

"I THINK" AS FORM AND ACTION: KANT'S SELF BEYOND TIME AND SUBSTANCE

Paulo Jesus*

INTRODUCTION

The qualitative determination of the relationships between time, substance and transcendental apperception reveals a complex labyrinth of trajectories. In the first *Critique* the three concepts circulate through one another without showing a perfect dialectical totality in which each of them could constitute a moment of mediation between the others. It appears that, instead of a stable dynamic triangle emerging, a double structural instability unfolds, specially if the triangle is observed from the vertex of transcendental apperception. This is due to the fact that not only does pure self break its traditionally strong ties with substance, but it also posits itself outside the sphere of time. Indeed, owing to its intellectual and logical non-phenomenal essence, transcendental apperception has no common measure with sensibility and sensible intuition. Furthermore, it cannot belong either to substance or to time, given that only a permanent sensible intuition can correspond to the concept of substance, and that only intuited phenomena can appear in the form of time. Now, by enjoying a state of exception, as the originating condition of the unity of all experience – that is, the common quality of all representations which consists in their being *mine* or being unified *by and in myself* –, transcendental apperception seems to be on the brink of becoming an unstable centre. Without activity, transcendental apperception is reduced to an empty formal concept or judgement, deprived of all mental effectiveness. On the other hand, however, if transcendental apperception does display a real and effective mental activity, as should be necessarily supposed, one must wonder whether and how the *I think* can be conceived simply as a timeless process and, what is more, as an absolutely disembodied, non-substantial, process, as though there were activity without any agent. To be sure, *dynamics* is the centre of any possible science of mind

or self (regardless of the pure or empirical character of that up-and-coming science), and the epistemological foundation of such a dynamics is to be accomplished by connecting time and substance within the pure self as their common unifying condition. Thus, our Kantian reading invites one to discover in his transcendental argumentation an outline of the manner in which this grounding connectedness might be drawn in order to avoid aporetic constellations and, most significantly, in order to give rise to a model of the original self that, without venturing into the realm of rational psychology, is capable of integrating logical determination and dynamic functioning. The instabilities undergone by the self within the transcendental regime might prove to be a coherent strategy for redefining the system of intelligibility in which pure self is embedded and by means of which the foundations of unified experience are to be firmly laid. In the last analysis, to be beyond time and substance is to be legitimately entitled to become the cornerstone, not only of the unity of phenomena, which appear in time, inhere in substance, and constitute all possible experience, but also of the formal unity of the concepts of time and substance themselves. It is nevertheless true that, despite its “being-beyond”, transcendental apperception discloses something *impure* in itself, something that gives primordial evidence for the reality of subjective spontaneity by presenting both its existential and intensive quality.

1. FIRST TRIANGULAR DYNAMIC CONSTELLATION: FROM SELF TO PERMANENCE THROUGH SUBSTANCE

Traditionally, real permanence and unchanging duration is ascribed to substantiality alone: the accidents change, whereas the substance remains. In this respect, it is noteworthy to evoke the Aristotelian matrix that organises the Leibnizian-Wolffian canon. Aristotle (*On the Soul*, II, I, 412a 20-27²) considers the “substance of the soul in the sense of being the form of a natural body, which potentially has life”, so as “actuality”, and, from the two senses of actuality, “possession of knowledge” and “exercise of knowledge”, the philosopher chooses the first, because of its absolute logical priority (possession of anything or of any power precedes logically its usage or exercise). Moreover, the *priority* of this “first actuality” lies in its being continuous and synchronic with every moment of the body’s lifespan, contrary to the “second actuality” which is broken and interrupted in time. Thus, to the substance of the mind is ascribed the most absolute *firstness*: it is formal (eidetic) rather than material, it is actual rather than potential, and even its actuality is of the most eminent quality as “episteme” or “life” itself. This perdurable quality underlies and makes possible, as their causal source, the ever-changing states; and this is what guarantees the real permanence of the soul. The notion of *entelecheia*, *forma substantialis* or force (*vis*, *Kraft*), once it is ontologically validated as the core of substance³, occupies a dominant place in pre-Kantian psychology⁴ in which the substantiality of the soul is construed as a most ultimate and “primitive force”. The “supposition” of such a metaphysical force intrinsic to the soul seems to follow the need for a fundamental principle to explain both the unceasingly motion of consciousness from one perception to another⁵ and the motion of psychological faculties from mere potentiality to actuality⁶. The changing actions and perceptions of the soul must stem from this special principle of mental action, that is a representing force, *vis repraesentativa universi*⁷; and this force is necessarily one and constant

in myself because it must correspond to the simplicity and identity of my thinking substance⁸. Kant, in his *Vorlesungen über Metaphysik* (namely in the chapter on Psychology, reconstituted according to Pölitz's notes⁹, dating back to the winter semester of 1779/1780 at the latest¹⁰), fully endorses the substantial notion of the self as the founding psychological thesis. However, since "force" no longer univocally means substance¹¹, force being rather redefined in terms of "relationship between substance and its accidents" (*respectus der Substanz zum Accidens*)¹², the Kantian dynamic notion of substance allows a plurality of "primitive forces" (*Grundkräfte*) to coexist in the soul and explicitly rejects to reduce the soul to "a primitive force" (*Eine Grundkraft*), to a single common force animating all faculties and yet distinct from them all. Indeed, given the radical different *manners* in which the soul relates to its radically different real determinations, and given that these distinct *relational manners* or *respecti* constitute distinct forces, one is entitled to conclude that force and substance are not interchangeable terms, and that, most importantly, our faculties (e.g. imagination, understanding and reason) are "primitive forces" coexisting in one and the same substance¹³. As a result, the Kantian approach in the *Vorlesungen* becomes more analytic than dogmatic, more "phenomenological" than ontological, relying mainly upon the logical elucidation of my inner intuition of myself as a thinking subject, regarded in contrast with my outer bodily experience. The "thinking substance" (*denkendes Wesen*) or "thinking self" (*denkendes Ich*), it is argued, can be intuitively and logically distinguished from the "corporeal substance" (*körperliches Wesen*). In actual fact, whereas the body can appear as an exterior object and even as something strange and of no use to myself, if I consider for instance one of its limbs as something that can be lost and severed, the individual man as a self-conscious being, on the contrary, is always able to say "I am", for "he remains himself always unchanged and does not lose his thinking self"¹⁴. Therefore, while the body is potentially the basis for an experience of otherness, multiplicity and difference, my thinking self offers the formal sameness and oneness of existence. It follows unsurprisingly that the concept of substantiality may be deduced from "the mere concept of my self (*der blosser Begriff vom Ich*), which is the unchanging (*der unveränderlich*)". Thus, as self-consciousness, I am the only object which always appears directly to itself as being perdurably itself. Even better expressed, being conscious of myself consists in the appearing of "selfhood alone" (*das Ich in sensu stricto oder die Selbstheit nur allein*)¹⁵. On thinking, feeling or saying "I am", it is selfhood or substantiality itself, the pure quality of being a subject, that appears in myself, converting my self into the unique place of its immediate apparition. That is why Kant holds that not only is *my* pure self-consciousness a perfect substance, and the unique self-perception of substance, but it constitutes also the expression of "the substantial itself" (*das substantiale selbst*), "the original concept" (*der ursprüngliche Begriff*) of substance:

[...] Denn dieser Begriff von Ich drückt aus: Die Substantialität. – Substanz ist das erste Subject aller inhärenden Accidenzen. Es ist dieses Ich aber ein absolutes Subject, dem alle Accidenzen und Prädicate zukommen, und was gar kein Prädicat von einem andern Dinge seyn kann. Also drückt das Ich das Substantiale aus; denn dasjenige substratum, was allen Accidenzen inhäret, ist das substantiale. Dieses ist der einzige Fall, wo wir die Substanz unmittelbar anschauen können. Wir können von keinem Dinge das substratum und das erste Subject anschauen; aber in mir schaue ich die Substanz unmittelbar an. Es drückt also das Ich nicht allein die Substanz, sondern auch das substantiale selbst aus. Ja was noch mehr ist, den Begriff, den wir überhaupt von allen Substanzen haben, haben wir von diesem Ich entlehnt. Dieses ist der ursprüngliche Begriff der Substanzen.¹⁶

Also, the self is the paradigm and the analogical ground of all substantiality; every substance can be understood as the capacity of saying “I am”, capacity that means the “excellent” mode of self-subsisting and self-persisting as an individual existence aware of itself⁷. *My self* as pure subject, as the simple consciousness that *I am*, leaving aside all exterior phenomena, expresses the common form and essence of all substance: the *self*-quality hidden in everything which exists but only immediately perceivable in me. *My self* expresses the ultimacy of a subject that cannot be the predicate of any other subject; *my self* shows nothing but the only form of being and only form of relationship which always remains unchanged, and on which depends all change (since change is selfless but never self-free). In this metaphysical context, substance, self and permanence tend to be accommodated in a stable tautological structure. By distinguishing force and substance, Kant announces the position to be developed in the *Critique of pure reason*, namely in the first and second *Analogies*, in which substance belongs to the categories of relation, position that will become a brutal declaration of war against the metaphysical interiority of substance¹⁸. Indeed, as *respectus*, force presents substance from the outside, from the phenomenal field of its actions, and hence substance is not the interior oneness of a force, but only the “*general subject*” of predicates¹⁹ – by the same token, the metaphysics of substance will progressively give way to the causal legality of experience.

2. SECOND TRIANGULAR DYNAMIC CONSTELLATION: FROM SELF TO SUBSTANCE THROUGH TIME

In the first *Critique*, self has no longer an immediate intuition of substance in inner sense, and thus the relationship between transcendental apperception, time and substance are structurally modified. To begin with, both pure time (A144/B183, B224-225) and transcendental apperception (A107, A123, B132-133) are presented as necessarily “abiding” (*stehende*), “perdurable” (*bleibende*), subjective conditions to the extent that they render the succession of phenomena possible without sharing their successive dimension. Indeed, just as all successive sensible phenomena must belong to the universal and permanent form of their intuition, that is, to time, so every successive empirical consciousness must be comprised and unified by my pure and permanent thinking self. Consequently, both pure time and pure self are conceived as timeless, and moreover as correlative transcendental elements. Thus time, as the one and the same receptive form of all intuitions, corresponds to self, as the one and the same active function that unifies all representations. This means that the role played by time in sensibility bears a functional similarity to the role played by transcendental apperception in understanding (B136). Besides, the act of paying attention to any perception, the act of becoming aware of any representational content in the inner sense, and hence in time, entails, according to the self-affection hypothesis (B68-69, B155-156), that a timeless unifying act affects the inner sense. Therefore, by means of this unifying act and of the cognitive motion intrinsically linked to its determining power, not only are the sensible intuitions tied together but the concept of succession itself is also produced. As for the unity of cognitive motion, we should bear in mind the metaphor of drawing a line as the icon of unified time and unifying spontaneity, and thus as the primacy of the never-ending subjective action over the

concomitant objective construct (A33/B50, A102, B137-138, B154-156, A162-3/B203-4, B292). In short, timeless self-affection generates the consciousness of perceptions in time and, simultaneously, determines the time of perceptions. However, closely correlated though they may appear, pure time and pure self cannot be identified, in so far as such an identification would imply a reciprocal levelling that completely denatures their original asymmetry. The Heideggerian interpretation²⁰, therefore, does violence both to the letter and the spirit of the *Critique*. Heidegger's *Kantbuch*, one could daresay, seems to be (more than simply «an "historical" introduction»²¹) an attempt to translate the anthropological stance of *Sein und Zeit* into *critical* and *transcendental* language.

Instead of identifying directly pure time and pure self, one should wonder about the significance of their asymmetry and ask what happens to time when it is submitted to the determining action of transcendental apperception. Here, as is implied in the answer given by the three *Analogies*, the experience acquires its lawful quality, since the temporal modes of connecting phenomena become particular rules of the general law of necessary unity of experience. Expressed with the vocabulary of the *Dissertatio*, the *Analogies* convert the coordinative syntax of time in sensibility into the subordinating syntax of necessary conjunctions in understanding. Evidently, the concept of substance results from this determining asymmetry between the supreme active form of understanding and the temporal form of sensibility. The permanence of substance, in fact, is nothing but an intellectual rule of experience, a regulative principle of unity, which expresses the unification of time in general under the synthetic unity of transcendental apperception.

Besides, permanence of substance has the privilege of being the first principle, the first rule, by which temporal connections, in the sense of "relationships of existence" between perceptions, must be determined (A179/B222). Needless to say, the three *Analogies* of experience rely logically upon the first one; for not only duration, but also succession and simultaneity, require the unity and identity either of one or of a community of substances. Should time remain a pure passive form, my experience as well as my self would be reduced, in Hume's well-known words, to a mere "heap"²², "bundle or collection of different perceptions which succeed each other with an inconceivable rapidity, and are in a perpetual flux and movement"²³. Should time of phenomena not be unified in my self, it would have no quantity, no duration, it would remain continuously in a zero degree, as though the world of experience were created and annihilated at every instant (A183/B226). Each instant would be a new, broken, point of time corresponding to a new, broken, atomic perception, as though changing perceptions were self-contained substantial existences²⁴, rather than "particular modes of existence" of a unique unchangeable substance (A186-187/B229-231). Time would constitute an undetermined and undeterminable subjective succession, a succession without the geometrical constraints of the straight line, as if its monadic points remained untied, interrupted, and could not belong to the orderly oneness and universal necessity of an absolutely regular and regulative chain of events. Therefore, without the unifying unity of consciousness, without submitting the "bundle of perceptions" to the unity of the "bundling self"²⁵, so to speak, time is broken and the conjunctions between phenomena are merely associative, and even contrary to the natural atomic character of phenomena themselves. The Humean labyrinth of dissociated perceptions

and *contra-natura* connections cannot be overcome unless one assumes the belonging of every perception to the synthetic unity of consciousness to be the first principle of all representation. Only this *a priori* belonging is able to safeguard the transcendental affinity between phenomena, which renders their connections legitimate, inasmuch as, in their diversity, they must always be accompanied by the same consciousness of myself, through which they must always be *mine*. Now, the notion of “permanence” lies at the heart of such a transcendental structure of belonging and unification: all representations belong to and are unified by the abiding oneness and sameness of pure self, pure time and *substantia phaenomenon*. Firstly, pure self is the permanence of the active unity of all intellectual functions of unity, the permanence of the synthetic act that accompanies every representation; secondly, pure time shows the permanence of a substratum as permanent form of inner sense, the unchanging form in which every sensible change appears; finally, substance in the phenomenon is presupposed as an existing permanent substratum of which all phenomena must be the variable attributes. These three different kinds of permanence are mutually inter-expressive, insofar as they all relate to the same necessary unity of experience, although each of them unfolds a peculiar expression of it according to its own peculiar position in the cognitive process. Thus, unity and permanence *a priori* are decomposed here as unity of the unifying function itself (transcendental apperception), as unity and oneness of the receptive form of phenomena (pure time), and as unity and identity of the “object itself” (*der Gegenstand selbst*, A183/B227), substratum of all change (*substantia phaenomenon*). The idea of their inter-expression is reinforced by the perfect correspondence between this triangle of transcendental conditions and the triangle of their empirical positive surface, which presents the perceivable conditioned data as their exact parallel instances, these are, inner sense, modes of time and changeable accidents or attributes. However, inter-expression does not invalidate the above-mentioned asymmetry, described as the passage from coordination to subordination. Quite the opposite, it reveals that the real inter-expression is to be found between the oneness of time and the identity of object itself. Time, as the formal condition of perceiving phenomenal change, and substance, as the “perdurability of the [phenomenal] subject”, express one another. The concept of time and the concept of the “*phenomenal eternity* of the general *cause*” are one and the same²⁶. Transcendental consciousness, as activity and representation of the unity of experience, must be the condition and the formal principle of this inter-expression.

3. SELF BEYOND TIME AND SUBSTANCE

Transcendental apperception is the condition of unity of forms of intuition and categories alike, and therefore it has in itself nothing of the nature of any of them in general and, more specifically, nothing of the nature of temporal and substantial sensible phenomena (B422). Owing to the logical heterogeneity between sensibility and understanding, my pure self, as determining spontaneity, cannot give rise to any empirical perception of itself as such, and thus remains entirely exterior to appearances embedded in temporal relationships, the given “determinable” (*das Bestimmbar*). In other words, “the determining in me” (*das Bestimmende in mir*, B158n), myself as “intelligence” (*Intelligenz*), is strictly undeterminable, for, by definition, the determining conditions of experience cannot become objects of experience themselves.

The *I think* contains nothing but the form of all possible consciousness, a form without any perceptive content; it reveals the mere logical form of judgment, the simple copulative verb without any self-reflexive determinable subject or predicates (the pure "est" of "*S est P*" without *S* nor *P*). Moreover, my original thinking self, as unity of all functions of unity, that is, as unity of the table of categories, is logically prior to all of them and cannot apply to itself any of them. So, if substance there is in my pure consciousness, it has neither "notion" (Ak. IV, 542-543) nor cognitive value because this consciousness is a mere "thought" representing the spontaneity of understanding, and in this mere thought there is nothing but the form of all possible object of knowledge, "the representation of something in general", as opposed to an object susceptible of being determined according to the category and transcendental schema of substance, that is, as phenomenal permanence (A144/B183). In my determining self, far from the self-perception of a substantial being, only there will be the logical form or idea of substance, the general subject of predicates, the representation that accompanies every representation and cannot be accompanied by any other, the pure form of unity on which rest both the unity of time and the unity of experience as represented by the regulative concept of phenomenal substance.

It is undeniable, nevertheless, that the form of consciousness, expressed by the *I think*, implies in itself a unifying function in which logical form and cognitive action are correlative sides of one and the same spontaneity. Now, by being active, the logical form meets with mental operations, and similarly, by being formal, the actions are meant to exhibit an *a priori* legality and differ from the substantial mode of permanent action, that must be determined and schematised *a posteriori*. This raises the question of whether and how transcendental apperception has a particular manner of lasting and being unceasingly active. Paradoxical though it may seem, pure self, despite its timelessness, despite its being beyond time in all its modes, namely the substantial mode of perdurability, appears to claim at the same time a supra-temporal status and the combination of synchronic unity with diachronic identity, according to the spatio-temporal metaphor of "accompanying" (*begleiten*), which indicates the simultaneousness of co-presence and the duration of an act. In reality, if transcendental apperception is asserted to be the act-representation *I think* that "must be able to accompany all representations" (A116, B131), and if this accompaniment is described as a necessary intellectual capacity of adding every new representation to the preceding one (B133), and if this transcendental "addition" is not the theoretical "necessity of a possibility"²⁷, but rather a truly unified and uninterrupted synthetic activity, in accordance with the logical truth of the belonging of every representation to the self and in accordance with the absorption of possibility by necessity allowed by the semantic analysis of logical modalities²⁸, then not only must the *I think* be actually simultaneous to every representation, it must also actually establish a proto-durative and proto-successive principle. The significance of "accompaniment" is not reducible to the power of self-ascription of representations with the subsequent emergence of self-awareness that deploys a timeless act of self-affection eliciting temporal acts of empirical apperception²⁹. The transcendental "accompaniment" of the *I think* involves a lawful unifying unity in the form of logical and cognitive activity, of which the phrase "*muss begleiten können*" offers the most formalised expression. This concept of "accompaniment" demonstrates the unity of all syntheses of representations in myself and formulates that which could be called

the “first-person rule of representation” (to represent *p* as representable is to represent *p* as necessarily attached to a representing self, which must always be an “I”). In addition, the unity of any “object” relies on the unity of the self: there is no proper object-consciousness without self-consciousness³⁰.

It follows that the adequate metaphor to conceive the unity of my consciousness is not that of a theatre in which all representations make their successive entrances and exits attached to the substantial oneness and substantial quantitative unity of a real being, like in the Cartesian theatre, as it has been somewhat caricatured and deconstructed³¹, but rather that of a pure drama without theatre. Kant accepts the sceptical constraints posed by Hume, namely the imperceptibility of the self as such, and the perception of mind as nothing but a manifold that has “no *simplicity* in it at one time, nor *identity* in different”³². Yet, unlike Hume, Kant refuses to take the drama of the mind for “a mere passive admission of impressions”³³, since, given the primordial belonging of representations to the self, one has to suppose necessarily a “*qualitative unity*”: “the unity of the synthesis of the manifold considered like the unity of the theme in a drama, speech or tale” (B114). Thus, the unity of the mind does not require the unity of a *res cogitans*, but only the semantic unity of the *cogitata*; it does not consist in the unity of a theatre, but in the narrative unity of a drama, the inner qualitative unity that assures its intelligibility. As ultimate cognitive operator and logical principle of this qualitative unity, transcendental apperception converts the ontology of *transcendentalia* into logical criteria of knowledge and fulfils the logical functions corresponding to those criteria, that is to say, pure self shows the (perceptively empty) form of the concept of “*being itself*” (*das Wesen selbst*, B429) as *ens unum*, and therefore *ens verum* (B113-115).

However, the efficacy of this formal self remains totally obscure as far as one fails to understand its dynamic reality. Semantic or narrative unity supposes an active intelligence, in which there is a communication of meaning from representation to representation. In the light of the inspiring anti-metaphysical hypothesis of the *Third Paralogism* (A363n), nothing is perdurable in my self but this perfect unifying activity that can be compared to the perfectly smooth communication of movement and force between elastic balls. The unity of movement is kept regardless of the unity or diversity of its agents. So, whereas the substratum of the self is unperceivable and its nature completely unknown, the quality of its action does not postulate any ontological hypothesis and lies solely in the commonly perceivable cognitive effects, namely in the major effect of a semantic-noematic community of representations that necessitates a kind of pragmatic-noetic community. Indeed, the narrative or semantic unification of experience supposes the proto-successive principle of synthetic accompaniment: the narrative power of my transcendental consciousness, consisting, not in the real unity of an author or narrator, but simply in the capacity “of adding a representation to the previous one”³⁴ without any hiatus between them. Every unifying act under the unity of the *I think* produces and expands a systemic and organic community of meaning and knowing that exposes the system and the organism of *myself* as intelligence. Thus, intelligence is irreducible to logical forms, for it encompasses the very formation of Logics, that is to say, it embodies a praxeological and autopoietic organism³⁵. The metaphysical minimalism and parsimony observed in this manner of conceiving the diachronic dimension of the *I think* explains why

the pure self tends to become a simple synchronic unity, the mere co-presence between the *I think* and its representations. The transcendental self is the *I am*, the *I unite*, a transcendental act "always" in the present tense, contrary to the empirical self that perceives its phenomena in memory and imagination through the diverse tenses with their determined quantum ("I was, I am, I shall be")³⁶. Time is in me, as determining self, and I am in time, as determinable self. By being anchored in the timeless present, the transcendental act can be said to contain all times, or even the possibility of time and temporal determination of experience, without merging into any determinable time. Similarly, the act of drawing a line is always moving between the two latest points, and the act of counting is always moving between the two latest unities, in such a way that the act is a pure unified and unifying motion which has no quantum (*Grösse*) in itself but from which, as quantifying principle, stems all possible quantity. In order to understand the complex timelessness of the *I think*, without erasing its synchronic and diachronic transcendental principle, it is necessary to consider the act of drawing a line or counting in its pure actuality, detached from the empirical *quanta* formed by the points or the unities. Thus, the *I think* is the pure act of the passage or transition between representations occurring in myself. Its transcendental mode of acting implies that in the *I think* nothing empirical is available; so its activity consists in a form of transcendental "first actuality" or transcendental "episteme" (in the Aristotelian sense), which renders possible all object of thought (that is any "line" or "number"). The analysis of "accompaniment" shows that the possibility of thought and experience depends on a kind of "arithmetical principle" in the understanding. Kantian pure apperception contains the condition of time and objectivity in general as "the calculable measure or dimension of motion with respect to before-and-afterness" (*Physics*, IV, xi, 219 b 2)³⁷, and thereby reframes the puzzling Aristotelian question on the relationship between time and the "arithmetical" or "counting soul": "the question whether or not time would exist if there were not consciousness" (*Physics*, IV, xiv, 223 a 21-22)³⁸. The reality of time and temporal determination can no longer be safeguarded by the independence and exteriority of objective motion. All motion of nature, and specially the unity of this motion, is not intelligible at any way as long as the transcendental unifying motion of pure self is not viewed as its original and unique source. The combination of space and time in the metaphor of "*begleiten*" exhibits the principle of pure arithmetic (Ak. II, 397) and announces the analogical power of the law of attraction to explain the possibility of matter (Ak. IV, 508 sq) as well as the possibility of thought. The transcendental permanence of the *I think* is metaphorically very much like that of an "attractive force", of which no sensation is available, but from which one can deduce the necessary regularity and legality (*Gesetzmässigkeit*) of phenomenal relations. Conversely, the merely empirical succession in the inner sense would be metaphorically very much like the effect of a "repulsive force" dispersing representations.

The non-empirical perdurability of the *I think* goes together with its non-empirical immobility. Subsequently, Kant's thinking self, like Hume's imagination³⁹, appears to transmit motion from representation to representation by attraction; it operates like a "centre of qualitative gravity", or a "centre of narrative gravity"⁴⁰. The presence, the *nunc stans* quality, of my original self is purely functional; it is a transcendental supposition, not a substantial reality. Of my original self, I only have the consciousness of an act; I do not perceive any real

subject of action. From my perception of a flux of phenomena in my empirical consciousness, I can immediately deduce and be somehow directly aware of a unifying act that must be “always” taking place in my understanding. It goes without saying that this “always” has no truly temporal significance. To represent the *I think* is to represent a *noesis* without *noema*, and an *episteme* without *theorein*. The necessary inference and awareness of an act does not teach anything about the substratum of such an act. Kant explains, in effect, that even the “position of existence”, given by the pure representation of an intellectual act in myself (in such a manner that *I think* and *I am* can be taken for synonymous propositions), must be conceived as “pre-categorical existence”⁴¹, for it rests on the logical supposition of an undetermined matter as material condition of the possibility of the undeterminable existence of the determining act *I think* (B422-423n). If there is an act, there must also be as its previous logical condition *something real upon which* the act must be applied. The awareness of existence does not result from and has not its roots in the activity as such; it rests rather on an “undetermined empirical perception”, the perception of *something undetermined* that exists. That is why one is aware of the existence of the *I think* without knowing anything about its “mode of existence”. Also, as far as the supposedly substantial power of this act is concerned, one can only witness the exercise of it as a kind of “force”, and thereby remain in full ignorance about the substance from which its force must derive. One supposes in the *I think* the pure actuality of force alone, as if it were a free force, a force in its active interval between substance and accidents. In actual fact, Kant assigns a variable “intensive degree” or intensity to the powers of the soul and to consciousness, but this *degree* is independent from any eventual substance (B413-414; Ak. IV, 542); as if it were a simple dynamic dimension. The cognitive counterpart of this notion of *degree* is the awareness without knowledge, the pure consciousness of the effectiveness of a “force”; of which we could be aware as pure force in itself and only know what it produces, namely the passage from one representation to another, the unity of objects of experience. Once again, to know that the mind must have a continuous degree of activation that explains my experience as mine, that is, the communication of unity through my perceptions entails no positive knowledge on the eventual substance from which act and force must stem. This means that just as the existence of the *I think* is thought previously to all determination of perceptions according to the category of existence (whose schema is the “existence in a determined time”, A145/B184), so the active force of the *I think* is thought previously to all determination of perceptions according to the category of substance and causality (whose conjunction is rightly summarised in the *Second analogy*: “wherever there is action, and therefore activity and force, there must also be substance”; A204/B250). In the pure *I*, all categories are thought *generatim* as transcendental functions of unity, but they cannot be applied to the thinking self because there is nothing to be unified, that is, nothing determinable, in my pure self.

CONCLUSION: "THE DETERMINING IN ME"

The instability one observes here between the assumption that the *I think* is beyond time and substance and the comprehensible constraint of linking activity to a substantial basis and to a temporal process reveals a doubled-edge sword, it poses two equally ominous terms in an apparently compulsory disjunction: either the *I think* is merely a logical form and, in that case, its being beyond time and substance is unproblematic but cognitively innocuous, or the *I think* is a real act, and therefore it must take place in real time⁴² and have *something* substantial – in this case one should concede that self-perception conveys substantiality. However, as Kant suggests, form and act must be thought together, for, if a logical form without an act is not efficient, an act without a form is not ("legally") determining. This invites one to rehabilitate⁴³ the identification between logical forms and mental acts, as held by the logicians of Port-Royal⁴⁴. Thus, formal logics and transcendental psychology should merge into one another and the table of categories should be conceived as exhibiting at the same time the system of pure logical Topics and the system of cognitive Praxeology. Indeed, while the logical *form* is the reduced state of the determining function, the unifying *act* constitutes its realized state; reduction and realization are to be understood as two correlated states in the one and the same process of objective determination⁴⁵. The real Kantian *distinguo* lies in the transcendental opposition and cognitive conjunction between the determining and the determinable. The "determining in me" (*das Bestimmende in mir*) is not something determinable but only the condition of all determination to the extent that the unity of pure consciousness, presented by the consciousness *I think–I am*, coincides with the principle of unity expressed in every proposition. The *sum* of *sum cogitans* and the *est* of every '*S est P*' share the same unifying quality. Furthermore, the *sum* "animates functionally" the *est*, and the *est* "formalises logically" and "instantiates propositionally" the *sum*.

The instability above underlined could be portrayed by contrasting Kant's transcendental apperception with Leibniz's *substantial self* and Fichte's *self-positing self*. Leibniz and Fichte would be the opposite poles between which Kant's pure *I think* demonstrates its originality. On the one hand, the Leibnizian *notio completa* integrates real substantial identity and real substantial activity in the absolute unity of the self. The individual substance would express from its unique point of view everything that happens in the past, present or future universe and the *a priori* reason for the connexion of all times in the one and the same self would lie exclusively in the principle of inherence of all past, present and future predicates to the substance (*semper enim notio praedicati inest subjecto in propositione vera*)⁴⁶. On the other hand, Fichte conceives the pure self as an act able of intellectual self-perception, that is, able of intuiting himself "only" as *Tathandlung*. So, in this self-perception, there is the intuition of pure self-activity outside time and without substance⁴⁷. In this context, both Leibnizian and Fichtean *Cogito* would be metaphysically stable constructs thanks to their homogeneity: totally substantial to the former and purely self-active to the latter. On the contrary, Kantian transcendental apperception expresses my intellectual synthetic activity as "accompaniment"; and therefore it seems to function *as if* it were a substance, not only as a general container of predicates but also as a centre of continuous activity.

However, given the transcendental character of its activity, the pure Kantian *I* has neither the reality of an individual substance nor the self-intuitive capacity of grasping himself as pure self-determining activity, pure freedom. Indeed, Kant needs to suppose an “undetermined empirical” basis to conceive the existence of the meta-intuitive act *I think*, and a “degree without substance”, an intensity, to construe its meta-categorical active dimension (thus, this pure force does not allow the passage from force to activity and substance, as presented in the *Second analogy*, A204/B250). The instability of the self emerges as the result of a conjunction of heterogeneous elements *a priori*, the transcendental form and transcendental matter of *something in general*; and yet this primordial conjunction guarantees the regularity of the relationship between the determining and the determinable, the unifying and the unifiable, since the *I think* contains the dynamic principle through which every representation of a manifold is necessarily bound to the self and thereby bound to a chain of representations with a necessary order, *myself* as intelligence, i.e. a cognitive praxis and poesis.

ABSTRACT: If permanence or abiding presence is a common quality shared by transcendental apperception and pure time, this does not imply that one should identify them, in accordance with Heidegger’s *daimon*, as connatural structures; instead, it might be more illuminating to uncover the underlying mediation that surpasses their original heterogeneity. This mediating role can be assigned to substance, conceived by Kant himself in a quite Leibnizian vein, as a self-founded force and, hence, an autonomous centre of ever-lasting activity. In a Kantian perspective, however, substance appears to be a fragile mediation, especially as one moves from the *Lectures on Metaphysics* of the 1770’s to the first *Critique*, in so far as an essential asymmetry emerges within this triadic community. Thus, whereas pure time and substance remain consistently linked—though space will tend to relate more immediately to substance than time—, the thinking self and its activity no longer signify the paradigmatic expression of real substantiality and real duration but “only a substance in Idea”. Located beyond time and substance, the *I think* comes to a sort of inner *instability* oscillating between static timelessness and dynamic production of time, pure self-representation and pure self-(re)presenting activity, logical form and logical act, transcendental unity and actual unification. Indeed, how can *Myself* “function as if” *I* were a substance without being so and, consequently, without being incorporated into a mere form? In other terms, how is one to grasp “activity” without using the idiom of substance and, at the same time, without inactivating it? Form and act must be envisaged, respectively, as the reduced and realized states of the same process, that is, mind or self in its determining motion.

KEYWORDS: *I think*, transcendental apperception, transcendental psychology.

REFERENCES

- ALLISON H., *Kant’s Transcendental Idealism: An Interpretation and Defense*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1983.
- ARISTOTLE, *The Physics I*, trans. by P. H. Wicksteed & F. M. Cornford (Loeb Library), Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1980.
- ARISTOTLE, *On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, trans. by W. S. Hett (Loeb Library), Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1986.
- ARISTOTLE, *The Metaphysics*, trans. by H. Tredennick (Loeb Library), Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1989.
- ARNAULD A. & NICOLE P., *La Logique ou L’art de penser*, éd. critique par P. Clair et F. Girbal, Paris, Vrin, 1993.
- BAUMGARTEN A. G., *Metaphysica (Editio VII)*, Hildesheim, Olms, 1982 [1779].
- BENNETT J., *Kant’s Analytic*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966.

- BUCHDAHL, G., *Kant and the Dynamics of Reason: Essays on the Structure of Kant's Philosophy*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1992.
- CARNAP R., *Meaning and Necessity: A Study in Semantics and Modal Logic*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1956.
- CHISHOLM R. M., *Person and Object: A Metaphysical Study*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1976.
- CHISHOLM R. M., *The First Person: An Essay on Reference and Intentionality*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1981.
- CHISHOLM R. M., *A Realistic Theory of Categories: An Essay on Ontology*, Cambridge, CUP, 1996.
- DENNETT D., *Consciousness Explained*, Boston, Little, Brown, 1991.
- DYCK, C., *Kant and Rational Psychology*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2014.
- ECOLE J., *La métaphysique de Christian Wolff*, Hildesheim, Olms, 1990.
- FICHTE, *Wissenschaftslehre nova methodo*, Hamburg, Meiner, 1994.
- GIL F., *Traité de l'évidence*, Grenoble, Millon, 1993.
- GIL F., *La conviction*, Paris, Flammarion, 2000.
- HEIDEGGER M., *Phänomenologische Interpretation von Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft, Gesamtausgabe II, Band 25*, Frankfurt am Main, V. Klostermann, 1977.
- HEIDEGGER M., *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik, Gesamtausgabe I, Band 3*, Frankfurt am Main, V. Klostermann, 1991.
- HENRICH D., *The Unity of Reason: Essays on Kant's Philosophy*, Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1994.
- HUME, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, I, IV, II, ed. by L. A. Selby-Bigge, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896.
- JESUS, P., *La poétique de l'ipse: étude sur le 'Je pense' kantien*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2008.
- KANT, I. (1900–). *Kants gesammelte Schriften* (Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Ed.). Berlin, G. Reimer / W. de Gruyter.
- KANT, "Vom inneren Sinne/Du sens interne", *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, vol. 119, 1987/IV, 424-434.
- KITCHER P., *Kant's Transcendental Psychology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990.
- KITCHER, P., *Kant's thinker*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2011.
- KLEMME, H. F., *Kants Philosophie des Subjekts: systematische und entwicklungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Selbstbewusstsein und Selbsterkenntnis*, Hamburg, Meiner, 1996.
- LEIBNIZ, G.W. (1965–). *Die philosophischen Schriften* (C. I. Gerhardt, Ed.) (7 vols.). Hildesheim, Olms.
- LONGUENESSE B., *Kant et le pouvoir de juger: Sensibilité et discursivité dans l'Analytique transcendantale de la Critique de la raison pure*, Paris, Puf, 1993.
- WOLFF C., *Psychologia empirica*, ed. J. Ecole, Hildesheim, Olms, 1968 [1738].
- WOLFF C., *Psychologia rationalis*, Hildesheim, Olms, 1972 [1740].

NOTES

* Paulo Jesus studied philosophy and psychology at Coimbra Univ and Univ Catholique de Louvain. In 2006, he obtained a PhD in Philosophy and Social Sciences at EHESS-Paris with a dissertation on time, selfhood and cognition based on Kant's critical works, published by P. Lang (*La poétique de l'ipse: étude sur le 'Je pense' kantien*, 2008). He has lectured several research seminars at Collège international de philosophie (CIPh, Paris, France) and was a Visiting scholar at New York University and Columbia University. He was also a Stagiaire Post-doc at the Centre for Research in Applied Epistemology (CREA, Paris) and a Professeur invité at EHESS. Presently, he is researcher at the Philosophy Centre of Lisbon University, and lecturer of Law Philosophy at Portucalense University.

2 ARISTOTLE, *On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, trans. by W. S. Hett (Loeb Library), Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1986, pp. 68-69. On "substance", see *Metaphysics*, V, VIII, 1017b 10-26 and VII, I-VI, 1028a-1032a 11, in ARISTOTLE, *The Metaphysics*, trans. by H. Tredennick (Loeb Library), Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1989, pp. 238-241, 310-337.

3 Let us remember the famous Leibnizian rehabilitation of *forma substantialis* and the foundation of physics on a dynamic conception of substance reacting against Cartesian mechanicism and Malebranchian occasionalism: "[...] ipsam rerum substantiam in agendi patiendique vi consistere. [...] [H]inc judicari potest, debere in corporea substantia reperiri *entelechiam primam*, tandem πρῶτον δεκτικὸν - vim scilicet motricem primitivam, quae praeter extensionem (seu id quod est mere geometricum) et praeter molem (seu id quod est mere materiale) superaddita, semper quidem agit [...]." (LEIBNIZ, "De ipsa natura", PS IV, pp. 508, 511; see also e.g., PS II, 58, 93, 137; III, 260, 356, 457; IV, 470, 499.)

4 As for Wolffian systematic psychology, see WOLFF C., *Psychologia empirica*, ed. J. Ecole, Hildesheim, Olms, 1968 [1738], and ID., *Psychologia rationalis*, Hildesheim, Olms, 1972 [1740]. For a succinct presentation, see ECOLE J., *La métaphysique de Christian Wolff*, Hildesheim, Olms, 1990, pp. 261-326.

5 Leibniz presents the "force", "tendency" or dynamical principle that makes the soul (and all substances in general) move from one perception to another, as "appetition" or "appetite" (*appetitio, appetitus*); see e.g. LEIBNIZ, PS III, 347, 575. Wolff conserves the same conceptual couple, perception and appetition, the former is a state and the latter a *principium mutationum*, thence an active force: "*Anima vi quadam praedita est. Anima substantia est & cum in eadem perceptiones aliae succedant aliis, ex perceptionibus nascantur appetitus, ex appetitibus denuo perceptiones, quemadmodum universa loquitur Psychologia empirica, status ejus mutatur. Vi igitur praedita est.*" (WOLFF C., *Psychologia rationalis*, §. 53, p. 35.) See also *ibid.*, §. 56, p. 37 (*Anima continuo tendit ad mutationem status sui*), §. 58, p. 38 (*Status animae continuo mutatur*), and §. 67, p. 45 (*Natura animae in eadem vi repraesentativa consistit.*)

6 Cf. WOLFF, *ibid.*, §. 54, p. 35-36 (*Vis & facultas animae a se invicem differunt*), §. 55, p. 36 (*Vi animae actuantur, quae per facultates ejusdem in eadem possibilia intelliguntur*), §. 60, p. 39 (*Eadem vi omnes animae actiones producantur*), and §. 61, p. 40 ([...] *anima igitur vi eadem sentit, nunc imaginatur, nunc meminit, nunc reminiscitur, nunc attendit, nunc reflectit, nunc notiones format, nunc judicat, nunc ratiocinatur, nunc appetit, nunc aversatur, nunc libere vult, nunc non vult.*)

7 Let us observe the agreement shown by Leibniz, Wolff and Baumgarten on this topic. "[...] Dieu a mis dans chaque Ame une *Concentration du monde*, ou la force de représenter l'univers suivant un point de vue propre à cette Ame, et c'est ce qui est le principe de ses actions, qui les distingue entre elles et des Actions d'une autre Ame. Car il s'ensuit qu'elles auront continuellement des changements qui représenteront les changements de l'univers, et que les autres Ames en auront d'autres, mais avec correspondance." (LEIBNIZ, "Extrait du dictionnaire de M. Bayle", PS IV, p. 542; cf. also PS II, pp. 114, 171; PS IV, 476, 484, 523, 554; PS VI, 326; PS VII, p. 529.) "*Anima habet vim sibi repraesentandi hoc universum limitatam materialiter situ corporis organici in universo; formaliter constitutione organorum sensoriorum.* [...]" (WOLFF, *ibid.*, §. 63, p. 42.) "*Vis repraesentativa universi est natura animae, quatenus repraesentationes istas actuat; essentia vero, quatenus ad tales potius, quam alias, tali potius, quam alio ordine actuandas restringitur.* [...]" (*Ibid.*, §. 68, p. 46.) "*Vis repraesentativa universi pro positu corporis humani in eodem, cum hinc pendentibus ipsius modis, est complexus determinationum animae internarum, quae mutationum eius & inhaerentium ipsi accidentium principia sunt.* [...]" (BAUMGARTEN A. G., *Metaphysica (Editio VII)*, Hildesheim, Olms, 1982 [1779], §. 758, p. 302.)

8 "*Vis animae non nisi unica est. Anima enim simplex est, adeoque partibus caret. Ponamus jam animam plures habere vires a se invicem distinctas: cum unaquaeque in continuo agendi conatu consistat, unaquaeque peculiare requiret subjectum, cui inest. Atque ita plura concipienda erunt entia actualia a se invicem distincta, quae cum simul sumta anima sint, erunt ejusdem partes: quod utique absurdum per demonstrata.*" (WOLFF C., *Psychologia Rationalis*, §. 57, p. 37.)

9 KANT, *Vorlesungen über Metaphysik und Rationaltheologie*, Ak. XXVIII-1, Berlin, Gruyter, 1968, pp. 221-301.

10 The dating of the diverse *Vorlesungen* is proposed by H. F. KLEMME, *Kants Philosophie des Subjekts: systematische und entwicklungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Selbstbewusstsein und Selbsterkenntnis*, Hamburg, Meiner, 1996, pp. 122 sq.

11 On the Kantian distinction between substance and force, cf. HENRICH D., *The Unity of Reason: Essays on Kant's Philosophy*, Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1994, pp. 27-28.

12 "Wolff nimmt Eine Grundkraft an und sagt: Die Seele selbst ist eine Grundkraft, die sich das Universum vorstellt. Es ist schon falsch, wenn man sagt: die Seele ist eine Grundkraft. Dieses kommt daher, weil die Seele falsch definiert ist, wie die Ontologie lehrt. Kraft ist nicht, was den Grund der wirklichen Vorstellung in sich enthält, sondern der respectus der Substanz zum Accidens, so fern in derselben der Grund der wirklichen Vorstellungen enthalten ist. *Die Kraft ist also nicht ein besonderes Princip, sondern ein respectus*. Wer also sagt: anima est vis, der behauptet, dass die Seele keine besondere Substanz sey, sondern nur eine Kraft, also ein Phänomenon und Accidens." (Ak. XXVIII-1, 261.) In the *Dissertatio* (§. 28), Kant had already held this conception of force as *respectus* that must be given by experience: "Nam, cum *Vis* non aliud sit, quam *respectus* substantiae A ad *aliud quiddam* B (accidens), tanquam rationis ad rationatum: vis cuiusque possibilitas *non nititur identitate* causae et causati, s. substantiae et accidentis, ideoque etiam impossibilitas virium falso confictarum *non pendet a sola contradictione*. Nullam igitur *vim originariam* ut possibilem sumere licet, nisi *datam ab experientia*, neque ulla intellectus perspicacia eius possibilitas a priori concipi potest" (Ak. II, 416-417).

13 "Da wir nun in der menschlichen Seele reale Bestimmungen oder Accidenzen von wesentlich verschiedener Art antreffen; so bemüht sich jeder Philosoph umsonst, solche aus Einer Grundkraft herzuleiten. [...] Z. E. das Gedächtniss ist nur eine Imagination vergangener Dinge, also keine besondere Grundkraft. Die Imagination selbst aber können wir nicht weiter herleiten. Demnach ist das bildende Vermögen schon eine Grundkraft. Ferner so ist die Vernunft und der Verstand a priori." (Ak. XXVIII-1, 262.)

14 "Es kann ein Mensch viele von seinen Gliedern verlieren, deswegen bleibt er doch, und kann sagen: Ich bin. Der Fuss gehöret ihm. Ist er aber abgesäget, so sieht er ihn eben so an, als jede andere Sache, die er nicht mehr gebrauchen kann, wie einen alten Stiefel, den er wegwerfen muss. Er selbst aber bleibt immer unverändert, und sein denkendes Ich verliert nichts. Es sieht also jeder leicht ein, auch durch den gemeinsten Verstand: dass er eine Seele habe, die vom Körper unterschieden ist." (Ak. XXVIII-1, 225.)

15 Ak. XXVIII-1, 265.

16 Ak. XXVIII-1, 225-226.

17 Leibniz had already stated that to conceive a substance is to conceive a being able of saying "I am", so all substances are thought of by analogy with my conscious experience of being a self: "Pour juger de la notion d'une substance individuelle, il est bon de consulter celle que j'ai de moy même, comme il faut consulter la notion spécifique de la sphere pour juger de ses propriétés" (LEIBNIZ, "Remarques sur la lettre de M. Arnauld", PS II, 45); "Et comme je conçois que d'autres Estres ont droit aussi de dire moy ou qu'on peut penser ainsi pour eux, c'est par là que je conçois ce qu'on appelle la substance" (LEIBNIZ, "Sur ce qui passe les sens et la matière", PS VI, 488).

18 For an in-depth analysis of the transition from Wolffian Rational Psychology to Kantian critical thought, see Dyck, C., *Kant and Rational Psychology*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2014.

19 "Das Ich bedeutet das Subject, sofern es kein Prädicat von einem andern Dinge ist. Was kein Prädicat von einem andern Dinge ist, ist eine Substanz. Das Ich ist *das allgemeine Subject* aller Prädicate, alles Denkens, aller Handlungen, aller möglichen Urtheile, die wir von uns als einem denkenden Wesen fällen können. Ich kann nur sagen: Ich bin, Ich denke, Ich handele. Es geht also gar nicht an, dass das Ich ein Prädicat von etwas andern wäre. Ich kann kein Prädicat von einem andern Wesen seyn; mir kommen zwar Prädicate zu; allein das Ich kann ich nicht von einem andern prädiciren, ich kann nicht sagen: ein anderes Wesen ist das Ich. Folglich ist das Ich, oder die Seele, die durch das Ich ausgedrückt wird, eine Substanz." (Ak. XVIII-1, 266.)

20 HEIDEGGER M., *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik, Gesamtausgabe I, Band 3*, Frankfurt am Main, V. Klostermann, 1991, § 34, pp. 188-195. See also ID., *Phänomenologische Interpretation von Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft, Gesamtausgabe II, Band 25*, Frankfurt am Main, V. Klostermann, 1977, § 11. b, pp. 150-153, § 25. c-e, pp. 389-399. The Heideggerian identification of selfhood with temporality, based on his interpretation of Kantian time as "pure self-affection" (*reine Selbstaffektion*), corresponds to the central subject matter of *Sein und Zeit*, that is, "temporality as the ontological sense of the concern" (*Zeitlichkeit als der ontologische Sinn der Sorge*); see §§ 61-65.

21 HEIDEGGER M., *Kant und das Problem...*, *op. cit.*, p. XVI.

22 "[...] [W]e may observe, that what we call a *mind*, is nothing but a heap or collection of different perceptions, united together by certain relations, and suppos'd, tho' falsely, to be endow'd with a perfect simplicity and identity. Now as every perception is distinguishable from another, and may be consider'd as separately existent; it evidently follows, that there is no absurdity in separating any particular perception from the mind; that is, in breaking off all its relations, with that connected mass of perceptions, which constitute a thinking being." (HUME, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, I, IV, II, ed. by L. A. Selby-Bigge, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896, p. 257.)

23 HUME D., *Treatise*, Book I, Part IV, Sect. VI, p. 300.

24 "I have already prov'd, that we have no perfect idea of substance; but that taking it *for something, that can exist by itself*, 'tis evident every perception is a substance, and every distinct part of a perception a distinct substance [...]." (HUME, *Treatise*, I, IV, V, p. 292.)

25 As for the self-insufficiency of the *self-as-bundle* and the supposition of an active substratum, see CHISHOLM R. M., *Person and Object: A Metaphysical Study*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1976, p. 52 ; ID., *The First Person : An Essay on Reference and*

Intentionality, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1981, pp. 87-88 ; Id., *A Realistic Theory of Categories: An Essay on Ontology*, Cambridge, CUP, 1996, p. 103-104.

26 “Porro, quoniam possibilitas mutationum et successionum omnium, cuius principium, quatenus sensitive cognoscitur, residet in conceptu Temporis, supponit perdurabilitatem subiecti, cuius status oppositi succedunt, id autem, cuius status fluunt, non durat, nisi sustentetur ab alio: conceptus temporis tamquam unici infiniti et immutabilis, in quo sunt et durant omnia, est *causae generalis aeternitas, phaenomenon.*” (*Dis.* IV, §. 22, Sch.; Ak. II, 410.)

27 This is possibly the most current interpretation of the Kantian proposition “*mus begleiten können*”: “this principle affirms only the necessity of the possibility of attaching the ‘I think’, not the necessity of actually doing so” (ALLISON H., *Kant’s Transcendental Idealism: An Interpretation and Defense*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1983, p. 137).

28 Necessity includes and surpasses possibility just as that which is “logically true” (namely the synthetic unity of transcendental apperception) includes and surpasses that which is simply “not logically false”. See e.g. CARNAP R., *Meaning and Necessity: A Study in Semantics and Modal Logic*, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1956, p. 173 sq.

29 J. BENNETT refers to this interpretation of transcendental synthesis as the “genetic interpretation” and opposes it to the “analytic interpretation” which insists on the combination and unity between past and present representations (see *Kant’s Analytic*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966, pp. 111-112, 118 *passim*).

30 To our mind, this is the main thesis maintained by Kitcher, P., *Kant’s thinker*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2011.

31 Cf. DENNETT D., *Consciousness Explained*, Boston, Little, Brown, 1991, ch. 4, *passim*.

32 “The mind is a kind of theatre, where several perceptions successively make their appearance; pass, re-pass, glide away, and mingle in an infinite variety of postures and situations. There is properly no *simplicity* in it at one time, nor *identity* in different; whatever natural propension we may have to imagine that simplicity and identity. The comparison of the theatre must not mislead us. They are the successive perceptions only, that constitute the mind; nor have we the most distant notion of the place, where these scenes are represented, or of the materials, of which it is compos’d.” (HUME, *Treatise*, I, IV, VI, p. 301.)

33 HUME, *Treatise*, I, III, II, p. 121.

34 “Si un réseau de récits ne se confond pas avec l’aperception, celle-ci est très précisément déterminée par la capacité qu’a le «je» d’ajouter une représentation à la précédente : sa structure est en quelque sorte narrative” (GIL F., *La conviction*, Paris, Flammarion, 2000, p. 49).

35 We have developed this argument in Jesus, P., *La poétique de l’ipse: étude sur le ‘Je pense’ kantien*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2008.

36 “Man muss die reine (transsc:) Apperception von der empirischen apperceptio percipientis von der apperceptiva/percepti unterscheiden. Die erste sagt bloss ich bin. Die zweyte ich war, ich bin, und ich werde seyn d.i. ich bin ein Ding der Vergangenen der Gegenwärtigen und Künftigen [seyn] Zeit wo dies Bewusstseyn ich bin allen Dingen Bestimmung meines Daseyns als Grösse gemein ist.” (KANT, “Vom inneren Sinne/Du sens interne”, *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, vol. 119, 1987/IV, p. 426.)

37 ARISTOTLE, *The Physics I*, trans. by P. H. Wicksteed & F. M. Cornford (Loeb Library), Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 1980, pp. 386-387.

38 *Ibid.*, pp. 418-419.

39 “Here is a kind of ATTRACTION, which in the mental world will be found to have as extraordinary effects as in the natural, and to shew itself in as many and as various forms. Its effects are every where conspicuous; but as to its causes, they are mostly unknown, and must be resolv’d into *original* qualities of human nature, which I pretend not to explain.” (HUME, *Treatise*, I, I, IV, p. 60.)

40 Cf. DENNETT D., *ibid.*, pp. 418, 451, *passim*.

41 GIL F., *Traité de l’évidence*, Grenoble, Millon, 1993, pp. 257-258.

42 “If time is not real, then the accounts of the identity of a mind through time, and of the cognitive processes that enable us to have knowledge, are incoherent. Conversely, if the theories of synthetic processing and apperception are true, then time is real.” (KITCHER P., *Kant’s Transcendental Psychology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 141.)

43 On the meaning of such rehabilitation, see LONGUENESSE B., *Kant et le pouvoir de juger: Sensibilité et discursivité dans l’Analytique transcendantale de la Critique de la raison pure*, Paris, Puf, 1993, pp. XII and 76 sq.

44 According to the logicians of Port-Royal, Logics is the “art of thinking” and “this art consists in the reflections the men have made on the four main operations of their mind, *conceiving, judging, reasoning, & ordering*” (“La Logique est l’art de bien conduire sa raison dans la connoissance des choses, tant pour s’en instruire soi-même, que pour en instruire les autres. Cet art consiste dans les reflexions que les hommes ont faites sur les quatre principales operations de leur esprit, *concevoir, juger, raisonner, & ordonner.*”) (ARNAULD A. & NICOLE P., *La Logique ou L’art de penser*, éd. critique par P. Clair et F. Girbal, Paris, Vrin, 1993, p. 37.)

45 We represent the relationship between these two poles of reduction and realization in line with G. BUCHDAHL's dynamic model of the Kantian transcendental structure (*Kant and the Dynamics of Reason: Essays on the Structure of Kant's Philosophy*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1992, pp. 8-11, 56-64, *passim*).

46 "Il est vrai que mon expérience intérieure m'a convaincu *a posteriori* de cette identité, mais il faut qu'il y ait une [raison] aussi *a priori*. Or, il n'est pas possible de trouver une autre, si non que tant mes attributs du temps et estat precedant, que mes attributs du temps et estat suivant sont des predicats d'un même sujet, *insunt eidem subjecto*. [...] [I] faut avouer que ces predicats estoient des lois enfermés dans le sujet ou dans ma notion complete, qui fait ce qu'on appelle moy, qui est le fondement de la connexion de tous mes estats differens et que Dieu connoissoit parfaitement de toute eternité." (LEIBNIZ, "Remarques sur la lettre de M. Arnauld", PS II, 43.)

47 "Uibrigens ist es richtig[,] dass man in der Philosophie von einem Postulate ausgehen müsse; auch die WissenschaftsLehre thut diess, und drückt es durch Tathandlung aus. Diess Wort *wurde* nicht verstanden; es heisst aber, und soll nichts anderes heissen, als man soll innerlich handeln, und diesem Handeln zusehen. [...] Der Begriff oder das Denken des Ich in dem auf sich handeln des Ich selbst, und ein Handeln im Handeln auf sich selbst, giebt ein Denken des ich, und nichts anderes; beide erschöpfen sich gegenseitig; das Ich ist, was es sich selbst setzt, und weiter nichts, und was sich selbst setzt, und in sich selbst zurückgeht[,] wird ein Ich, und nichts anderes." (FICHTE, *Wissenschaftslehre nova methodo*, Hamburg, Meiner, 1994, pp. 28-29; see also *ibid.*, 48-49, 130, *passim*.)

Recebido / Received: 27/07/15.

Aprovado / Approved: 22/08/15.

