

The Metaphysics Lectures in the Academy Edition of *Kant's gesammelte Schriften*

Steve Naragon

Kant lectured on metaphysics throughout his teaching career, from the winter semester (WS) of 1755/56 (his first semester at the Albertina in Königsberg) through the WS 1795/96 (his last full semester of teaching). Beginning with the summer semester (SS) of 1770, Kant taught as the full professor of logic and metaphysics, and thus was required to lecture publicly (for free) on metaphysics once a year, which he then did every winter semester except 1793/94, when he lectured on moral philosophy instead. He may have lectured on metaphysics as many as 50 of the 82 semesters of his teaching career.¹

These lectures go far in providing the philosophical context assumed by Kant's published works. Here we find the "textbook" metaphysics of the day so familiar to Kant and his contemporaries – and we see it being discussed, dissected, corrected, and occasionally praised by Kant over the course of his teaching and writing career. Along with more familiar topics, we also find Kant discussing themes and problems that never or rarely appear in the published writings, but which help form the common background against which those writings were to be understood. And finally, because the notes span from the early 1760s to the middle 1790s, we are given an important window into Kant's philosophical development. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine a more valuable resource for insight into Kant's writings.²

¹ The records prior to 1770 are not wholly reliable. We know when Kant announced that he would lecture, but not always whether the course actually took place (for instance, the course might fail for lack of students). We have evidence that 35 of the courses took place. Also, Kant may have taught metaphysics as many as 52 times if we accept Arnoldt's records indicating that that he taught two sections in 1771/72 (one public, one private), as well as once again privately in SS 1771; but in his letter to Herz (Dec. 15, 1778), Kant claims that he taught metaphysics only publicly since 1770.

² The lectures have been increasingly put to good use, most prominently by Karl Ameriks, *Kant's Theory of Mind: An Analysis of the Paralogisms of Pure Reason*. Oxford University Press ¹1982, ²1999; Paul Guyer *Kant and the Claims of Knowledge*. Cambridge University Press 1987; Wolfgang Carl, *Der schweigende Kant: die Entwürfe zu einer Deduktion der Kategorien vor 1781*. Göttingen 1989 [= *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historische Klasse der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Dritte Folge*, vol. 182]; and Heiner F. Klemme, *Kants Philosophie des Subjekts*. Hamburg 1996 [= *Kant-Forschungen*, vol. 7].

Notes from these lectures are collected in volumes XXVIII and XXIX of the Academy edition, edited by Gerhard Lehmann (1900–87).³ These are notes written down by students or others auditing Kant's classes; they do not stem from Kant's own hand, and they are not Kant's own notes from which he lectured, as one might expect. Indeed, the notes that Kant took with him into the classroom are pretty much those he jotted down on scraps of paper or in the margins and on the interleaved pages of his copy of the textbook he used for his course on metaphysics: Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten's *Metaphysica*, 4th ed. (Halle 1757).⁴ This edition of Baumgarten's text is reprinted in vols. XV (1923) and XVII (1926) of the Academy edition, and Kant's notes (his "Reflections") are printed alongside the relevant passages, with dating and other helpful information supplied by their editor, Erich Adickes (1866–1928).

The above suggests two further observations. First, because these notes were written by Kant's auditors, and without Kant's oversight, we cannot give them the same authority as Kant's own published writings; and indeed we ought briefly to consider how closely the text might be related to Kant. A verbatim transcript would not have been easy, given Kant's lecturing style, so we must assume that there were omissions, as well as possible additions. Similarly, auditors would mishear or miswrite a name or word, or lose Kant's thread and introduce confusions. What is more, we have good reason to believe that none of the extant manuscripts, with the exception of the Herder notes, stem directly from the classroom (*Mitschriften*). The best we can hope for are fair copies (*Reinschriften*) that were rewritten at home after the lecture; and what we often get are even more removed: copies (*Abschriften*) written by someone other than the student who wrote the original notes — often by a professional copyist ("professional" only in

³ XXVIII consists of three volumes: 1st half (1968; pp. 1–524), 2nd half, part 1 (1970; pp. 525–987), and 2nd half, part 2 (1972; pp. 988–1529). Metaphysics lectures are found in the first two of these volumes, with lectures on rational theology in the third. Lehmann's introduction to all three volumes is also located in this third volume (pp. 1338–72). AA XXIX consists of two volumes: 1st half, part 1 (1980; pp. 1–742) and 1st half, part 2 (1983; pp. 743–1187). Metaphysics lectures are found in the second volume only. Lehmann provides a separate introduction for each of these volumes (pp. 650–71 and pp. 1083–1103, respectively).

⁴ All editions of Baumgarten's *Metaphysica* were published in Halle by Carl Hermann Hemmerde: ¹1739 (292 pp), ²1743 (363 pp), ³1750 (387 pp), ⁴1757 (432 pp), ⁵1763 (432 pp), ⁶1768 (432 pp), and ⁷1779 (432 pp). The 4th edition is reprinted in the Academy Edition: the sections on Empirical Psychology are reprinted at XV 3–54 and the remainder at XVII 5–226. Kant's copy of the 4th edition travelled from Königsberg to Dorpat with G. B. Jäsche (1762–1842) when he assumed a professorship there in 1802. The book then made its way to Göttingen in 1957, where it was deposited with the Academy of Sciences archive in the university library. It was eventually returned to Dorpat/Tartu in 1995. Kant had also used an earlier edition of Baumgarten (presumably the 3rd), but this has not been located.

the sense of doing it for money). Some of the manuscripts seem to be compilations of notes ultimately stemming from different semesters. Some manuscripts appear to have been purchased by a student who then attended the lecture and added marginal notes (thus, adding material from a later semester into notes stemming from an earlier semester). The dates that often appear on the covers of these manuscripts might refer to the actual lectures of origin; or to the date that the notes were copied, or purchased, or used when attending the course. These are some of the difficulties to be acknowledged when using these texts.

Our second observation is that, when using these notes, it is often helpful to consult the relevant reflections that Kant wrote in his copy of Baumgarten. Doing so helps us better understand the notes and it provides a check against any confusions or errors introduced into the notes by a student or copyist (to this end, one should also compare them with other contemporary notes, with Kant's published writings of that period, and with the Baumgarten text itself). Unfortunately, before the relevant reflections can be found, one needs to know which part of Baumgarten is being discussed in the notes, and for this one needs a concordance – something never prepared for the metaphysics lectures in the Academy edition.⁵ Until this gap is remedied, the reader should consult the concordance developed for the English translation of the metaphysics lectures,⁶ which coordinates the paragraphs in Baumgarten with relevant passages in the available notes, as well as coordinating additional topics not found in Baumgarten, but which often occur in the notes.

As for the lectures themselves, two facts are particularly relevant. First, the actual lectures took place four times each week on the main lecture days (Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday) for 45 minutes each lecture, and with a *repetitorium* on Wednesday and Saturday (on Saturday only, beginning WS 1783/84) during which students could ask questions and could in turn be questioned. Kant's metaphysics lectures were always given in the morning (insofar as we know a time) and; beginning with SS 1770, always from 7–8 A. M. Second, professors in the Prussian universities of Kant's day were required to lecture on a textbook, if any existed for that subject, and for his course on metaphysics Kant lectured on Baumgarten's *Metaphysics* for all but a few early semesters in the 1750s. The textbook was in Latin so, although Kant lectured in German, the notes are often quite thick with Latin terms and phrases. In the notes, Kant follows Baumgarten's order of presentation rather faithfully, and the most complete sets of notes

⁵ What is needed is something along the lines of the concordance prepared for the logic lectures (printed at AA XXIV 1085–98).

⁶ Immanuel Kant, *Lectures on Metaphysics*, edited and translated by Karl Ameriks and Steve Naragon, Cambridge University Press 1997, pp. 524–51.

include each of the following six sections: (1) Prolegomenon (or Introduction), which is quite brief in Baumgarten (§§ 1–3), but is often used by Kant to discuss some of his own ideas about the nature of cognition and the nature and history of metaphysics, (2) Ontology (§§ 4–350), (3) Cosmology (§§ 351–500), (4) Empirical Psychology (§§ 501–739), (5) Rational Psychology (§§ 740–99), and (6) Natural Theology (§§ 800–1000).⁷

There are sixteen sets of metaphysics notes of whose existence we have at least mention (see Table #1).⁸ Seven of these sets are still extant: the second half of *an-Pölitz 3.2*, *Dohna-Wundlacken 4*, *Herder 4*, *Mrongovius 3*, *von Schön 2*, *von Schön 3*, and *Volckmann 3*. The others are lost or destroyed; of these, *Vigilantius 3* was preserved in a hand-written copy, and fragments of text from five others are preserved in part in published form: *an-Königsberg 5*, *an-Korff*, *an-Pölitz 1*, the first half of *an-Pölitz 3.2*, and *Rosenhagen*. Of the remaining four manuscripts, no known text has been preserved: *an-Reicke 6*, *Motherby 1*, *Nicolai 2*, and *Willudovius*.⁹

⁷ Kant also used the empirical psychology portion of Baumgarten's metaphysics text for the anthropology lectures that he offered every winter semester for the last 24 years of his teaching career, and he used the natural theology portion of Baumgarten as a text for his lectures on natural or rational theology (taught four times: 1774, 1783/84, 1785/86, and 1787).

⁸ The names used here are from a proposed standardized list for all the lecture Nachlaß, stemming from work done at the Kant Archive in Marburg. Manuscripts are identified by the name of a person or location; some also have the "anonymous" (or "an-") prefix attached, and some have a number suffix. The name is that of the earliest discoverable individual who either wrote the notes or else owned or used them. If no such individual is identifiable, we use the location where the manuscript was originally or is still housed (e. g., Königsberg). If there is good reason to believe that the individual attended the relevant lectures and that he possessed or was in the process of writing the manuscript at that time, then we omit the "anonymous-" prefix. The numbers occasionally suffixed to a name indicate that more than one lecture manuscript is attributed to that source. When two or more sets of notes are bound together, they are distinguished by decimals (e. g. *an-Pölitz 3.1* is on logic, followed in that same volume by *an-Pölitz 3.2* on metaphysics). The letter/number system used in the Academy edition stems from Heinze, who used the first letter of the manuscript's location (H = Hamburg, K = Königsberg, L = Leipzig) followed by a number.

⁹ We know very little of these four manuscripts. *An-Reicke 6* has on its title-page: "Collegium des Herrn Professor Kant über die Metaphysik," and was last housed in the University Library at Königsberg (ms 2586). *Motherby 1* is thought to have stemmed from William Motherby (1776–1847), the son of Kant's dinner companion Robert Motherby and who matriculated at the Albertina on March 8, 1792. The notes were supposedly from 1792/93, and consisted of about 300 narrowly written pages. They were last reported as being in the private possession of the Motherby family. *Nicolai 2* has on its title-page "Collegium der Metaphysik bey Kant nach der Nachschrift des Herrn Prorektor Nicolai.," with a closing date of March 29, 1776. It consists of two volumes (136 pp and 485 pp) and was last in the possession of the Dohna-Schlobitten family. It was presumably written or owned by Carl Ferdinand Nicolai (1752?-1802), who matriculated on June 21, 1770. *Willudovius*, a 600 page manuscript, has on its title-page: "Metaphysik vorgetragen von Herrn Professor Immanuel Kant nach Baumgartens Lehrbuch: B. Willudovius.," it was last housed at the Ma-

Three of these manuscripts almost certainly stem from the same original set of notes: *an-Korff*, *an-Pölitz 1*, and *Rosenhagen*. Finally, there is indirect evidence that a seventeenth set of notes on metaphysics was owned by Kant's friend Theodor Gottlieb von Hippel (1741–96), as well as some possibility that an eighteenth set of notes was owned by Gottlob Benjamin Jäsche (1762–1842), the editor of Kant's logic notes (1800).¹⁰

While some of these notes have been widely available for more than a century, a few have only recently been located and made public. Parts of *an-Pölitz 1* and *an-Pölitz 3.2* were published in Pölitz¹¹ (1821); fragments and larger sections of *an-Königsberg 5*, *an-Korff*, *Rosenhagen*, and the unpublished parts of the Pölitz notes appeared in Heinze¹² (1894); fragments from *Herder* were published in Menzer¹³ (1911); and *Dohna-Wundlacken 4* was published in Kowalewski¹⁴ (1924). But two important sets of notes – *Mrongovius* and *Vigilantius* – significant in both their length and content, as well as in their provenance, became widely available only upon their publication in vol. XXIX of the Academy edition (1983).¹⁵

rienstiftgymnasium at Stettin, and was written or owned presumably by August Ludwig Bogislaus Willudovius (Wildowski), who matriculated at the Albertina on March 14, 1791.

¹⁰ The evidence we have of the Hippel notes is an anonymously written letter sent from Königsberg and dated December 28, 1780, that appeared in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* and claimed that passages in part two of Hippel's *Lebensläufe* were being lifted from Kant's metaphysics lectures; see the materials gathered in Anke Lindemann-Stark, *Kants Vorlesungen zur Anthropologie in Hippels "Lebensläufen"*. Magisterarbeit Marburg/Lahn 1990, pp. 1–7. As for Jäsche, he writes in the preface to the published *Logic* that he "will edit and publish a Kantian metaphysics, for which he already has the manuscript [*Handschrift*], as soon as he is able" (IX 10). Such a book was advertised as *Metaphysik, zum Handbuche für Vorlesungen*, prepared by J. B. Jäsche, Königsberg 1802. Karl Morgenstern, the recipient of Jäsche's various books and papers, reports that this book never appeared, however, "because closer inspection of the manuscript found that the essentials were already contained in Kant's critical works. Kant's handwriting consists only of explanatory and critical notes in Baumgarten's *Metaphysics*" (Karl Morgenstern, *Dorptische Beyträge für Freunde der Philosophie, Litteratur und Kunst*. Dorpat/Leipzig 1821, Bd. 3.2., p. 485).

¹¹ Karl H. Ludwig Pölitz (ed.), *Immanuel Kant: Vorlesungen über Metaphysik*. Zum Druck befördert von dem Herausgeber der Kantischen Vorlesungen über philosophische Religionslehre. Nebst einer Einleitung, welche eine kurze übersicht der wichtigen Veränderungen der Metaphysik seit Kant enthält. Erfurt 1821. (The preface is reprinted at AA XXVIII 1511–14.)

¹² Max Heinze: *Vorlesungen Kants über Metaphysik aus drei Semestern*, Leipzig 1894.

¹³ Paul Menzer, *Kants Lehre von der Entwicklung in Natur und Geschichte*, Berlin 1911.

¹⁴ Arnold Kowalewski (ed.), *Die philosophischen Hauptvorlesungen Immanuel Kants. Nach den aufgefundenen Kollegheften des Grafen Heinrich zu Dohna-Wundlacken*. München/Leipzig 1924 [Reprint: Hildesheim 1965].

¹⁵ Fragments from *Vigilantius* also appeared in Arnoldt (1894/1909) and Schlapp (1901). See Rudolf Malter, "Rezension zu Band XXVIII der Akademie-Ausgabe von Kant's gesammelte Schriften, hrsg. v. Gerhard Lehmann." In: *Kant-Studien* 65 (1974), 214–18 for a brief overview of these texts.

Table 1: The Metaphysics Notes

	Acad. Ed.	Manuscript	Date	Available	Published
(1) an-Königsberg 5	K2	NA (Königsberg)	early 90s?	P*, O*, C*, EP*, RP, NT	Arnoldt 1894; Heinze 1894; Schlapp 1901; XXVIII 709–816
(2) an-Korff	K1	NA (Königsberg)	mid-1770s?	P, O*, C*, EP*	Erdmann 1883/1884; Arnoldt 1894; Heinze 1894; XXVIII 171–91
(3) an-Pölitz 1	L1	NA (Leipzig)	mid-1770s?	O*, C, EP, RP, NT	Pölitz 1821; Heinze 1894 XXVIII 177–81, 185–91, 195–350
(4) an-Pölitz 3.2	L2	Leipzig	1790/91?	P, O, C*, EP, RP, NT*	Pölitz 1821; Heinze 1894 XXVIII 531–610
(5) an-Reicke 6		NA (Königsberg)			
(6) Dohna-Wundlacken 4	Dohna	Bentheim	1792/93	P, O, C, EP, RP, NT	Kowalewski 1924; XXVIII 615–702
(7) Herder 4	Herder	Berlin	1762–64	P, O, C, EP, RP, NT	Menzer 1911; Irmischer 1964; XXVIII 5–55, 137–38, 143–60, 843–931
(8) Motherby 1		NA	1792/93?		
(9) Mrongovius 3	Mrongovius	Gdansk	1782/83	P, O*, C, EP, RP	XXIX 747–940
(10) Nicolai 2		NA	1775/76		
(11) Rosenhagen	H	NA (Hamburg)	mid-1770s?	P, O*, EP*	Heinze 1894; XXVIII 171–91
(12) von Schön 2	von Schön	Berlin	late 80s?	P, O*	XXVIII 463–524
(13) von Schön 3		Berlin	late 80s?	P*, O*	
(14) Vigilantius 3	K3, Arnoldt	Torun (copy)	1794/95	P, O*, EP*, RP*, NT*	Arnoldt 1894; Schlapp 1901; XXVIII 821–34, 837–38; XXIX 945–1040
(15) Volckmann 3	Volckmann	Berlin / Göttingen	1784/85	P, O*, RP, NT*	XXVIII 355–459
(16) Willudovius		NA (Stettin)	early 90s?		

Abbreviations: P = Prolegomena, O = Ontology, C = Cosmology, EP = Empirical Psychology, RP = Rational Psychology, NT = Natural Theology, * = fragments, an = anonymous, NA () = not available (last known location).

Problems to watch for in the Academy edition of the metaphysics notes

The Academy edition of the metaphysics lectures is not an easy work to consult. The introductions (found at XXVIII 1338–72 and XXIX 1083–1103) ramble and often only hint at information, the many abbreviations used by Lehmann in his apparatus are often difficult to decode, and there is no proper bibliography. Perhaps most exasperating is the absence of any summarizing paragraph or table that quickly informs the reader of the available notes and of their scope. Before discussing the individual sets of notes, four general points should be mentioned: the reliability of Lehmann's presentation of the notes (especially as discussed in his "Textänderungen und Lesarten" apparatus), Lehmann's editorial endnotes, the marginalia found in the notes, and the abbreviations used by the notetakers or copyists.¹⁶

The notes as presented in the Academy edition need to be read always with an eye to the "Textänderungen und Lesarten" apparatus found at the end of the volumes (XXVIII 1450–1500; XXIX 1148–85), for a great deal of useful information lies buried there. Unfortunately, this information is not entirely reliable, especially in vol. XXIX, where one finds on average one to two errors per Academy page of notes for *Mrongovius*, and about three errors per page for *Vigilantius*. Many of these errors are more annoying than they are misleading, but they tend to make the entire apparatus problematic.¹⁷

Lehmann also provides explanatory endnotes on the texts (XXVIII 1373–1424; XXIX 1104–47). These endnotes suffer from the same sort of errors that infect the "Textänderungen und Lesarten" apparatus, but they are often quite helpful, and without them many of Kant's references would remain opaque to many modern readers. The fundamental problem with these explanatory notes, however, is that they seem to be guided more by inclination than by any obvious principle. For instance, the *an-Pölitz 1* text receives only one explanatory reference to Baumgarten's *Metaphysics*, while the shorter *Volckmann* text receives some twenty references. Similarly, a great many parallel passages exist between the lecture notes and Kant's published writings, yet only a handful of these are ever noted, and it is wholly unclear why Lehmann notes these rather than others. In general, *Herder* and *Mrongovius* are most heavily annotated, *Vigilantius* and *an-Königsberg 5* less so, and the rest hardly at all. Of course, to properly gloss these texts would be an immense task, and likely the work of more than a single scholar.

¹⁶ Many of these problems have been discussed at length elsewhere. See, for instance, Norbert Hinske, "Die Kantausgabe der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und ihre Probleme." In: *il cannocchiale* 3 (1990), 247–52.

¹⁷ For a list of these errors, see the linguistic notes in Ameriks/Naragon (1997).

It is only from the “Textänderungen und Lesarten” that one learns that some of the text in the notes was in fact written down in the margins. That the notes themselves are not clearly marked for marginalia is no small matter, since marginalia as such are always ambiguous: they might be contemporary additions by the same author — say, from a *repetitorium* later in the week — or an accidentally omitted passage, or they might be additions or comments made during a later semester (by the same or a different author), or they might even be comments added by some later user of the notes and in a manner wholly separate from the context of Kant’s classroom. It is important to know when the text is marginalia, and whether there is a sign inserting it into the main body of the text, and whether it is written in the same hand as the other notes. Lehmann only sporadically offers this information, and then occasionally gets it wrong. In general, there are a great many marginalia in these notes, a fact not at all apparent from the presentation of the notes on the page.

Finally, nearly all of the notes use some abbreviations, and most use a great many. Lehmann’s occasional indications in the “Textänderungen und Lesarten” that some word or other is abbreviated can mislead the reader into thinking that such abbreviations are rare, when in fact they are commonplace. Indeed, some of Lehmann’s more unusual misreadings result from mistaking one abbreviation for another — for example, misreading an “L” (= Logik) for an “M” (= Metaphysik).¹⁸

What follows are brief summaries of what to look for in each of the available sets of notes, presented in the same order as given in the table of lectures (above).

Anonymous-Königsberg 5 [K₂ / XXVIII 709–816]

Date: early 1790s?

This manuscript, once housed in the Königsberg University Library (Ms. 1731), was studied and in part transcribed by Heinze¹⁹ (1894),

¹⁸ As an example, frequently used abbreviations in the *Mrongovius* manuscript include the following: A = Autor (i. e. Baumgarten); Erf. = Erfahrung; Erk. = Erkenntnis; dh. = durch; h. = -heit; k. = -keit; K./k. = keine; Kenntnis; L./l. = logisch; M = Mensch/en; R = rein/en, Regel; s. = sein/e/er/en/em; sd = sind; SW = sinnliche Welt; θ [Greek “theta”] = Gott; trscdt = transcendent; trscdtal = transcendental; Urs = Ursprung; v. = von; V = Vernunft, Verstand, Vollkommenheit; Vern = Vernunft; Verst = Verstand; w = weiter; W = Welt; Wissenschaft.

¹⁹ Max Heinze, *Vorlesungen Kants über Metaphysik aus drei Semestern*, Leipzig 1894 [= *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, vol. 14 (pp. 479–728)].

Arnoldt²⁰ (1894/1909), Schlapp²¹ (1901), and Kowalewski²² (1944–45). A quarto volume of 294 pages, it was lost in the bombing or aftermath of WW II. On the endpaper: “Immanuel Kants Vorlesungen über die Metaphysic”; below and to the right of this, in the corner: “im Winter 1794.” – all written in the same hand as the notes themselves. The notes are legible but crowded, and with many abbreviations.²³

Included in the Academy edition are fragments from the Prolegomena, Ontology, Cosmology, and Empirical Psychology, interspersed with Heinze’s italicized commentary (XXVIII 709–50; partial reprint of Heinze 1894, 592–648); Rational Psychology (XXVIII 753–75; reprint of appendix IV in Heinze 1894, 679–97); Natural Theology (XXVIII 775–812; reprint of appendix V in Heinze 1894, 698–727); and a short fragment from the Empirical Psychology on pleasure and displeasure, interspersed with Schlapp’s italicized commentary (XXVIII 815–16; reprint of Schlapp 1901, 389–91).

Additional text from this manuscript can be found in at least two other places: Arnoldt (1894/1909) contains fragments from the Prolegomena (p. 103) and Cosmology (pp. 126–30) that do not overlap with Heinze’s selections, and Kowalewski (1944–45) contains a long fragment from the Cosmology (ms. 416–20) that partially replicates material in Arnoldt (1894/1909) and Heinze (1894), but which, unlike them, appears to be a continuous fragment (primarily devoted to the antinomies).

These notes probably stem from WS 1791/92 or WS 1792/93 (the same semester as the Dohna notes). The date on the endpaper – Winter 1794 – suggests either WS 1793/94 or WS 1794/95; but it can’t be the former, since Kant didn’t teach metaphysics that semester, and it is not likely the latter, since the notes differ so widely from *Vigilantius*, which almost certainly comes from WS 1794/95.

Anonymous-Korff & Rosenhagen [K₁ & H / XXVIII 171–91]

Date: mid-1770s?

An-Korff, once part of the Gotthold Collection of the Königsberg University Library, was studied and in part transcribed by Erdmann²⁴ (1883,

²⁰ Emil Arnoldt, *Kritische Exkurse im Gebiete der Kantforschung* (part 2). Vol. 5 of *Gesammelte Schriften*, edited by Otto Schöndörffer, 11 vols., Berlin 1907–1909 [Original publication: Königsberg 1894].

²¹ Otto Schlapp, *Kants Lehre vom Genie und die Entstehung der “Kritik der Urteilskraft”*, Göttingen 1901.

²² Arnold Kowalewski, *Kant-Volksausgabe*, 5 volumes projected, 1st volume typeset and extant. Königsberg 1944–45 [Unpublished. Private possession of Professor Sabina Kowalewski].

²³ Arnoldt (1894/1909, 38–9), Heinze (1894, 506–7).

²⁴ Benno Erdmann, “Eine unbeachtet gebliebene Quelle zur Entwicklungsgeschichte Kants.” In: *Philosophische Monatshefte* 19 (1883), 129–44. *Ibid.*, “Mittheilungen über Kant’s me-

1884), Arnoldt (1894/1909), and Heinze (1894). *Rosenhagen* was last owned by Dr. Albrecht Krause of Hamburg. Both manuscripts are now lost, and the text found at XXVIII 171–91 consists of reprints from Erdmann (*an-Korff* only) and Heinze (both manuscripts).²⁵ A comparison of *an-Korff*, *an-Pölitz 1*, and *Rosenhagen* suggests that they all share a common ancestral manuscript.²⁶ Consequently, Heinze's selections preserve text from several sets of notes at once when he provides variant readings. What is listed from Heinze is identified in the Academy edition as belonging instead to "L1" (*an-Pölitz 1*).

An-Korff was a quarto volume of 443 pages. On the spine: "P. Kants Metaphysic"; on the first side of the endpaper, at the bottom right: "kostet: 3 rthl." and below this, in the same hand: "C. C. v. Korff." The notes were written and paginated in a different hand, in large and legible script, and without abbreviations. So it appears that von Korff (whose closer identity has not been determined) bought this manuscript for three Reichsthaler.²⁷ *Rosenhagen* was a quarto volume of 111 pages. On its title-page: "Immanuel Kants ordentl. Prof. der Logic und Metaphysic Vorlesungen über Baumgartens Metaphysic". To the left, under this heading: "Königsberg am 5. Junii 1788". To the right: "Carl Gottf. Christian Rosenhayn aus Hirschberg in Schlesien". The handwriting is legible but compact. It is likely that June 5, 1788 (a Thursday, and falling in the middle of the summer semes-

taphysischen Standpunkt in der Zeit um 1774." In: *Philosophische Monatshefte* 20 (1884), 65–97.

²⁵ A great many of the short fragments scattered throughout Heinze are not reprinted in Lehmann, and none of the minor fragments in Arnoldt (1894/1909, 47–48, 53, 58, 60, 65–68).

²⁶ Erdmann noted the close correspondence between *an-Korff* and Pölitz's published version of *an-Pölitz 1*, and concluded that they stemmed from two separate auditors taking notes during the same semester (Erdmann 1883, 135). Carl du Prel (ed.), *Immanuel Kants Vorlesungen über Psychologie. Mit einer Einleitung: "Kants mystische Weltanschauung"*. Leipzig 1889, lxiv, 96 pp. (Reprint: Pforzheim 1964) reported that the psychology section of *Rosenhagen* was in near verbatim agreement with the corresponding section in the published *an-Pölitz 1* (1889, ix). Arnoldt argued, contrary to Erdmann, that the close agreements suggested instead a common *textual* source (1894/1909, 62–71), which Heinze confirmed after a more thorough comparison of *Rosenhagen*, the Ontology section of *an-Pölitz 1*, and *an-Korff*, reporting that there were too many exact agreements for the notes to stem from separate notetakers. On the other hand, their differences made it unlikely that all three stemmed from a common fourth manuscript, or that two stemmed from the remaining third. The most plausible explanation, Heinze argued, was that they ultimately stem from some single set of notes, with a closer relationship between *an-Korff* and *Rosenhagen* than between either of them and *an-Pölitz 1* (1894, 489–98).

²⁷ For comparison, it cost four Reichsthaler to attend a private lecture (with the option of repeating the course once without cost). Kant's metaphysics lectures, at the time these notes would have been written, were already being given publicly, that is, for free.

ter), has to do with the manuscript's acquisition or copying date, and not the semester from which it issued.²⁸

Included in the Academy edition is the whole of the Prolegomena (XXVIII 171–77; a reprint of appendix I in Heinze 1894, 663–69),²⁹ a selection on space and time from the Ontology (XXVIII 177–81; a reprint of appendix II in Heinze 1894, 670–74); short fragments from the Ontology, interspersed with Heinze's italicized commentary (XXVIII 185–91; partial reprint of Heinze 1894, 520–31); short fragments from the Ontology and Cosmology, interspersed with Erdmann's commentary (XXVIII 1518–27; partial reprint of Erdmann 1884, 73–97); and, hidden away in the apparatus, a short fragment on the *Gegenbildungsvermögen* from the Empirical Psychology (XXVIII 1471) as preserved in Erdmann (1883, 133 n). These reprints appear to be reliable, and Lehmann includes in his apparatus the variant readings marked in Heinze.

Anonymous-Pölitz 1 [L₁ / XXVIII (171–77), 177–81, 185–91, 195–350]

Date: mid-1770s?

Along with *an-Pölitz 3.2*, Karl Pölitz (1772–1838) used selections from this set of notes for his 1821 publication of Kant's metaphysics lectures. Pölitz published the Cosmology, Psychology, and Natural Theology sections of this set of notes, along with the Prolegomena and Ontology sections of *an-Pölitz 3.2* (see below). Those portions of the notes used by Pölitz were lost, and the remaining sections were copied in part by Heinze (1894) before they too were lost. None of the original manuscript is presently available, and what we know of it comes primarily from Heinze, who reports that it was a quarto volume of 157 pages, without title page and unpaginated, but with "P. Kants Metaphysik" on the spine. The handwriting is legible and without abbreviations, also with blank spaces where, apparently, the copyist was unable to read a word, and so left blank for later insertion; occasionally an entire line is missing, or a word is written twice (1894, 486–7).

AA XXVIII 171–81 consists of two extended portions from the Prolegomena and Ontology that were preserved by Heinze (1894) in his first two appendices. Lehmann's presentation of Heinze's first appendix (1894, 663–69) makes it appear as though it comes from L1 (*an-Pölitz 1*), but

²⁸ Heinze (1894, 487–9).

²⁹ Lehmann presents this as part of *an-Pölitz 1*, but Heinze bases the selection on *Rosenhagen*, with variant readings from *an-Korff* (1884, 663), and he also reports that *an-Pölitz 1* does not have a Prolegomena (491). Lehmann acknowledges this in his introduction (1972; XXVIII 1364–65).

Heinze tells us that they are “nach H [*Rosenhagen*] mit Varianten aus K1 [*an-Korff*]” (1894, 663), and also that L1 does not have a Prolegomena (491). So AA XXVIII 171–77 is actually from *Rosenhagen* and *an-Korff*, and related to *an-Pölitz 1* only to the extent that all three of these manuscripts most likely share a common source. Heinze’s second appendix, reprinted at XXVIII 177–81, transcribes a passage on space and time from the Ontology section. Heinze reports that this text “follows all three manuscripts H [*Rosenhagen*], K1 [*an-Korff*], L1 [*an-Pölitz 1*]. The variants are indicated exactly” (1894, 670). AA XXVIII 185–91 is a careful reprint of scattered passages from the Ontology section preserved by Heinze and interspersed with his comments in italics (the ellipses are Lehmann’s). Lehmann lists (in his “Textänderungen und Lesarten”) very nearly all of the variant readings recorded by Heinze from the three sets of notes in these appendixes and excerpts. Finally, Lehmann reprints those sections of *an-Pölitz 1* published in Pölitz (1821), amending them occasionally with readings suggested by Arnoldt and Heinze: Cosmology (XXVIII 195–221), Empirical Psychology (XXVIII 221–62), Rational Psychology (XXVIII 262–301) and Rational Theology (XXVIII 301–50). The marginal pagination refers to Pölitz (1821). In general, Lehmann’s reprinting of Heinze and Pölitz is fairly reliable; only a few errors are apparent. At 237,38 Lehmann claims to change “Deutungsvermögen” in Pölitz to “Dichtungsvermögen,” when in fact Pölitz reads “Dichtkunstvermögen.” At 249,29 Lehmann claims to be correcting “zulässig” in Pölitz to “zufällig,” when in fact Pölitz already reads “zufällig”; similarly at 272,38 where Lehmann wrongly claims to be changing “vernehmen” in Pölitz to “hernehmen.” These and a handful of similar errors are indeed minor, although they foreshadow some of the sloppiness to come in vol. XXIX.

Anonymous-Pölitz 3.2 [L₂ / XXVIII 531–610]

Date: WS 1790/91?

Along with *an-Pölitz 1* (see above), Karl Pölitz also used selections from this set of notes for his 1821 publication of Kant’s metaphysics lectures, namely, the Prolegomena and Ontology. As with *an-Pölitz 1*, the pages used by Pölitz for his publication are missing, although the remainder is fortunately still available at the university library at Leipzig (cataloged as: Rep VI 42 c). The manuscript is in a quarto volume, consisting of two sets of notes, all paginated and written in the same hand: 136 pages of notes from Kant’s logic lectures (of which pp. 9–18 are missing), and 55 pages of metaphysics notes, of which only the Cosmology, Psychology, and Natural Theology sections remain (pp. 1–82 are missing, p. 138 is blank other than a heading). On the title page: “Logik und Metaphysik / von Kant / Ein

Collegium ann. 1798 nachgeschrieben”; a “1789” is written in darker ink over the “1798”. The wide margins contain occasional marginalia that Pölitz believed was written by a second hand during a later semester (1821, v; XXVIII 1512), although Heinze thought it was likely written by the same hand as wrote the main body of the notes, but at a later date (1894, 502). Most of the marginalia are in a darker ink, often smaller, and are clearly written at a different time from the main text; there are also marginalia written around earlier marginalia.

In the Academy edition, Lehmann reprints the Prolegomena and Ontology as they were published in Pölitz (XXVIII 531–77; marginal pagination refers to Pölitz), and then offers his own transcription of the remaining fragment from the Cosmology (XXVIII 581–3; ms 83–7), Empirical Psychology (XXVIII 583–90; ms 87–95), Rational Psychology (XXVIII 590–94; ms 95–105),³⁰ and Natural Theology (XXVIII 595–609; ms 105–38) – here the marginal pagination refers to the manuscript. The Cosmology fragment is missing at least one page at the beginning (it begins mid-sentence), although the few pages devoted to the cosmology correspond to the very beginning of Baumgarten’s discussion, so it is likely that only one page is missing (most likely the backside of the last sheet containing Ontology notes). On the other hand, there is a great deal of material missing near the end of the Cosmology (text corresponding to Baumgarten §§ 384–500), although there is no indication of missing pages between the Cosmology and the Psychology sections. The Psychology section is also quite brief, although it more or less covers the full scope of Baumgarten. The Natural Theology breaks off at the discussion of “Moraltheologie” – a break stemming, Heinze assumes, from the student or copyist quitting prematurely, rather than Kant ending his lectures just as he was to begin discussion of a topic that held such great interest for him (1894, 503).³¹

There is good reason to believe that the “Einleitung” printed at AA XXVIII 531–40 actually belongs to the set of logic notes that are bound in front of the *an-Pölitz* 3.2 metaphysics notes. These logic notes, paginated from 1 to 136, are missing pp. 9–18. This is where one would expect a brief introduction and history of philosophy, which is precisely what we find at XXVIII 531–40. Pölitz (1821) originally introduced this insertion, presumably inadvertently, but in any event without indicating it. Heinze

³⁰ The Rational Psychology was also printed as Appendix III of Heinze (1894, 675–78). Lehmann made use of the manuscript, and he notes some corrections to Heinze.

³¹ Lehmann suggests that only “Moral” is found in the manuscript, and then only as a catchword at the bottom of ms 137 (1972; XXVIII 1482), but his set of photocopies included ms 138, blank except for “Moraltheologie” written at the top (along with the page number). The following page is unnumbered and blank, other than “Moraltheologie” again written at the top.

noted the missing pages in the logic notes (1894, 503), and even compared these pages with the corresponding section in the published Jäsche logic to highlight their close similarity (pp. 567–8), but in the end accepted them as part of the metaphysics notes (pp. 591–2). Some seventy years later, Lehmann reported that he could not find any gap in the text, and claimed that the “missing pages” were best explained as a pagination error, thus continuing to include them with the metaphysics notes (1966; AA XXIV 979). As Stark³² has since pointed out, however, there is indeed a gap at XXVIII 509,28, and the missing pages (XXVIII 531–40) should be inserted here.

Pölitz claimed in his preface to have made no changes to the text other than correcting poor punctuation and a few other minor items: “thus the reader has in fact on every printed line the true Kant” (1821, vii). But it appears that Pölitz altered the text rather more than he claimed. Apart from inserting the passage from the logic notes, he also either omitted or included without comment whatever marginalia he found;³³ Heinze also notes that he omitted passages from the Natural Theology (1894, 492); and both Erdmann (1883, 135) and Heinze (1894, 492) noticed that all reference to Baumgarten (“the author”) is missing in Pölitz’s published version of *an-Pölitz 1*, which they believed to be editorial (the same is true of *an-Pölitz 3.2*, where references to Baumgarten appear only in those notes not edited by Pölitz).³⁴

Dohna-Wundlacken 4 [Dohna / XXVIII 615–702]

Date: WS 1792/93

This manuscript remains in the possession of the Dohna family. It is a bound quarto volume consisting of 185 pages, with pages numbered apparently by the same hand as wrote the notes, and which corresponds with the marginal pagination found in the Academy edition. The text is quite legible, with widely spaced lines, few abbreviations, and occasional marginalia. The same hand that wrote the notes also wrote the marginalia, as well as the other extant notes bearing Dohna’s name. The text is complete, with no missing pages.

³² Werner Stark, “Neue Kant-Logiken. Zu gedruckten und ungedruckten Kollegheften nach Kants Vorlesungen über Logik”, pp. 156–157, in: Reinhard Brandt and Werner Stark, eds., *Neue Autographen und Dokumente zu Kants Leben, Schriften und Vorlesungen*. Hamburg 1987 [= *Kant-Forschungen*, vol. 1], pp. 123–64.

³³ The extant manuscript fragment has about one marginal note per page (Lehmann groups them together, rather than inserting them near where they are written), so there is some reason to assume that the sections published by Pölitz likewise had marginalia.

³⁴ See also Lehmann’s criticisms of Pölitz’s edition (1972; XXVIII 1364).

Heinrich Ludwig Adolph Graf von Dohna-Wundlacken (1777–1834) matriculated at the Albertina on June 15, 1791, having just turned fourteen. He is the youngest of our known notetakers of metaphysics lectures, and also one of the more industrious, leaving us notes from Kant's anthropology (WS 1791/92, Dohna's first semester), physical geography and logic (both from SS 1792), as well as metaphysics, which he would have heard in his third semester of studies (WS 1793/94). We have every reason to believe that this is indeed the semester from which these notes stem. The title page of the manuscript reads "*Die Metaphysik / nach / den Vorlesungen des HE. Professor / Kant, im Winterh: Jahre 1792/93 von 7–8. / von H. L. A. Dohna / angefangen Montag d 15ten / Octbr. 1792. (Comp. v Baumgarten)*", with "Ende von Kants Metaphysik d 15ten Maerz / 1793" on the last page; these, and the few running entries with dates and days of the week scattered in the body of the text all fit the 1792/93 calendar.³⁵ Most of the entries simply mark the hour (i. e., the hour in the semester), without giving a time, day, or date (Dohna's other notes – which he would have written earlier in his student career – are much more explicit in this regard).

The metaphysics notes were first published by Arnold Kowalewski (1924, 521–631). Lehmann made use of the manuscript in preparing the Academy edition, adding much information on the marginalia and other aspects of the manuscript, as well as transcriptional errors found in Kowalewski (see his "Textänderungen und Lesarten," XXVIII 1482–90). On the whole, Lehmann's reading of *Dohna* appears reliable. His introductory remarks on these notes are found at AA XXVIII 1356–60.

As for content, *Dohna* offers a fairly complete discussion of each section of the metaphysics course: Prolegomenon (XXVIII 615–22; ms 1–19), Ontology (XXVIII 622–56; ms 19–114), Cosmology (XXVIII 656–70; ms 115–37), Empirical Psychology (XXVIII 670–79; ms 138–50), Rational Psychology (XXVIII 679–90; ms 151–65), and Natural Theology (XXVIII 690–704; ms 166–85). At the end of the Ontology (XXVIII 650–56; ms 103–14) is an explicitly critical discussion of the preceding "dogmatic" presentation of ontological matters – the 32nd hour (XXVIII 650,37f.) begins: "We have up to now expounded the ontology dogmatically, i. e., without looking to see from where these a priori propositions arise – we now want to treat them critically."

Many passages bear a strong resemblance to *an-Königsberg 5*, which dates from either this semester or the previous year.

³⁵ For instance, March 15, 1793, fell on a Friday, an appropriate day to end a course of lectures that met Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday. The one exception to the 1792/93 calendar is likely a miswrite by Dohna or else a mistranscription (it is difficult to read). At Ms 85 (AA XXVIII 643) we find: "Dienstag, d. 21...", which doesn't fit for November 1792, although November 27 *would* fit, being a Tuesday.

Herder 4 [XXVIII 5–55, 59–140, 143–66, 843–49, 850–931]

Date: 1762–64

The Herder notes are much more fragmentary than the others available to us. They are also the earliest. Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) matriculated as a theology student at the Albertina on August 10, 1762, and left Königsberg on November 22, 1764. He apparently began attending Kant's metaphysics lectures almost immediately, for we find in his brown notebook, at the top of a page of notes: "with Kant the first time, the 21st August, on pneumatology." This was likely around the time classes resumed after summer break, and there would have been about three weeks left in the semester. Herder's stay in Königsberg overlapped with six semesters at the university (SS 1762 through WS 1764/65). He attended all of Kant's lectures, repeating several of them, and claimed that after each hour he would re-write the lecture notes in his own words, avoiding Kant's own language as much as possible.³⁶ We have notes from all of these lecture topics: physical geography (1763/64 and 1764), logic (date undetermined; Kant lectured on this each semester of Herder's stay), mathematics (1762/63 and/or 1763), metaphysics (1762 and either 1762/63, 1763/64, 1764, or the first part of 1764/65), moral philosophy (1763/64 and/or the first part of 1764/65), and physics (1763 and/or the first part of 1764/65).

Most of the notes are written on loose sheets folded once (thus making a signature of four pages), and these are occasionally nested one inside the other, making unbound signatures of eight, twelve, or sixteen pages. The relevant manuscripts are: two bound notebooks, one blue (NL-Herder XX.188), the other brown (NL-Herder XXVI.5); four signatures showing evidence of having been bound together, and which appear to be fair copies prepared at home (one signature is NL-Herder XXV.41 a, printed at XXVIII 5–14, the other three are cataloged as NL-Kant 19 and printed at XXVIII 15–55); four separate sheets individually cataloged (NL-Herder XXV.38, 39, 40, 41), and a group of 13 fragments, some clearly belonging together and cataloged as a group (NL-Herder XXV.46 a).³⁷

Other than the brown notebook, which appears to have been paginated by Herder, all the pagination was later added by librarians. Many of the notes are written in pencil, without margins, with many corrections, and in a hurried manner such as one would expect of notes written in the lecture hall (this is typical of the notes cataloged as NL-Herder XXV.46 a

³⁶ Suphan (1967, 22: 12–13), as repr. in Rudolf Malter, *Immanuel Kant in Rede und Gespräch*. Hamburg 1990, 59–60.

³⁷ All of these manuscripts are housed at the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz (Berlin-Tiergarten), except for NL-Kant 19, which is found at the archive of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences.

and printed at XXVIII 53–5, 843–931). Others are clearly fair copies prepared at home, although even these typically include many abbreviations, and are rarely ornamented. Two four-page manuscripts (in NL-Herder XXV.46 a) also include unpublished notes from Kant's logic lectures. Other than the text transcribed from the brown and blue notebooks, the marginal pagination found in the Academy edition reflects only the page breaks of the manuscripts, rather than any original pagination marks, and has the disadvantage of hiding the piece-meal nature of these manuscripts.

Prior to the Academy edition, fragments of Herders notes were published in Menzer (1911), and then Irmischer³⁸ published in 1964 all the notes available at that time (all of the above except for NL-Herder XXV.41a, XXV.46 a, and NL-Kant 19). Because the Herder papers passed through various stages of being lost and found, what we find in the Academy edition is somewhat confusing, but with a little care quite useable. His notes are found in the first two parts (1968, 1970) of volume XXVIII. In the 1968 volume, Lehmann included a transcription of NL-Herder XXV.41 a (XXVIII 5–14), NL-Kant 19 (XXVIII 15–53), and NL-Herder XXV.46 a (XXVIII 53–5), XXV.38–41 (XXVIII 137–8, 143–8), XXVI.5 (XXVIII 148–51), and XX.188 (XXVIII 155–66) and a transcription of a handwritten copy of Herder notes prepared by Paul Menzer (XXVIII 59–140, minus the one-page transcription of XXV.41 that Lehmann inserted into the middle of this).³⁹ After this 1968 volume was completed, Lehmann then located the original Herder notes that Menzer had copied (cataloged as NL-Herder XXV.46 a), and so prepared a new transcription of these notes for the 1970 volume (XXVIII 843–931), as well as including additional material from the blue notebook (XXVIII 935–46) and Herder's essay on "Sein" (XXVIII 951–62) – both of which are indeed Herder's and do indeed concern metaphysics, but neither of which can possibly be viewed as notes from Kant's metaphysics lectures, and so do not properly belong in this volume. Because the copy prepared by Menzer was a rough draft unintended for publica-

³⁸ Immanuel Kant, *Aus den Vorlesungen der Jahre 1762 bis 1764, auf Grund der Nachschriften Johann Gottfried Herders*. Köln 1964 [= *Kant-Studien Ergänzungshefte*, vol. 88].

³⁹ Lehmann also inadvertently included in his 1968 transcription of the Menzer copy a page of Menzer's own notes. A comparison of the parallel texts in 1968 (from the Menzer copy) and 1970 (from the original) shows that the text printed at XXVIII 101,3–30 is not replicated in the 1970 volume, and indeed Lehmann notes in his apparatus that the original Herder notes for this text cannot be located. It turns out that the manuscript cannot be located, because it does not exist: the numbered sentences comprising this text appear to be quotations and near-quotations from the Herder notes that Menzer compiled on a sheet of paper (see the texts at XXVIII 887,32; 887,35–36; 888,35–38; 889,2–3; 889,20–21; 889,26; 891,31–33; 892,22–23; 892,31–32; 893,20; 895,6; 895,35–36; 897,18; 898,26; 899,31–33). Menzer's copy is housed at the archive of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences, under NL-Adickes 4.

tion,⁴⁰ the Academy transcription of this copy was made superfluous by the more careful 1970 transcription of the original Herder notes.

In summary, we have a fairly complete set of notes from Herder. If we ignore the transcription of the Menzer copy (in the 1968 volume), as well as the material that is clearly not from Kant's metaphysics lectures (XXVIII 935–62 in the 1970 volume), we have the following line-up: Prolegomena (XXVIII 5–7, 155–60),⁴¹ Ontology (XXVIII 7–39; 53–55, 843–9),⁴² Cosmology (XXVIII 39–53),⁴³ Empirical Psychology (XXVIII 143–4, 850–86, 924–31),⁴⁴ Rational Psychology (XXVIII 144–50, 886–906),⁴⁵ Natural Theology (XXVIII 137–8, 150–1, 906–23).⁴⁶

There are eight points at which the Herder notes overlap, suggesting that either we have notes from two separate semesters, or else two drafts from the same set of notes. Most likely each of these explanations are correct for one or more of the overlaps. It is easiest to describe the overlapping texts in terms of the corresponding sections (§§) in the Baumgarten textbook. The number following “46 a/” is the item number I have given to the fourteen individual fragments found in NL-Herder XXV.46 a. More work needs to be done investigating these overlapping texts.

Overlap	Length and location of texts, including location of overlapping texts	Evaluation
§§ 7–20	XXV.46 a/14 (§§ 7–20), XXVIII 53–5. XXV.41 a (§§ 1–36), XXVIII 5–14; here: pp. 7–14.	No closely related text. XXV.46 a/14 appears to be written in the classroom, while XXV.41 a appears to be a draft prepared at home.
§§ 180–239	XXV.46 a/1 (§§ 180–239), XXVIII 843–9. NL-Kant 19 (§§ 69–450), XXVIII 15–53; here: pp. 22–30.	Texts closely related. XXV.46 a/1 appears to be written in the classroom; NL-Kant 19 appears to be a clean draft prepared at home.

⁴⁰ Those passages published by Menzer (1911) clearly were checked again against the original notes, as they are much more accurate than the rough copy as reproduced in Lehmann (1968).

⁴¹ Manuscripts: NL-Herder XXV 41 a (28: 5–7), XX 188 (XXVIII 155–60).

⁴² Manuscripts: NL-Herder XXV 41 a (XXVIII 8–14), NL-Kant 19 (XXVIII 15–39), NL-Herder XXV.46 a (XXVIII 53–55, 843–9).

⁴³ Manuscript: NL-Kant 19 (XXVIII 39–53).

⁴⁴ Manuscripts: NL-Herder XXV.38 (XXVIII 143–4), XXV.46 a (XXVIII 850–86, 924–31).

⁴⁵ Manuscripts: NL-Herder XXV.39 (XXVIII 144–5), XXV.40 (XXVIII 145–8), XXVI.5 (XXVIII 148–50), XXV.46 a (XXVIII 886–906).

⁴⁶ Manuscripts: NL-Herder XXV.41 (XXVIII 137,30-38,29), XXVI.5 (XXVIII 150–51), XXVV.46 a (XXVIII 906–23).

Overlap	Length and location of texts, including location of overlapping texts	Evaluation
§§ 531–48	XXV.46 a/2 (§§ 531–620), XXVIII 850–67; here: pp. 850–3. XXV.46 a/12 (§§ 516–48), XXVIII 924–8; here: pp. 926–8.	No similar text, different examples. Likely from two semesters.
§§ 589–91	XXV.38 (§§ 589–91), XXVIII 143–4. XXV.46 a/2 (§§ 531–620), XXVIII 850–67; here: pp. 859–60.	No similar text. Likely from two semesters.
§§ 593–644	XXV.46 a/2–3 (§§ 531–649), XXVIII 850–75; here: pp. 860–75. XXV.46 a/13 (§§ 593–644), XXVIII 928–31; here: pp. 928–31.	No similar sentences or examples.
§§ 742–45	XXV.39 (§§ 742–48), XXVIII 144–5. XXV.40 (§§ 742–45), XXVIII 145–8.	No similar sentences or examples, but could easily stem from the same semester. XXV.39 has all the appearances of notes from the lecture hall, while XXV.40 appears to be prepared at home, perhaps in the context of a repetitorium. Also, unlike the former, the latter does not cite Baumgarten §§.
§§ 796–806	XXVI.5 (§§ 796–806), XXVIII 148–51. XXV.46 a/8–9 (§§ 792–815), XXVIII 901–11; here: pp. 902–11.	Some similar text, many different examples. XXVI.5 stems from 1762; XXV.46 a/8–9 must be later.
§§ 844	XXV.41 (§§ 844–46), XXVIII 137–38; here: p. 137. XXV.46 a/10 (§§ 815–44), XXVIII 911–922; here: pp. 921–2.	No clear connection between texts.

Mrongovius 3 [XXIX 747–940]

Date: WS 1782/83

This manuscript, housed in the Biblioteka PAN in Gdansk (Ms. 2214), was given up for lost in 1972 when Lehmann wrote his introduction to vol. XXVIII, but then was rediscovered and included in vol. XXIX, along with the newly discovered *Vigilantius*. It is a quarto volume of 132 sheets. On the title page: “Metaphysic / vorgetragen / vom / Prof. Imanuel Kant. / nachgeschrieben / von / C. C: Mrongovius. / 1783 d. 4. Febr.” Christoph

Coelestin Mrongovius (1764–1855) matriculated at the Albertina on March 21, 1782. We also have notes written or owned by him on Kant's anthropology, logic (fragmentary), moral philosophy, physics, and rational theology lectures. The metaphysics notes were likely written by Mrongovius himself (although two hands were involved in different sections of the notes, one of which appears to be Mrongovius), and the notes probably stem from the WS 1782/83, although the date on the title-page presents a mystery.⁴⁷

Apart from the missing section on Natural Theology, a large section of the Ontology is missing (there is no text corresponding to Baumgarten, §§ 61–190),⁴⁸ and a few sections of the manuscript were copied out of place and so need re-ordering. On the whole, however, Mrongovius offers a thorough discussion of the topics, and his set of metaphysics notes is the longest currently available.

Unfortunately, as Zelazny and Stark (1987)⁴⁹ have shown, the Academy edition of *Mrongovius* was so mishandled that anyone using it must first overcome several serious hurdles. Lehmann describes the manuscript and what he takes to be its problems at XXIX 1083–89, but many of these problems are in fact of his own creation, stemming primarily from paginational and transcriptional errors. Lehmann introduced two kinds of pagination error into the Academy edition. The first kind probably resulted from Lehmann's photocopied pages falling out of the proper sequence. Although the manuscript is completely paginated in the upper-right corner of each sheet,⁵⁰ Lehmann's copy must not have always (or never) included these numbers. An inspection of the manuscript, or a good film or photocopy of

⁴⁷ What this date refers to is unclear, as it falls on a Tuesday in what is presumably the middle of the winter semester. The manuscript lacks a Natural Theology section, but even if Mrongovius stopped taking notes at this point, it seems unusual that Kant would have devoted the remaining one-third of the semester to this topic. The date for the last repetitorium was Saturday, March 29, and normally the last metaphysics lecture would have occurred the previous day (March 28). Oddly, Arnoldt gives the last class day for metaphysics as Tuesday (!) April 15 (1894/1909, 265); either a miswrite, or else Kant extended his metaphysics lectures without also extending the repetitoria as well. Of the years for which we have dates, only on four other semesters (all of them winter semester, when he lectured on metaphysics) did Kant end the repetitorium *before* the lecture course was over, and these were all by just one week.

⁴⁸ This gap can be remedied by reading the corresponding pages of *Volckmann* (roughly XXVIII 414–28), which presumably stem from 1784/85.

⁴⁹ Miroslav Zelazny and Werner Stark, "Zu Krzysztof Celestyn Mrongovius und seinen Kollegheften nach Kants Vorlesungen." In: Brandt/Stark (1987), pp. 279–92.

⁵⁰ These numbers were likely added by a librarian, and are continuous (there are also two discontinuous pagination series in ink that appear to be contemporary with the notes). The numbers mark the sheets of the manuscript, with recto and verso designating individual pages (e. g., 1, 1', 2, 2'). The marginal pagination provided by Lehmann is of his own devising, and relates to the manuscript only insofar as it marks the page breaks.

it, makes these pagination errors obvious. For example, at XXIX 750,27 the text suddenly jumps from the bottom of ms. 4 to the top of ms. 6, and then back to ms. 4' at 751,5. Thus ms. 6 is inserted into the middle of a sentence running from the bottom of ms. 4 to the top of ms. 4'; Lehmann adds a period at this first break, but splices the sentences together at the second break, resulting in: "Ich muß also ihr ganzes Vermögen suchen kennen zu lernen, // ohne in Verblendung und Irrthümer zu gerathen" instead of: "Endlich die Grenzen, über welche sie nicht schreiten darf, wenn sie ohne Erfahrung urtheilen will, // ohne in Verblendung und Irrthümer zu gerathen." The pages are out of sequence also at 753,14 (jump from 6' to 8'), 755,6 (jump from 10 to 7), and 756,18 (jump from 8–10'). The second sort of pagination error arose when Mrongovius, in copying out his notes, would inadvertently omit a section, then added it later, inserting it at its proper location with a sign – but then Lehmann failed to make the insertion. For instance, a long section copied into the "Prolegomena" section (766,27-767,7 and 769,1-773,9) appears to belong in the Ontology section, and a long section (921,2-937,15) found near the end of the manuscript, and printed by Lehmann in a section titled "Aus einer anderen Fassung," appears to belong in the middle of the Cosmology section (inserted after 864,24).⁵¹

In sum, the proper pagination of the manuscript runs as follows: Introduction (747,1-750,27; 751,5-752,38; 750,27-751,4; 752,38-753,14; 755,6-756,17; 753,14-755,5; 756,18-765,39; 767,8-768,39; 766,1-766,26; 773,10-784,6), Ontology (784,7-822,33; 766,27-767,7; 769,1-773,9; 822,34-848,7), Cosmology (848,8-864,24; 921,2-937,15; 864,25-875,3), Empirical Psychology (875,6-906,29), Rational Psychology (906,30-920,9), unassimilated text (937,17-940,10).

Some of the marginalia also appears to be misinserted in the Academy edition (and, as always, these marginalia go unidentified except in the "Textänderungen und Lesarten" found at the end of the volume). For instance, marginalia printed at 751,19–23 has an insertion sign that Lehmann ignores; this text belongs at 750,4 (inserted after "principien hinzuthun."); similarly, marginalia printed at 751,24–29 should be inserted at 750,5 (after "rein").

The second sort of error is transcriptional. The Mrongovius manuscript contains a great many abbreviations, and these were sometimes misread, with considerable change of meaning. For instance, at 756,3, "L" is misread as "M," changing "Logik" to "Metaphysik"; at 834,19 an 's.' is wrongly expanded as "ist" rather than as "sehe." Various other misreadings: a "2" is misread as a "5" at 749,31, leaving readers to wonder what the remaining

⁵¹ These changes in pagination were closely argued by Zelazny and Stark (1987).

three “Arten von Erkenntnissen” are besides a priori and a posteriori. “2 Phil:” (= “two philosophers”) is wrongly transcribed as “der Philosophie” at 764,10; “einen Schritt” is misread as “keinen Schritt” at 767,35; “durch” is misread as “ohne” at 779,33; and so on. These are errors of someone working too quickly, and with too little proofreading. One striking instance is at 781,35–36, where Lehmann misreads “Speculationen” as “Skepticism,” but then gives the correct reading when referring to this passage in his “Erläuterungen” (XXIX 1108).

von Schön 2 [XXVIII 463–524] and von Schön 3 [unpublished]

Date: Late 1780s?

This 94 page fragment is housed at the archive of the Berlin-Brandenburg Akademie des Wissenschaften (NL.-Kant #17). It consists of seven unbound signatures, each with 16 pages except for the 2nd and 3rd, which have 8 pages each, and the 4th, which has 14.⁵² On the first page of each signature, in the top-right corner, and in the same hand as the notes: “Meta-physic, Pr. Kant. Vol” followed by the number of the signature in Roman numerals. The text is neatly written, with a moderate use of abbreviations; and wide margins with only a few marginalia (written in the same hand).⁵³ The pages are unnumbered, and the marginal pagination in the Academy edition is simply Lehmann’s count of text pages.

Lehmann re-arranges the text without explanation in two places: (1) two manuscript pages (XXVIII 468,26–469,32) are displaced, and should be inserted after XXVIII 466,7 (with or without a paragraph break; none is indicated in the manuscript), (2) five manuscript pages (XXVIII 471,8–474,26), which are found at the very end of the manuscript, should be moved back to the end and identified as a fragment.⁵⁴ Studying the penciled markings on the photocopies that Lehmann used in preparing the Academy edition suggests that his sheets were disordered before he was able to number them; in any event, his silence regarding the re-arranging of the text suggests that it was inadvertent.⁵⁵

⁵² Five of these pages are blank: one in the middle of the first signature, and the four last pages of the last signature.

⁵³ Lehmann describes this manuscript at XXVIII 1369–70. One idiosyncrasy in Lehmann’s preparation of this manuscript is that he treats the first marginalium (written alongside the first paragraph of text, and printed at 463,34–35) as an asterisked footnote, rather than inserting it in the main body of the text with extra line spacing (his usual practice).

⁵⁴ So, if we use the marginal pagination in the Academy Edition, the pages should run: 1–5, 11–12, 6–10, 13–14, 20–89, 15–19.

⁵⁵ Errors like these suggest that he either lacked access to the original manuscript, or else he simply did not bother referring to it. In a similar vein, he notes a textual break at XXVIII 490,9 and suggests that the next page is possibly missing, since the catchword at the bottom of the previous manuscript page is ‘Ratio’, but the first words of the following page are

The text consists of the Prolegomena (XXVIII 463–469; ms 1–12) and most of the Ontology (XXVIII 469–524; ms 13–89), offering a full discussion until around Baumgarten (§319) and the topic of efficient causation. The notes are attributed to Heinrich Theodor von Schön (1773–1856), who matriculated on October 25, 1788. Adickes viewed this manuscript as a copy, with the source lecture occurring sometime in the 1780s.

A short manuscript closely related to *von Schön 2* and familiar to Lehmann, although left unpublished and unmentioned in the Academy edition, is also extant. This is *von Schön 3*, a second fragment from metaphysics notes, also attributed to von Schön, and housed at the Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin (Dep. 35. v. Brünneck #92). It consists of twenty pages, without a title page. This partial set of notes includes the end of a Prolegomena section (about one-half of a page), followed by nineteen pages from the beginning of the Ontology. This Ontology section is identical to *von Schön 2* as printed at XXVIII 469,35–471,14, up until the bottom of ms 2 a, after which the texts agree in order of presentation and material, but not verbatim. The manuscript ends on page 9 a, which is one-third full (corresponding to text printed at XXVIII 482,8).

Vigilantius 3 [Arnoldt or K₃ / XXVIII 821–34, 837–38; XXIX 945–1040]

Date: WS 1794/95

This manuscript, housed in the university library at Torun (Ms. R 631), is a handwritten copy of a manuscript once belonging to the Gotthold collection at the university library at Königsberg, but lost since WW II. The original manuscript may well have been prepared by Johann Friedrich Vigilantius (1757–1823), an older auditor who was a close friend of Kant's near the end of his life and who served as his legal advisor. We also have Vigilantius' notes from Kant's lectures on physical geography (SS 1793) and moral philosophy (WS 1793/94); his notes on logic (SS 1793) are lost. Krauß (1926, 84–5), in examining Vigilantius's notes on moral philosophy, also examined Vigilantius metaphysics notes for comparison, and found that the two manuscripts were identical in format and arrangement, and were written by the same hand; as such, he provides us with the only known description of this manuscript. The original manuscript, a folio volume, had no title page; the first sheet was blank with a title at the top of the first page of text. Each sheet was creased in the middle: on the right

'Der Grund'. Yet one can see from the film, from Lehmann's own set of photocopies, and of course from the manuscript itself, that there is no missing page, and that the odd catchword is perhaps best explained by the copyist switching between Latin and German — 'Ratio' and 'Grund', after all, mean the same thing.

was the text, on the left any marginalia. Pagination was added later, in pencil. There were fewer annotations here than in the moral philosophy notes, and they were shorter. No name of the author or owner could be found on the manuscript. The two sets of notes were also roughly the same length: moral philosophy at 539 pages, metaphysics at 559 pages.

A copy of this manuscript was prepared in 1883 by Rudolf Reicke (1825–1905, a long-time librarian at Königsberg and founder of the *Alt-preußischen Monatschrift*) and two of Reicke's family members – most likely in preparation to publish the notes. Reicke loaned this copy to Emil Arnoldt, from whom we learn that it consisted of “about 550 quarto pages” (1894/1909, 39) and most of those pages used by Arnoldt are now missing, although passages from them are printed in Arnoldt's work.⁵⁶ What is left of this copy is 100 sheets collected into 22 signatures. The last sheet is blank on both sides, resulting in 198 pages of text. A title at the top of the first page of text reads: “Bemerkungen über Metaphysic nach Baumgarten, aus dem Vortrage des HE. Prof. Kant pro 1794/95 / d. 13.t. Oktbr.”. At the end of the manuscript: “20t. Febr.”. Schlapp (1901) presumably made use of the original manuscript, and included passages in his study. The original manuscript consisted of 280 sheets (as evidenced by the marginal pagination that Reicke provided in his copy), which would have printed out to roughly 252 pages in the Academy edition, making it longer even than *Mrongovius* (which runs 189 Academy pages). About 63 percent of the copy sheets are missing.

Lehmann wrongly believed that the Reicke copy was actually prepared by Arnoldt – thus his referring to the manuscript as “Metaphysik Arnoldt.” When Lehmann was preparing vol. XXVIII, he was aware only of the passages preserved in Arnoldt (1894/1909) and Schlapp (1901), and so reprinted these (XXVIII 821–34 and 837–38).⁵⁷ The Reicke copy was then later located at Torun by Rudolf Malter,⁵⁸ and so Lehmann published a transcription of it at XXIX 945–1040 (working from a microfilm), supplementing this with the Arnoldt selections already published in vol. XXVIII whenever this helped fill gaps left by missing sheets. In general, the reprint-

⁵⁶ Heinze was familiar with Arnoldt's work, noting that Arnoldt had a “carefully prepared and collated copy” of *Vigilantius* (1894, 507–8). See Werner Stark's extended discussion of this manuscript's history in “Kantiana in Thorn.” In: *Kant-Studien* 76 (1985), 328–35.

⁵⁷ The marginal pagination here is to Arnoldt (1894/1909) and Schlapp (1901). Italicized text is commentary by Arnoldt and Schlapp. The material in vol. XXVIII reproduces all the passages preserved in Arnoldt (save for a few sentences at p. 120), and reproduces it fairly carefully (although a textual break at the end of 831₁₄ needs to be indicated, and there are minor changes in orthography and punctuation).

⁵⁸ Reported in Rudolf Malter, “Die letzte überlieferte Metaphysik-Vorlesung Kants. Zur Wiederauffindung der Bemerkungen über Metaphysik nach Baumgarten, aus dem Vortrage des HE Prof Kant pro 1794/95.” In: *Kant-Studien* 68 (1977), 464–67.

ing of the Arnoldt selections in vol. XXVIII is more reliable than their reprinting in vol. XXIX, and whenever the marginal pagination is to Arnoldt (i. e., “Ar ###”), the best route is to consult Arnoldt (1894/1909) directly, and the next best is to use the reprint found in vol. XXVIII.

The title page of the notes indicates that they stem from the WS 1794/95 lectures — the next-to-last semester that Kant lectured on metaphysics — and by all accounts this date is correct.⁵⁹ Marginal pagination found in the copy (1 a, 1 b, 2 a, 2 b, etc.) indicates the sheets of the original Vigilantius manuscript. (Note: The marginal pagination in the Academy edition simply counts pages of text in the Reicke copy.) The Reicke copy had sheets (perhaps entire signatures) removed in four places; the remaining text (using the pagination of the original Vigilantius manuscript) is: (1) 1 a–62 a (XXIX 945,1–1001,16; includes the Prolegomena and part of the Ontology),⁶⁰ (2) 66 a–70 a (XXIX 1001,16–1005,13; includes part of the Ontology), (3) 161 a–180 a (XXIX 1009,5–1024,37; includes the latter half of the Empirical Psychology), (4) 203 a–220 a (XXIX 1025,15–1040,4; includes most of the Rational Psychology, possibly missing only the first and last sheets), (5) 279 a–280 a (XXIX 1040,5–33; includes the last page of the Natural Theology). The notes end on 280 a (on the recto side of the sheet); the facing page is blank.

Lehmann notes most (but not all) of the marginal pagination in his apparatus (although with various errors), as well as some (but not all) of the other marginalia. He occasionally inserts marginalia into the text parenthetically without note (cf. 951,8–12, 974,39–975,1). Much of this marginalia, as found in the manuscript, is preceded by: “[Neben am Rand]”, indicating that it was marginalia in the original manuscript, although sometimes there are square-bracketed notes in the body of the text, introducing longer marginalia from the original manuscript.

One example of how Lehmann was capable of proceeding in preparing these notes can be found at XXIX 1025,1–15, where he added two paragraphs preserved in Arnoldt (1894/1909, 147–48) into a gap in the extant manuscript.⁶¹ While this text clearly does belong in this place (the passage

⁵⁹ October 13 and February 20 are the beginning- and end-dates as reported by Arnoldt (1894/1909, 323). Kant ended all his classes early that semester.

⁶⁰ Lehmann fails to note that the text from about eight pages (62 b–66 a) is missing here. The break occurs at XXIX 1001,16 in the middle of a sentence. “Die Metaphysic” (from 62 a of the Vigilantius ms) is at the bottom of the backside of one sheet, and “sieht also, daß hier...” begins the top of the frontside of the next sheet — except that this text stems from the middle of 66 a of the Vigilantius ms. Clearly several sheets of the Reicke copy are missing, although one would never guess this from the Academy edition, which splices together these two sentence-fragments.

⁶¹ A similar insertion at XXIX 1005,13–19 is duly noted and described by Lehmann, although in his “Erläuterungen” (XXIX 1144), rather than in the “Textänderungen und Lesarten,” where one would expect such information.

in Arnoldt overlaps with where the manuscript begins again), it is remarkable that Lehmann does this without noting his insertion. When we turn to the “Textänderung und Lesarten” for this page (at XXIX 1183), we find Lehmann noting that the first syllable of “fideliter” is re-written in the manuscript (Lehmann cites line 20, but he means line 22), he notes his addition of two commas and the presence of the marginalium “202 b” at 1925,26 (he means 1025,28, and the marginalium is actually “203 b”) — yet, rather remarkably, he says nothing about his insertion of two entire paragraphs. Such are the errors piled on top of errors, and unfortunately this is typical of the treatment that both *Mrongovius* and *Vigilantius* receive in vol. XXIX.

Volckmann 3 [XXVIII 355–459]

Date: WS 1784/85

The Volckmann notes consist of seven unbound signatures, totalling 110 pages, 106 of which contain text. At least two signatures are missing from the original manuscript. Of the extant signatures, the first four are housed among the Deposita of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences in the Niedersächsischen Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (#7); the remaining three are housed in the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences archive (Nachlaß-Kant #18).⁶² The pages are unnumbered, and the marginal pagination in the Academy edition simply counts the pages of text. With reference to this marginal pagination, the seven signatures consist of 16 (title page, 3 blank pages, and 12 pages of text, so ms. 1–12), 18 (ms. 13–30), 12 (ms. 31–42), 16 (ms. 43–58), 16 (ms. 59–74), 16 (ms. 75–90), and 16 pages (ms. 91–106). The catchword at the bottom of Ms. 58 (the end of the Göttingen fragment) corresponds with the beginning of Ms. 59 (the beginning of the Berlin fragment). The notes are neatly written, well-spaced, and all in the same hand, with a modest use of abbreviations. On the title page: “Metaphysische Vorlesungen des Herrn Prof: Kant nachgeschrieben im Jahr 1784 und 85 von J. W. Volckmann d. G. G. Be.” [der Gottes Gelehrtheit Beflissener].

The first pages, covering the Prolegomena, are without marginalia and with very few corrections. The later pages have more corrections and insertions (both between the lines and as marginalia), but all is written in the same hand as the main text and almost certainly at the same time. About half of the marginalia are inserted into the text with a sign. Lehmann reproduces these marginalia in a variety of ways: as asterisked footnotes, as

⁶² Lehmann’s description at XXVIII 1369 is of the fragment housed at Göttingen, corresponding to the text printed at XXVIII 355,1–411,29.

unmarked insertions into the text (with or without added parentheses), or as separate paragraphs separated by blank lines (all of which he duly notes in his apparatus).

There is no reason to believe that the manuscript was not written by Johann Wilhelm Volckmann (1766–1836), who matriculated at the Albertina on 13 August 1782 as a theology student (just a few months after Mrongovius), and we have no reason not to view the 1784/85 on the title page as the date of the source lectures. This is almost certainly a fair copy prepared at home for his own use; the pages are unnumbered and the sheets were never bound (although margins were left so that binding was possible). We also have Volckmann's notes from Kant's lectures on physical geography (SS 1785) and natural theology (WS 1783/84); his notes on logic (160 pp) are lost.

The text bears strong affinities with *Mrongovius*. Although consisting of three fragments, these offer fairly complete and smoothly written discussions, and the breaks in the text are clearly the result of pages having been lost. The first fragment covers the Prolegomena (XXVIII 355–90) and Ontology (XXVIII 390–440) sections, breaking off in a discussion of finitude and infinitude (Baumgarten, §§ 246–64). The second (XXVIII 440–50) is from the Rational Psychology (Baumgarten, §§ 740–99), beginning in mid-sentence but clearly near the beginning of this section and continuing to the end. The third (XXVIII 450–59) comes from the first half of the Rational Theology, on the concept of God. Thus, the last third of the Ontology, all of the Cosmology and Empirical Psychology, and the latter part of the Rational Theology are missing.

Concluding Remarks

A great wealth of material exists from Kant's metaphysics lectures, spanning his teaching career from *Herder* in the 1760s to *Vigilantius* in the mid-1790s. The value of these notes lies in several directions: they clarify or develop points made in his major published writings, they consider topics not discussed in any of the published writings at all, they provide much of the philosophical context against which these writings were to be understood, and they offer a new perspective into Kant's intellectual development. The lectures on metaphysics are, by many accounts, the most significant of Kant's lectures. Unfortunately, the editorial treatment received by these lecture notes is in no manner commensurate with their importance, and in several cases they must be consulted with considerable caution. Still, most of these shortcomings are generally manageable by always keeping an eye to Lehmann's apparatus, by consulting the Cambridge translation when using *Mrongovius* or *Vigilantius*, and by keeping in mind the larger Kantian *corpus*. Such precautions should allow us to continue using these valuable texts until that time comes when a new critical edition is issued.