup: 57 (#57); Ego: 57 (#57)},

ב , {@2: Sup: 59 (#116); Ego: 2 (#59)},

ת , {@3: Sup: 54 (#170); Ego: 76 (#135)},

ש , {@4: Sup: 30 (#200 - I AM NOT A ROBBER OF SACRED
PROPERTY {%8}); Ego: 57 (#192 - I AM NOT SWOLLEN WITH
PRIDE {%39})},

ל , {@5: Sup: 60 (#260); Ego: 30 (#222)},

ו , {@6: Sup: 66 (#326); Ego: 6 (#228 - I HAVE NO UNJUST
PREFERENCES {%40})},

מ] {@7: Sup: 25 (#351); Ego: 40 (#268)}

**IMMANUEL KANT'S PROLEGOMENA SECTION #57 - ON
DETERMINING THE BOUNDARY OF PURE REASON AS IDEA @351:**

"After the extremely clear proofs we have given above, it would be an absurdity for us, with respect to any object, to hope to cognize more than belongs to a possible experience of it, or for us, with respect to any thing that we assume not to be an object of possible experience, to claim even the least cognition for determining it according to its nature as it is in itself; for by what means will we reach this determination, since time, space, and all the concepts of the understanding, and especially the concepts drawn from empirical intuition or *perception* in the sensible world, do not and cannot have any use other than merely to make experience possible, and if we relax this condition even for the pure

concepts of the understanding, they then determine no object whatsoever, and have no significance anywhere.

But, on the other hand, it would be an even greater absurdity for us not to allow any things in themselves at all, or for us to want to pass off our [IDEA: @351] experience for the only possible way of cognizing things—hence ***OUR* *INTUITION* *IN* *SPACE* *AND* *TIME* *FOR* *THE* *ONLY* *POSSIBLE* *INTUITION* *AND* *OUR* *DISCURSIVE* *UNDERSTANDING* *FOR* *THE* *ARCHETYPE* *OF* *EVERY* *POSSIBLE* *UNDERSTANDING*** – and so to want to take principles of the possibility of experience for universal conditions on things in themselves.

THUS TO MAKE IT VERY PLAIN WITH RESPECTS TO THE JEWISH 40 YEARS SOJOURN WITHIN THE WILDERNESS FROM THE YEAR:

49J1W2D

THAT IT IS INNATELY CONNECTED TO BOTH THE NOTION OF 49 as 49 JUBILEES and 1W2D as 9 YEARS + 40 YEARS = 49 YEARS AND IPSO FACTO:

#2184 = 6 x #364 x 49 AS JUBILEE = 107016 days = 6J / 293 = 365.242320819112628 SOLAR TROPICAL YEAR

#111 (@3 - Nature Surmounts Nature: #34 - Engendering Nature [#164 - AVOID HETERONOMY AGAINST AUTONOMY]) ...

166: [11 - **I AM NOT SLUGGISH**]
168: [26 - **I AM NOT THE CAUSE OF WEEPING TO ANY**]
169: [18 - **I TROUBLE MYSELF ONLY WITH MY OWN AFFAIRS**]
171: [20 - **I AM NOT UNCHASTE WITH ANY ONE**]
173: [27 - **I AM NOT GIVEN TO UNNATURAL LUST**]
175: [22 - **I AM NOT A TRANSGRESSOR**]
177: [29 - **I AM NOT GIVEN TO CURSING**]
180: [19 - **I COMMIT NOT ADULTERY WITH ANOTHER'S WIFE**]
181: [24 - **I LEND NOT A DEAF EAR TO THE WORDS OF
RIGHTEOUSNESS, 35 - I AM NOT ONE WHO CURSETH THE KING**]
182: [6 - **I AM NOT FRAUDULENT IN MEASURES OF GRAIN**]
184: [36 - **I PUT NO CHECK UPON THE WATER IN ITS FLOW**]
185: [25 - **I AM NOT BOISTEROUS IN BEHAVIOUR**]
186: [31 - **I AM NOT ONE OF INCONSTANT MIND**]
191: [32 - **I DO NOT STEAL THE SKINS OF THE SACRED
ANIMALS**]

192: [39 - **I AM NOT SWOLLEN WITH PRIDE**]
196: [37 - **I AM NOT ONE OF LOUD VOICE**]
197: [33 - **I AM NOT NOISY IN MY SPEECH**]
200: [8 - **I AM NOT A ROBBER OF SACRED PROPERTY**]

TOTAL: @166 + @168 + @169 + @171 + @173 + @175 + @177 + @180 + @181 + @182 + @184 + @185 + @186 + @191 + @192 + @196 + @197 + @200 = #3273 - PRINCIPLE OF MATERIALITY {3 x #1091: THAT #1092 = 3 x #364 IS THE 'OTH CYCLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE FROM 1550 BCE}: "WHO HATH TAKEN THIS *COUNSEL* {

@1 (**#1**) + @2 (**#41**) + @3 (**#81**) + @4 (**#369**) = #10 (**#492**) / #12 = #41 - ONTIC NECESSITY ESPOUSED BY 'ADVICE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL' (**LIBERTÉ** {17 SEPTEMBER 1900}) WHICH IMPLIES A TRINOMIAL BASIS TO EMPIRE GOVERNANCE

} AGAINST TYRE {**strength; rock; sharp**}, THE CROWNING CITY, WHOSE MERCHANTS ARE PRINCES, WHOSE TRAFFICKERS ARE THE HONOURABLE OF THE EARTH?" [Isaiah 23:8]



<<http://www.grapple369.com/images/HOSPITABILITY.PNG>>



<<http://www.grapple369.com/images/Star%20Of%20David.jpeg>>

$6J \times 12 = 72J + 3(3^2+1)/2 = \#$ as circa PURIM 457 BCE - "THEN THE KING SAID TO THE WISE MEN, WHICH KNEW THE *TIMES*, (FOR SO WAS THE KING'S MANNER TOWARD ALL THAT KNEW LAW AND JUDGMENT: AND THE NEXT UNTO HIM WAS:

CARSHENA {a lamb; sleeping}: @1 - **MENTALISM**: $1 \times \#41 = \#41$ as #1 - Will, free will, choice / **VIRTUE**: 64 meta descriptor prototypes: **OMNE DATUM OPTIMUM {#1 - Every perfect gift} (1139 CE) / Remember the Sabbath Day}**

SHETHAR {putrefied; searching}: @2 - **CORRESPONDENCE**: $2 \times \#41 = \#82$ as #2 - desire, inclination: **MILITES TEMPLI {#2 - Soldiers of the Temple} (1144 CE) / TOOLS: marriage / Honour Parents**

ADMATHA {a cloud of death; a mortal vapor}: @3 - **VIBRATION**: $3 \times \#41 = \#123$ as #3 - disposition towards (something or someone): **MILITIA DEI {#3 - Soldiers of God} (1145 CE) / POSITION: Soldier / Do Not Kill**

TARSHISH {contemplation; examination}: @4 - **POLARITY**: $4 \times \#41 = \#164$ as #4 - favour, affection: **PASTORALIS PRAEEMINENTIAE {#4 - Pastoral Pre-eminence to monarchs} (1307 CE) / TIME: #CENTRE and #INRI / Do Not Commit Adultery (ie. Avoid Heteronomy Against Autonomy)} [John 5:39-47 (KJV)]**

MERES {defluxion; imposthume}: @5 - **RHYTHM**: $5 \times \#41 = \#205$ as #5 - last will, testament: **FACIENS MISERICORDIAM {#5 - Granting forgiveness} (1308 CE) / CANON: RHYTHM & HARMONY / Do Not Steal}**

MARSENA {bitterness of a bramble}: @6 - CAUSE AND EFFECT: 6 x #41 = #246 as #6 - goal, object, purpose, intention: **AD PROVIDAM {#6 - To Foresee / For Providence} (1312 CE) / IMPLEMENTATION: HETEROS (binomial / bifurcated) THEORY OF NUMBER / Do Not Bear False Witness}**

MEMUCAN {impoverished; to prepare; certain; true}: @7 - **ENGENDERING / ENUMERATE: 7 x #41 = #287 as #7 - signification, import: VOX IN EXCELSO {#7 - The voice on high} (1312 CE) / LIMIT: #INRI AS TERNIO ANAGRAM / Do Not Covet}** [LATIN definition: VOLUNTĀTIS]

THE SEVEN PRINCES OF PERSIA AND MEDIA, WHICH SAW THE KING'S FACE, AND WHICH SAT THE FIRST IN THE KINGDOM;)" [Esther 1:13-14 (KJV)]

DOLF @ 1521 HOURS ON 23 JANUARY 2016: "That there is by determined means a lack of **#873 - *PROBITY*** shown BY ONTIC #205 - ABERRATION {@210 / @215 / @220 / @228} TO PRINCIPLES OF PARTICULAR **SECTIONS VIII / IX QUEEN VICTORIA'S LETTERS PATENT 29 OCTOBER 1900 AS CONVEYING** THE PERSISTENCE OF SUBSTANCE MADE AGAINST ELIZABETH {THE OATH, FULLNESS OF GOD} REGINA II and thereby as an impunity of the **@115 - DIGNITY ROYAL** and in the circumstance of TREASON the ONUS of accountability is placed upon OTHERS having no entitlement for any use of that INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY in such a manner whatsoever.

#175 {*MARRIAGE*} (@4 - NATURE AMENDED IN ITS NATURE: #369 - Autonomous Nature [#205 - DO NOT STEAL]) ...

210: [30 - **I AM NOT OF AGGRESSIVE HAND**]

215: [34 - **I AM NEITHER A LIAR NOR A DOER OF MISCHIEF**]

220: [38 - **I CURSE NOT A GOD**]

228: [40 - **I HAVE NO UNJUST PREFERENCES**]

TOTAL: @210 + @215 + @220 + @228 = #873 - PRINCIPLE OF THE PERSISTENCE OF SUBSTANCE as [#80, #5, #100, #10, #70, #600, #8] = perioche (G4042): {UMBRA: #873 % #41 = #12} 1) an encompassing, compass, circuit; 2) that which is contained; 2a) the contents of any writing SUCH AS QUEEN VICTORIAS LETTERS PATENT OF 29 OCTOBER 1900 AS DICTUM OF #2184 - FREEDOM from #1827 - OPPRESSION is:

#902 - RULE OF LAW (EGALITÉ {9 JULY 1900}: #22 x #41 as *ONTIC* necessity comprising a subset of 21 consonants with #VOWELS of Semitic origins),

#492 - VOLUNTARY FREE WILL (LIBERTÉ {17 SEPTEMBER 1900}: #12 X #41), and

#391 - HOMOGENEOUS PRINCIPLES (FRATERNITÉ {29 OCTOBER 1900}) OF CIVIL SOCIETY

THUS IF THE SUBJECT IS SACRED, AND THE SUBJECT IS SOVEREIGN ACCORDINGLY IT REQUIRES A THRESHOLD OF **#873 - *PROBITY*** AND **#644 - *DECORUM*** AS **#123 - *JUDGMENT* *SENSIBILITY*** THAT IS SUBSTANTIALLY GREATER THAN THEIR EXHIBITED **#101 - *INDOLENT*** TERRESTRIAL MANNER."

Our principles, which limit the use of reason to possible experience alone, could accordingly themselves become *transcendent* and could pass off the limits of our reason for limits on the possibility of things themselves (for which *Hume's* Dialogues can serve as an example), if ***A*** ***PAINSTAKING* *CRITIQUE* *DID* *NOT* *BOTH* *GUARD* *THE* *BOUNDARIES* *OF* *OUR* *REASON* *EVEN* *WITH* *RESPECT* *TO* *ITS* *EMPIRICAL* *USE*, *AND* *SET* *A* *LIMIT* *TO* *ITS* *PRETENSIONS***. Skepticism originally arose from metaphysics and its unpoliced dialectic. At first this skepticism wanted, solely for the benefit of the use of reason in experience, to portray everything that surpasses this use as empty and deceitful; but gradually, as it came to be noticed that it was the very same *a priori* principles which are employed in experience that, unnoticed, had led still further than experience reaches – and had done so, as it seemed, with the very same right – then even the principles of experience began to be doubted. There was no real trouble with this, for sound common sense will always assert its rights in this domain; but there did arise a particular confusion in science, which cannot determine how far (and why only that far and not further) reason is to be trusted, and this confusion can be remedied and all future relapses prevented only through a formal determination, derived from principles, of the boundaries for the use of our reason.

It is true: we cannot provide, beyond all possible experience, any determinate concept of what things in themselves may be. But we are nevertheless not free to hold back entirely in the face of inquiries about those things; for experience never fully satisfies reason; it directs us ever further back in answering questions and leaves us unsatisfied as regards

their full elucidation, as everyone can sufficiently observe in the dialectic of pure reason, which for this very reason has its good subjective ground. Who can bear being brought, as regards the nature of our soul, both to the point of a clear consciousness of the subject and to the conviction that the appearances of that subject cannot be explained *materialistically*, without asking what then the soul really is, and, if no concept of [IDEA: @352] experience suffices thereto, without perchance adopting a concept of reason (that of a simple immaterial being) just for this purpose, although we can by no means prove the objective reality of that concept? Who can satisfy themselves with mere cognition through experience in all the cosmological questions, of the duration and size of the world, of freedom or natural necessity, since, wherever we may begin, any answer given according to principles of experience always begets a new question which also requires an answer, and for that reason clearly proves the insufficiency of all physical modes of explanation for the satisfaction of reason? Finally, who cannot see, from the thoroughgoing contingency and dependency of everything that they might think or assume according to principles of experience, the impossibility of stopping with these, and who does not feel compelled, regardless of all prohibition against losing oneself in transcendent ideas, nevertheless to look for peace and satisfaction beyond all concepts that one can justify through experience, in the concept of a being the idea of which indeed cannot in itself be understood as regards possibility – though it cannot be refuted either, because it pertains to a mere being of the understanding – an idea without which, however, reason would always have to remain unsatisfied?

Boundaries (in extended things) always presuppose a space that is found outside a certain fixed location, and that encloses that location; limits require nothing of the kind, but are mere negations that affect a magnitude insofar as it does not possess absolute completeness. Our reason, however, sees around itself as it were a space for the cognition of things in themselves, although it can never have determinate concepts of those things and is limited to appearances alone.

SOVEREIGN ONTIC NECESSITY (6.5.5.41.0)@{

- @1: Sup: 41 (#41); Ego: 41 (#41),
- @2: Sup: 1 (#42); Ego: 41 (#82),
- @3: Sup: 42 (#84 - I AM NOT A MAN OF VIOLENCE {%2}); Ego: 41 (#123 - JUDGMENT SENSIBILITY),
- @4: Sup: 2 (#86 - I AM NOT A ROBBER OF FOOD {%10}); Ego: 41 (#164 - *PRINCIPLE* *OF* *MATERIALITY*),
- @5: Sup: 43 (#129); Ego: 41 (#205 - *PRINCIPLE* *OF* *THE* *PERSISTENCE* *OF* *SUBSTANCE*),
- @6: Sup: 3 (#132); Ego: 41 (#246),

@7: Sup: 44 (#176 - KANT'S IDEA B176: *THE*
TRANSCENDENTAL *DOCTRINE* *OF* *THE POWER* *OF*
JUDGMENT *OR* *ANALYTIC* *OF* *PRINCIPLES*); Ego: 41
(#287),

@8: Sup: 24 (#200 - I AM NOT A ROBBER OF SACRED PROPERTY
{%8}); Ego: 61 (#348),

@9: Sup: 66 (#266 - *PRECEPT* / *STATUTE*); Ego: 42 (#390 -
SOVEREIGNTY / *CROWN*),

Male: #266; Feme: #390

}

Prototype: *HOMOIOS* {#266 - *PRECEPT* / *STATUTE* / #390
- *SOVEREIGNTY* / *CROWN*} / HETEROS {#238 / #376} /
TORAH {#248 / #381}

<[http://www.grapple369.com?zen:6,row:5,col:5,nous:41&idea:{m,132}
&idea:{f,246}&idea:{m,266}&idea:{f,390}&PROTOTYPE:HOMOIOS](http://www.grapple369.com?zen:6,row:5,col:5,nous:41&idea:{m,132}&idea:{f,246}&idea:{m,266}&idea:{f,390}&PROTOTYPE:HOMOIOS)>

HUMAN BEING (3.5.5.41.0)@{

@1: Sup: 41 (#41); Ego: 41 (#41),

@2: Sup: 1 (#42); Ego: 41 (#82),

@3: Sup: 42 (#84 - I AM NOT A MAN OF VIOLENCE {%2}); Ego:
41 (#123 - JUDGMENT SENSIBILITY),

@4: Sup: 2 (#86 - I AM NOT A ROBBER OF FOOD {%10}); Ego:
41 (#164 - *PRINCIPLE* *OF* *MATERIALITY*),

@5: Sup: 43 (#129); Ego: 41 (#205 - *PRINCIPLE* *OF* *THE*
PERSISTENCE *OF* *SUBSTANCE*),

@6: Sup: 3 (#132); Ego: 41 (#246),

@7: Sup: 44 (#176); Ego: 41 (#287),

@8: Sup: 68 (#244); Ego: 24 (#311 *** SERIOUS BREACH OF
SOVEREIGN / AUTONOMY DYNAMIC GIVEN THE INNER MAIDEN /
MARRIAGEABLE MAIDEN DYNAMIC OF 3 APRIL 33 AD),

@9: Sup: 67 (#311 *** SERIOUS BREACH OF SOVEREIGN /
AUTONOMY DYNAMIC GIVEN THE INNER MAIDEN /
MARRIAGEABLE MAIDEN DYNAMIC OF 3 APRIL 33 AD); Ego: 80
(#391),

Male: #311; Feme: #391

} // [LATIN definition: VOLUNTĀTIS (*YES*) / NOLUNTĀTIS (*NO*)]

Prototype: *HOMOIOS* {#311 / #391 - HOMOGENEOUS
PRINCIPLES (FRATERNITÉ {29 OCTOBER 1900}) OF QUEEN
VICTORIA'S LETTERS PATENT TO THE FEDERATION OF THE
AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH 1901} / HETEROS {#283 / #377} /
TORAH {#237 - *USE* *OF* *FORCE* OR *IMMUTABLE* /

STUBBORN* *WILL / #435}

<<http://www.grapple369.com?zen:3,row:5,col:5,nous:41&idea:{m,84}&idea:{f,123}&idea:{m,311}&idea:{f,391}&PROTOTYPE:HOMOIOS>>

As long as reason's cognition is **#391 - *HOMOGENEOUS***, no determinate boundaries can be thought for it. In mathematics and natural science human reason recognizes limits but not boundaries; that is, it indeed recognizes that something lies beyond it to which it can never reach, but not that it would itself at any point ever complete its inner progression. The expansion of insight in mathematics, and the possibility of ever new inventions, goes to infinity; so too does the discovery of new properties in nature (new forces and laws) through continued experience and the unification of that experience by reason. But limits here are nonetheless unmistakable, for mathematics refers only to *appearances*, and that which cannot be an object of sensory intuition, like the concepts of metaphysics and morals, lies entirely outside its sphere, and it can never lead there; but it also has no need whatsoever for such concepts. There is therefore no continuous progress and advancement toward those sciences, or any point or line of contact, as it were. Natural science will never reveal to us the inside of things, i.e., that which is not appearance but can nonetheless serve as the highest ground of explanation for the appearances; but it does not need this for its physical explanations; nay, if such were offered to it from elsewhere (e.g., the influence of immaterial beings), natural science should indeed reject it and ought by no means bring it into the progression of its explanations, but should always base its explanations only on that which can belong to experience as an object of the senses and which can be brought into connection with our actual perceptions in accordance with laws of experience.

But metaphysics, in the dialectical endeavours of pure reason (which are not initiated arbitrarily or wantonly, but toward which the nature of reason itself drives), does lead us to the boundaries; and the transcendental ideas, just because they cannot be avoided and yet will never be realized, serve not only actually to show us the boundaries of reason's pure use, but also to show us the way to determine such boundaries; and that too is the end and use of this natural predisposition of our reason, which bore metaphysics as its favourite child, whose procreation (as with any other in the world) is to be ascribed not to chance accident but to an original seed that is wisely organized toward great ends. For metaphysics, perhaps more than any other science, is, as regards its fundamentals, placed in us by nature itself, and cannot at all be seen as the product of an arbitrary choice, or as an accidental extension from the progression of experiences (it wholly separates itself from those experiences).

Reason, through all of its concepts and laws of the understanding, which it finds to be adequate for empirical use, and so adequate within the sensible world, nonetheless does not thereby find satisfaction for itself; for, as a result of questions that keep recurring to infinity, it is denied all hope of completely answering those questions. The transcendental ideas, which have such completion as their aim, are such problems for reason. Now reason clearly sees: that the sensible world could not contain this completion, [IDEA: @354] any more than could therefore all of the concepts that serve solely for understanding that world: space and time, and everything that we have put forward under the name of the pure concepts of the understanding. The sensible world is nothing but a chain of appearances connected in accordance with universal laws, which therefore has no existence for itself; it truly is not the thing in itself, and therefore it necessarily refers to that which contains the ground of those appearances, to beings that can be cognized not merely as appearances, but as things in themselves. Only in the cognition of the latter can reason hope to see its desire for completeness in the progression from the conditioned to its conditions satisfied for once.

Above (§§33, 34) we noted limits of reason with respect to all cognition of mere beings of thought; now, since the transcendental ideas nevertheless make the progression up to these limits necessary for us, and have therefore led us, as it were, up to the contiguity of the filled space (of experience) with empty space (of which we can know nothing – the *noumena*), we can also determine the boundaries of pure reason; for in all boundaries there is something positive (e.g., a surface is the boundary of corporeal space, yet is nonetheless itself a space; a line is a space, which is the boundary of a surface; a point is the boundary of a line, yet is nonetheless a locus in space), whereas limits contain mere negations. The limits announced in the cited sections are still not enough after we have found that something lies beyond them (although we will never cognize what that something may be in itself). For the question now arises: How does our reason cope with this connection of that with which we are acquainted to that with which we are not acquainted, and never will be? Here is a real connection of the known to a wholly unknown (which will always remain so), and even if the unknown should not become the least bit better known – as is not in fact to be hoped – the concept of this connection must still be capable of being determined and brought to clarity.

We should, then, think for ourselves an immaterial being, an intelligible world, and a highest of all beings (all noumena), because only in these things, as things in themselves, does reason find completion and

satisfaction, which it can never hope to find in the derivation of the [IDEA: @355] appearances from the #391 - *HOMOGENEOUS* grounds of those appearances; and we should think such things for ourselves because the appearances actually do relate to something distinct from them (and so entirely *HETEROGENEOUS*), in that appearances always presuppose a thing in itself, and so provide notice of such a thing, whether or not it can be cognized more closely.

Now since we can, however, never cognize these intelligible beings according to what they may be in themselves, i.e., determinately – though we must nonetheless assume such beings in relation to the sensible world, and connect them with it through reason – we can still at least think this connection by means of such concepts as express the relation of those beings to the sensible world. For, if we think an intelligible being through nothing but pure concepts of the understanding, we really think nothing determinate thereby, and so our concept is without significance; if we think it through properties borrowed from the sensible world, it is no longer an intelligible being: it is thought as one of the phenomena and belongs to the sensible world. ***WE* *WILL* *TAKE* *AN* *EXAMPLE* *FROM* *THE* *CONCEPT* *OF* *THE* *SUPREME* *BEING*:**

"AND THE LORD SPAKE UNTO MOSES, SAYING,

SPEAK THOU ALSO UNTO THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL, SAYING, VERILY MY SABBATHS YE SHALL KEEP: FOR IT IS A SIGN BETWEEN ME AND YOU THROUGHOUT YOUR GENERATIONS; THAT YE MAY KNOW THAT I AM THE LORD THAT DOTHTH SANCTIFY YOU.

YE SHALL KEEP THE SABBATH THEREFORE; FOR IT IS HOLY UNTO YOU: EVERY ONE THAT DEFILETH IT SHALL SURELY BE PUT TO DEATH: FOR WHOSOEVER DOETH ANY WORK THEREIN, THAT SOUL SHALL BE CUT OFF FROM AMONG HIS PEOPLE.

SIX DAYS MAY WORK BE DONE; BUT IN THE SEVENTH IS THE SABBATH OF REST, HOLY TO THE LORD: WHOSOEVER DOETH ANY WORK IN THE SABBATH DAY, HE SHALL SURELY BE PUT TO DEATH.

WHEREFORE THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL SHALL KEEP THE SABBATH, TO OBSERVE THE SABBATH THROUGHOUT THEIR GENERATIONS, FOR A PERPETUAL COVENANT.

IT IS A SIGN BETWEEN ME AND THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL FOR EVER: FOR IN SIX DAYS THE LORD MADE HEAVEN AND EARTH, AND ON THE

SEVENTH DAY HE RESTED, AND WAS REFRESHED.

AND HE GAVE UNTO MOSES, WHEN HE HAD MADE AN END OF COMMUNING WITH HIM UPON MOUNT SINAI, TWO TABLES OF TESTIMONY, TABLES OF STONE, WRITTEN WITH THE FINGER OF GOD." [Exodus 31:12-18 (KJV)]

***THE* *DEISTIC* *CONCEPT* *IS* *A* *WHOLLY* *PURE*
CONCEPT *OF* *REASON*, *WHICH* *HOWEVER*
REPRESENTS *MERELY* *A* *THING* *THAT* *CONTAINS*
EVERY *REALITY*, *WITHOUT* *BEING* *ABLE* *TO*
DETERMINE *A* *SINGLE* *ONE* *OF* *THEM*, *SINCE*
FOR *THAT* *AN* *EXAMPLE* *WOULD* *HAVE* *TO* *BE*
BORROWED *FROM* *THE* *SENSIBLE* *WORLD*, *IN*
WHICH *CASE* *I* *WOULD* *ALWAYS* *HAVE* *TO* *DO*
ONLY *WITH* *AN* *OBJECT* *OF* *THE* *SENSES***, and not with something completely ***HETEROGENEOUS*** which cannot be an object of the senses at all. For I would, for instance, attribute understanding to it; but I have no concept what- soever of any understanding save one like my own, that is, one such that intuitions must be given to it through the senses, and that busies itself with bringing them under rules for the unity of consciousness. But then the elements of my concept would still lie within appearance; I was, however, forced by the inadequacy of the appearances to go beyond them, to the concept of a being that is in no way dependent on appearances nor bound up with them as conditions for its determination. If, however, I separate understanding from sensibility, in order to have a pure understanding, then nothing but the mere form of thinking, without intuition, is left; through which, by itself, I cannot cognize anything determinate, hence cannot cognize any object. To that end I would have to think to myself a different understanding, which intuits objects,¹³ of which, however, I do not have the least concept, since the human understanding is discursive and can cognize only by means of general concepts. The same thing happens to me if I attribute a will to the supreme being: For I possess this [IDEA: @356] concept only by drawing it from my inner experience, where, however, my dependence on satisfaction through objects whose existence we need, and so sensibility, is the basis – which completely contradicts the pure concept of a supreme being.

Hume's objections to deism are weak and always concern the grounds of proof but never the thesis of the deistic assertion itself. But with respect to theism, which is supposed to arise through a closer determination of our (in deism, merely transcendent) concept of a supreme being, they are very strong, and, depending on how this concept has been framed, are in

certain cases (in fact, all the usual ones) irrefutable. Hume always holds to this: that through the mere concept of a first being to which we attribute none but ontological predicates (eternity, omnipresence, omnipotence), we actually do not think anything determinate at all; rather, properties would have to be added that can yield a concept *in concreto*; it is not enough to say: this being is a cause, rather we need to say how its causality is constituted, e.g., by understanding and willing – and here begin Hume’s attacks on the matter in question, namely on theism, whereas he had previously assaulted only the grounds of proof for deism, an assault that carries no special danger with it. ***HIS***

***DANGEROUS* *ARGUMENTS* *RELATE* *WHOLLY* *TO*
ANTHROPOMORPHISM, *OF* *WHICH* *HE* *HOLDS* *THAT*
IT *IS* *INSEPARABLE* *FROM* *THEISM* *AND* *MAKES*
THEISM *SELF*-***CONTRADICTORY***, *BUT* *THAT* *IF* *IT*
IS *ELIMINATED*, *THEISM* *FALLS* *WITH* *IT* *AND*
NOTHING *BUT* *DEISM* *REMAINS* – *FROM* *WHICH*
NOTHING *CAN* *BE* *MADE*, *WHICH* *CAN* *BE* *OF*
NO *USE* *TO* *US*, *AND* *CAN* *IN* *NO* *WAY*
SERVE *AS* *A* *FOUNDATION* *FOR* *RELIGION* *AND*
*MORALS***.

If this inevitability of anthropomorphism were certain, then the proofs for the existence of a supreme being might be what they will, and might all be granted, and still the concept of this being could never be determined by us without our becoming entangled in contradictions.

If we combine the injunction to avoid all transcendent judgments of pure reason with the apparently conflicting command to proceed to concepts that lie beyond the field of immanent (empirical) use, we become aware that both can subsist together, but only directly on the *boundary* of all permitted use of reason – for this boundary belongs just as much to [IDEA: @357] the field of experience as to that of beings of thought—and we are thereby at the same time taught how those remarkable ideas serve solely for determining the boundary of human reason: that is, we are taught, on the one hand, not to extend cognition from experience without bound, so that nothing at all remains for us to cognize except merely the world, and, on the other, nevertheless not to go beyond the boundary of experience and to want to judge of things outside that boundary as things in themselves.

But we hold ourselves to this boundary if we limit our judgment merely to the relation that the world may have to a being whose concept itself lies outside all cognition that we can attain within the world. For we then do not attribute to the supreme being any of the properties *in themselves* by which we think the objects of experience, and we thereby avoid *dogmatic* anthropomorphism; but we attribute those properties, nonetheless, to the

relation of this being to the world, and allow ourselves a *symbolic* anthropomorphism, which in fact concerns only language and not the object itself.

If I say that we are compelled to look upon the world *as if* it were the work of a supreme understanding and will, I actually say nothing more than: in the way that a watch, a ship, and a regiment are related to an artisan, a builder, and a commander, the sensible world (or everything that makes up the basis of this sum total of appearances) is related to the unknown – which I do not thereby cognize according to what it is in itself, but only according to what it is for me, that is, with respect to the world of which I am a part. [CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, KANT'S PROLEGOMENA TO ANY FUTURE METAPHYSICS, IDEAS @351 to @357]

- dolf

The various PDF resources being essays as work in progress notations for the prospect of producing a viable syncretism with Immanuel Kant's Ground Work for the Metaphysics of Morals are now available within the directory:

<<http://www.grapple369.com/Groundwork/>>

Initial Post: 2 February 2019