A Kantian Theory of Art Criticism

by

Emine Hande Tuna

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Philosophy
University of Alberta

Abstract

My dissertation explores the role of art criticism within Immanuel Kant's aesthetic theory and its relevance for the particularism-generalism debate in contemporary aesthetics. In doing so, it provides a Kantian answer to the meta-critical question that generated the particularism-generalism divide in the first place, namely whether or not our aesthetic appraisals of artworks are based on natural facts concerning the non-aesthetic properties of those artworks. This is an examination of a neglected area in Kant scholarship since it is standardly assumed that a theory of criticism flies in the face of some of Kant's most central aesthetic tenets, such as his rejection of aesthetic testimony and general objective principles of taste. If art criticism is an enterprise of providing evaluations of artworks supported by reasons, then it is hard to see what the Kantian art critic can do for us. It does not seem to matter whether the critic provides evaluations since we cannot defer to them. Likewise, any reasons the critic provides by referring to the non-aesthetic properties of artworks would seem completely arbitrary in the absence of general principles governing the relation between aesthetic evaluations and non-aesthetic properties.

Nevertheless, the assumption that these Kantian tenets preclude the possibility of art criticism is mistaken and it is my aim to show how this can be. The project has two phases. In the first phase I develop a new interpretation of Kant's theory of artistic beauty. In the second phase I make use of this interpretation to put forward a Kantian account of art criticism, an essentially particularist account which integrates generalist elements. Central to my interpretation is the notion that judgments of perfection, which are non-aesthetic evaluations of artworks' success in meeting or exceeding our expectations regarding works of that kind, inform our aesthetic assessments. It is precisely this underappreciated role of judgments of perception that I exploit in making room for Kantian art criticism. Critics' reasons are not arbitrary because these reasons, listing non-aesthetic properties of the work, support non-aesthetic evaluations of success value which in turn contribute to the determination of aesthetic value of artworks.

In short, I propose that Kant's aesthetic theory yields a fruitful theory of art criticism and that this theory presents an alternative to both existing theories of his time and to contemporary theories.

Preface

Some parts of this dissertation have been accepted for publication. The majority of the final section of Chapter IV is a reprint of the material as it appears in Tuna, Emine Hande. "A Kantian Hybrid Theory of Art Criticism: A Particularist Appeal to the Generalists." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* (forthcoming a). A brief part of the second section of Chapter III will be published as Tuna, Emine Hande. "Why didn't Kant Think Highly of Music?," in *Natur und Freiheit: Akten des XII. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses 2015*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, forthcoming b.

Anne ve babama,
to Alev and Muzaffer Tuna

Acknowledgements

I would like to start by thanking my supervisor, Alexander Rueger, for all the help and support he provided throughout my MA and PhD. His class on Kant's Aesthetics is what initially sparked my interest in the subject and our continued conversations have been an invaluable source as I navigated through Kant's labyrinthine works. He is also the person who encouraged me to work on the topic of my dissertation and I am very grateful for that.

I also owe many thanks to my dissertation committee. Amy Schmitter has been a committee member on both my PhD and MA defenses and I have taken various courses from her. Through her erudition and mentorship, she has not only been one of the most important sources of my intellectual growth but also a continuous encouragement and confidence booster (and we all know that you need that while writing a dissertation). I am grateful to both Jennifer Welchman and Howard Nye for their helpful feedback on the present work but also on the various short papers I have presented over the years, which turned into this body of work. I particularly want to thank Rachel Zuckert for agreeing to be on my committee and for commenting on my work. Her astute remarks will continue to provide guidance as I develop these views further.

I had the opportunity to present parts of the present work at various venues. I was afforded many opportunities to discuss my work at the talks organized by the Publication Support Group at University of Alberta. All of the graduate students and faculty members have provided me with much needed feedback and helped me as my ideas took shape

over the years. I also want to thank the audience members and commentators at various meetings of the American Philosophical Association (APA), the Canadian Philosophical Association, and the American Society for Aesthetics (ASA), and at the International Kant Congress for lively discussions and feedback. Particularly, I want to express my gratitude to APA and ASA for their generous financial support. I am also in debt to Theodore Gracyk, the co-editor of the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, for his detailed and invaluable comments and suggestions regarding my forthcoming paper in the journal. The last section of my fourth chapter is a reprint of this paper, which has been significantly improved thanks to Dr. Gracyk's input. I also want to thank the students in my Philosophy of Criticism class, who unknowingly helped me and pushed me to develop the views expressed in this dissertation during our discussions.

I would like to thank my mother and father, Alev and Muzaffer Tuna, to whom this work is dedicated, for ceaselessly supporting me throughout the years. I want to thank my mother and father in-law, Doina and Grigore Ion, for their care and support. I will be forever indebted to my aunt, Sevgi Güngör, for teaching me about determination and hard work along with some crucial math skills. I want to thank my sister, Merve Tuna, for our sometimes minute-long and sometimes day-long Skype chats. Those were much needed. Finally, I want to say thank you to Octavian Ion, my spouse, even though I know that it is not enough. He worked with me, beside me, at every stage of this dissertation, discussing every idea expressed herein and all the ideas not worthy of being expressed. Thank you is not exactly enough.

Table of Contents

Note on References

References to Baumgarten's works are to the abbreviated title of the work, and the section and page number, with the exception of references to the *Reflections on Poetry*, which are to section and page number with no abbreviated title.

I follow the translation of Kant's works in the Cambridge edition, unless otherwise indicated. All references are to the *Akademie* edition with abbreviated title, volume, and page number.

All references to Wolff's works are to the abbreviated title of the work, and section and page number with the exception of references to "Von Geschichten der Baukunst: Vorrede von den Säulen-ordnungen zur gründlichen Anweisung zu der Civil-Baukunst nach den besten Römischen Antiquitäten" and *Entdeckung der wahren Ursache von der wunderbaren Vermehrung des Getreydes (1725) und Erläuterung der Entdeckung der wahren Ursache von der wunderbaren Vermehrung des Getreydes*.

Abbreviated titles of Baumgarten's works

A	*Ästhetik* [Aesthetica]
M	*Metaphysics*

Abbreviated titles of Kant's works

Anth	*Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*
EEKU	First Introduction to the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*
KrV	*Critique of Pure Reason*
KU	*Critique of the Power of Judgment*

Log	*Logic*
MS	*Metaphysics of Morals*
Refl	*Notes and Fragments*
V-Anth/Busolt	Anthropology Busolt
V-Anth/Collins	Anthropology Collins
V-Anth/Fried	Anthropology Friedländer
V-Anth/Mensch	*Menschenkunde*
V-Anth/Mron	Anthropology Mrongovius
V-Anth/Pillau	Anthropology Pillau
V-Lo/Blomberg	Logik Blomberg
V-Met/Dohna	Metaphysik Dohna
V-Met-L1/Pölitz	Metaphysik L1 (Pölitz)

Abbreviated titles of Wolff's works

Ontologia	*Philosophia prima sive ontologia methodo scientifica pertractata qua omnis cognitionis humanae principia continentur* [*Ontologia*]
DP	*Preliminary Discourse on Philosophy in General* [*Preliminary Discourse*]
PE	*Psychologia empirica, methodo scientifica pertracta, qua ea, quae de anima humana indubia experientiae fide constant, continentur et ad solidam universae philosophiae practicae ac theologiae naturalis tractationem sternitur* [*Psychologia empirica*]
DM	*Vernünftige Gedancken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt* [*German Metaphysics*]

Introduction

My aim in this dissertation is to explore the role of art criticism within Immanuel Kant's aesthetic theory and its relevance for the particularism-generalism debate in contemporary aesthetics. This is an examination of a neglected area in Kant scholarship since it is standardly assumed that a theory of criticism flies in the face of Kant's endorsement of aesthetic autonomy and rejection of objective aesthetic principles.

If art criticism is an enterprise of providing evaluations of artworks supported by reasons, then it is hard to see what the Kantian art critic can do for us. According to the autonomy constraint, which involves the rejection of what I call "thin" aesthetic testimony, the subject should judge the object herself in order to form an aesthetic appreciation of it. For instance, the determining ground of one's judgment of taste concerning Joan Mitchell's *George Went Swimming at Barnes Hole, but It Got Too Cold* cannot be someone else's testimony that *George Went Swimming* is beautiful. We cannot defer to the critic's aesthetic judgment, given the autonomy constraint, so it is hard to see whether it matters at all that an art critic communicates to us her evaluation of an artwork on the basis of its reception value, namely the aesthetic pleasure the artwork affords her.

Furthermore, Kant's no-principles constraint on judgments of taste asserts that *a priori* grounds of proof in the form of determinate rules cannot determine one's judgment either. For example, the critic can characterize *George Went Swimming* using the following descriptive statements:

> The yellows, which emblematized the warm light of a summer afternoon, gave way, for reasons internal to the painting, to areas of white and hence, wittily, to winter… There is a thick tangle of heavy, largely horizontal brushstrokes about a third of the way up the canvas – black – blue, ochres, paler greens, and a surprising passage of cadmium red. A patch of grays and pale blues in the upper right corner feels like winter sky, while a spread of strongly swept blues and purples at the bottom of the canvas must be a reminiscence of water. The feeling of cold is mostly achieved through white and whitish spaces, climbing like broken ice from bottom to top, punctuated by slashes and lashes of fluid pigment that the clever student in Empire Falls High School would recognize as the artist's attack (Danto, 2002).

It is far from clear what the force of these statements would be if there are no general objective principles stating, let's say, that every object featuring a surprising passage of cadmium red is bound to elicit aesthetic pleasure. Hence, it is not clear whether it matters at all that the critic provides reasons in the form of descriptive statements, if these reasons are completely arbitrary given the absence of general objective principles governing the relation between non-aesthetic properties and aesthetic evaluations.

Kant's two constraints on aesthetic *appreciation* also constitute the principal tenets of any particularist account and the points of divergence between particularists and generalists. Generalism in aesthetics holds that one can adequately support evaluations of artworks by means of good reasons because these reasons are backed up by general

principles or criteria.[1] Particularism rejects the notion that there are objective aesthetic principles and, in general, construes aesthetic evaluation as specific to the particular artwork under consideration, claiming that our evaluation of that work has no bearing on our evaluation of other artworks. Particularism's rejection of general aesthetic principles and testimony, however, does not preclude particularist art criticism from flourishing.

In the present literature there seem to be two main ways for particularists to conceive of the possibility of criticism. The first one is the realist option. I will argue that, in order to avoid the problem concerning the arbitrariness of reasons, Arnold Isenberg and Frank Sibley more discreetly, and Mary Mothersill more conspicuously, endorsed the view that aesthetic properties are real and perceptual.[2] Descriptive statements are considered to have an ostensive function and serve as a guide to perceiving aesthetic qualities of the object, which depend on non-aesthetic properties but are not reducible to them. One main problem with these accounts, however, is that they require us to accept more than what is implied by Kant's autonomy constraint. According to realist-particularist accounts, aesthetic properties are instantiated in each particular instance in a particular manner and hence their recognition will require first-hand experience of the object. The price one pays on this realist-particularist picture is that one must reject what I call "thick" aesthetic testimony. If one wants to adopt the realist-particularist solution then one is not only required to reject thin aesthetic testimony but must also accept the acquaintance principle according to which first-hand experience of the object is necessary and aesthetic knowledge is non-transmissible.

[1] For a clear formulation of aesthetic generalism, see Beardsley (1962).

[2] References will be provided later in Chapter IV.

The second solution, which does not incur the same sort of high-stake commitments that realist-particularism does, furnishes us with a less than satisfactory account of art criticism. This solution, which is proposed by Alan Goldman, embraces anti-realism. As the realists do, Goldman accepts that aesthetic properties supervene on but are irreducible to non-aesthetic properties. Unlike them, he argues that aesthetic properties consist not only in phenomenal properties, but also in relations among them, which are not always perceivable. By entering into structural, expressive, representational, or historical relations the formal phenomenal properties are transformed or altered. These relations are the sources of aesthetic value. However, the connections between these relations and the positive value judgments they elicit cannot be captured by a set of aesthetic principles. These connections arise in a particular manner in our experience of particular works. The critic can nevertheless use descriptive statements to trace the relations into which phenomenal properties enter and the manner in which they are altered to give a general picture of where an artwork's aesthetic value lies. However, the type of relations that alter the phenomenal properties can be various and can affect different judges in different ways depending on their personal taste and preferences. Goldman argues that there is no one right evaluation of an artwork and that equally well-educated and sensitive ideal critics can provide very different and equally appropriate evaluations of the same work depending on their different preferences, sensibilities, or even the emotional baggage they carry. As a result, this account seems to give a solution to the problem of arbitrariness of reasons at the expense of accepting that there are radical, irresolvable aesthetic disagreements. It is already debatable whether this outcome is desirable but I think there is even more at stake. On this anti-realist picture, it seems as

though an art critic can speak to someone only if that person shares the same type of sensibilities. However, there seems to be nothing that can ensure that this level of communication is even possible. There can be as many different evaluations as there are evaluators. If there is no way to draw the line with respect to which experiences are relevant to determining the outcome of an evaluation, then any and all experiential differences may be relevant and we end up with the possibility of an artwork eliciting different, but equally appropriate and incomparable evaluations. Goldman seems to find the way out by reviving the old construct of the "ideal" critic. The persuasiveness of such a move today is more questionable than it has been earlier in the history of aesthetics.

A Kantian account of art criticism cannot adopt either of these solutions. Even though Kant's theory of taste shares the basic theoretical premises of particularism, none of the additions made by the realist camp or the anti-realist camp can pass the Kantian test. First of all, each camp provides a solution to the arbitrariness problem by introducing aesthetic properties, whether real or relational, as mediators, and presents aesthetic evaluations as affective responses to aesthetic properties of objects. Kant's account does not share any of these theoretical commitments. Additionally, these accounts either explicitly or implicitly present beauty as a property, even though one claims that it is perceptual and the other says it is relational. This is something that is famously ruled out by Kant in the *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (KU). For Kant, aesthetic judgment does not consist in subsuming the object under the concept of beauty. Rather, the judgment expresses the state of mind one is in upon reflecting on the object. Retrofitting the Kantian framework to assimilate it into Goldman's anti-realism cannot do the job either. This is because, from the Kantian perspective, Goldman's reasons for

claiming that there are irresolvable, radical aesthetic disagreements require one to accept that what Kant calls charms and emotions can have an effect on aesthetic judgment which cannot be eliminated and is even welcome. For Kant, charms and emotions are always detrimental to taste and their effects fade away through the development of one's taste. In this sense, Kant does not accept that there can be radical aesthetic disagreements. In any case, the price one needs to pay for either of these solutions to work within a Kantian framework is too high and renders the resulting particularist position less attractive.

I argue that a Kantian solution to the problem of how to construct a non-trivial account of art criticism while sustaining one's commitment to the two constraints is made possible by integrating some generalist elements into the account. This can, of course, strike someone as a bizarre proposal given that the identifying markers of generalism are the rejection of Kant's autonomy and no-principles constraints. However, the version of generalism that I will argue needs to be incorporated into the Kantian framework is not concerned with the evaluations of artworks on the basis of their reception value, while Kant's interest lies precisely in reception value. This generalist theory of art criticism, proposed by Noël Carroll, renders art criticism 'taste-free' in line with the rejection of the two constraints. He presents an account in which art criticism is essentially evaluation supported by good reasons. Reasoned evaluation consists in informing readers as to what is of value (and/or disvalue) in an artwork and why. What is of value in an artwork, Carroll argues, is its "success value," which is defined as the achievement or the failure of the artist with respect to what he or she intended to achieve. The function of art criticism becomes that of telling whether or not the artwork under scrutiny is an achievement or a failure and further specifying why it is an achievement or why it is a

failure. What drops out of this picture is the reception value, the positive experiences the work affords to its audience. Assigning success value is merely a matter of determining whether the work is a good instance of its kind. For instance, determining the success value of *George Went Swimming* involves classifying it as an Abstract Expressionist painting and demonstrating whether or not it meets the expectations attached to the category of Abstract Expressionism. Carroll's account, I argue, is not at odds with the Kantian theory despite the impression we get that Carroll and Kant have opposing views concerning the force of the two constraints. Kant's constraints are legislative only over the evaluations of reception value. But this cannot be the source of conflict since Carroll accepts that there are no general principles of reception value. He also accepts that there are no general principles of success value that apply to all artworks at all times. However, he argues that there are general-enough *pro tanto* principles concerning what makes an artwork good of its kind that apply to works depending on which critical categories they fall under. Existence of such principles is completely compatible with Kant's theory. In fact, from a Kantian perspective, the two constraints do not have any binding force over the evaluations of success value.

This agreement of the seemingly opposed views is, of course, merely formal because each approach is concerned with a different target. What needs to be shown is that there are indeed benefits to integrating Carroll's account into the Kantian account. The benefits of such integration are proportional with the merits of Carroll's account. One of the main merits of Carroll's account is that it solves the problem of whether descriptive statements can support value judgments and how. His answer is simple: Descriptive statements support value judgments but not the value judgments concerning

reception value. Since critics' evaluations are not evaluations of the reception value of the work but only of its success value, descriptive statements support the evaluations of the artwork on the basis of its success value. I argue that Kant's account can adopt Carroll's solution with ease because Carroll's evaluations of success value correspond to Kantian judgments of perfection, which play a key role in making informed aesthetic judgments.

Positive aesthetic evaluations that involve incorporation of judgments of perfection into judgments of taste and negative aesthetic assessments, which result from judgments of perfection, are Kant's "impure" judgments of taste. It has often been suggested in the literature that such impure judgments – which are also called judgments of adherent beauty – are the typical Kantian judgments about artworks. The function of judgments of perfection is to make informed impure judgments of taste. Put otherwise, in the Kantian framework, evaluations of success value can inform evaluations of reception value. I argue that, surprisingly, judgments of perfection also can inform what Kant calls "pure" judgments of taste. These judgments are appropriate judgments to employ in assessing what Kant calls works of genius, which have originality and exemplarity as defining characteristics. These works, which resist ordinary classification, require us to either expand the critical categories we use or repudiate the extant categories and form new ones. Judgments of perfection are the only means by which to determine whether or not we need to expand our categories or create new categories in judging a work. I argue that, in these instances, the success value of an artwork does not depend on its being a good example of its kind and meeting the usual category expectations, but depends instead on its ability to exceed our expectations. One can settle whether a work is a work of genius or not only indirectly, namely, *via* frustrated attempts at making judgments of

perfection. Again, the success value of a work of genius informs our evaluation of its reception value. Correspondingly, I suggest that Kantian art criticism can be construed as a hybrid account that incorporates Carroll's model and puts Carroll-type evaluations in the service of evaluations of artworks with respect to their reception value. The Kantian art critic, by using what the generalist takes to be central to the critic's evaluations, namely good-of-its-kind judgments, narrows down the common ground of appreciation, which would otherwise be non-articulable.

My interpretation of Kant's theory of artistic beauty shows that there are various aesthetic judgments and, depending on the work itself, some are appropriate and others inappropriate to employ. By delineating the common ground of appreciation, the critic directs us to make what she takes to be the appropriate judgment. Which judgment is the appropriate one to make is always decided in relation to the work itself. Even though there are general enough principles, they can never be principles of taste and their applicability and usefulness is always decided within the context of the work itself. The critic's assessments are always and necessarily particular to the work, even if the artwork is probably not unique. As we will see, this is one of the main reasons why the Kantian account is essentially particularist. Another reason is that reading the critic or imitating the critic does not produce aesthetic experience in us. We can defer to the critic's evaluations of success value but not to her evaluations of reception value. The Kantian art critic, in delineating a common ground of appreciation, tells us how to approach the work. But it should be us who go through the process of judging. The Kantian art critic engages in several different operations, such as evaluation, classification, description, interpretation, analysis, elucidation, depending on the work, in order to create a common

ground of appreciation. She does so with the primary aim of explaining why it makes sense to have the response she deems appropriate, and in doing so aids our appreciation and contributes to the formation of good taste within a society.

What I am proposing in this dissertation is threefold: (1) contrary to common conception, a Kantian theory can indeed yield a fruitful account of art criticism without thwarting the two constraints; (2) this account of Kantian art criticism differs in important respects from his contemporaries' and predecessors' accounts; (3) it can prove to be useful in reconstructing the enterprise of art criticism today because it is preferable to both particularist and generalist theories of art criticism. Unlike particularist accounts, it does not require high-stake theoretical commitments. As an alternative to Carroll's generalist account, it reinstates the centrality of reception value to art critics' evaluations.

The dissertation is divided into two main parts. The first part is an explanation of Kant's theory of artistic beauty and the second part is an exposition of the theory of art criticism this theory supports. In the first part, my main focus is on Kant's free-adherent beauty distinction and its implications for his views on art appreciation. Kant describes judgments of adherent beauty as involving a presupposition of a concept of what the object ought to be and the perfection of the object in accordance with it. Judgments of free beauty, by contrast, do not presuppose such a concept, or indeed any determinate concept at all. There are strong similarities between Kant's descriptions of judgments of adherent beauty and judgments of artistic beauty. The question is what role judgments of perfection play in the context of judgments of artistic beauty. In the rationalist tradition, judgments of perfection had been identified with aesthetic judgments. If Kant were following his rationalist predecessors and accepting this identification, then we would

have an easy answer to the question of what Kantian art criticism is: a type of generalist theory of rule-guided criticism. However, Kant famously breaks with this tradition and rejects this identification. We should be careful, however, in evaluating the extent of this rejection. There are still important insights we can derive from an analysis of rationalist theory in understanding Kant's theory since, as I aim to demonstrate, Kant appropriates certain aspects of judgments of perfection as depicted by rationalists and assigns new roles to them in aesthetic assessments. In order to trace this connection and to emphasize the distinctness of Kantian art criticism from one of the most dominant theories of art criticism at his time, in Chapter I, I briefly present the rationalist theory of aesthetics and art criticism. I will end this chapter with an exposition of how Kant transforms judgments of perfection into good-of-its-kind judgments or, as I will argue, value judgments concerning attributive good.

In Chapter II, I turn to the intricacies of the free-adherent beauty distinction and lay out its seemingly problematic aspects and additional problems it creates for Kant's theory of artistic beauty. I explain some of the most prominent interpretations that are set to solve these problems and analyze their respective flaws and merits. We will see that some of the interpretations can make sense of Kant's seemingly inconsistent claims by rejecting the reduction of judgments of adherent beauty to judgments of perfection and by focusing on the free aspects of these judgments while assigning different roles to judgments of perfection. They all tell us different ways in which we can form *impure* but informed aesthetic judgments. Furthermore, I argue that they should not be construed as rivals but instead complementary interpretations that reveal the richness of the Kantian theory of artistic beauty.

In Chapter III, I demonstrate that there is something missing in these interpretations, which can nevertheless be accommodated by the interpretation I provide. The problem is that by following the extant interpretations we cannot possibly reach a satisfactory account of how to judge works of genius that is consistent with Kant's view. The two main features of works of genius, namely "originality" and "exemplarity," become unrecognizable under these interpretations. If we are supposed to judge these works as adherent beauties, we would be subsuming them under the existing critical concepts or categories of artforms, genres, sub-genres, styles, oeuvres, periods, movements, lineages, traditions, and so on. But the terms "originality" and "exemplarity" indicate that such works cannot be subsumed in this manner. On the other hand, if we treat them as free beauties, there seems to be only one way to do so: we have to abstract from all the concepts being used. Yet, again, if we abstract from the concepts we use this would amount to abstracting from the very conditions under which a work of genius is original and exemplary. I solve the problem by proposing alternative methods, distinct from abstraction, by which we can appreciate a work of genius as a free beauty. I argue that originality and exemplarity lie in the work's ability to exceed one's expectations concerning its form and content. One does not experience these features directly but comes to appreciate them only relationally, that is in relation to the existing relevant concepts of criticism. In judging a work of genius, our reflection on the work is occasioned by relevant concepts, but the work exceeds our expectations by means of amplifying or repudiating these concepts and thereby renders them ultimately inoperative. Hence, the initial concepts that trigger the process cease to determine our judgment. Through a detailed analysis I show how, in judging works of genius, the

frustrated attempts at making judgments of perfection lead to a transformation of the initial uninformed pure judgments of taste into informed pure judgments of taste. This account of transformation leads to a rather surprising and novel outcome: not only is it *possible* to make pure judgments of taste regarding works of genius, but indeed these are the only appropriate judgments we *ought* to make. Hence, this reading shows that contrary to common conception there are such things as informed *pure* judgments of taste.

Chapter IV constitutes the second part of the dissertation, which comprises the implications of my reading of Kant's adherent-free beauty distinction and theory of artistic beauty for art criticism. In this chapter, my aim is to justify two claims: (1) Kant was an aesthetic particularist, and (2) the possibility of Kantian art criticism lies in the fact that it incorporates generalist elements, while being essentially particularist. I argue that a Kantian theory of art criticism should be construed as a hybrid theory, one that incorporates Carroll's objective[3] generalist model of art criticism, but puts Carroll-type evaluations of the success value of artworks in the service of evaluations of their reception value. I begin by explaining the two constraints on pure judgments of taste, the autonomy and the no-principles constraints, which render a Kantian theory essentially particularist and discuss the problems they cause for such a theory. At this juncture, (1) I will explain the solutions other particularist accounts provide to overcome these problems and why a Kantian account cannot adopt either of these solutions; and (2) I discuss and evaluate two earlier attempts at constructing an account of Kantian art criticism. Then I

[3] I use the term "objective" when I talk about Carroll's account. However, I must note that what Carroll means by "objective" and what Kant means by "objective" are different. Carroll equates objectivity with intersubjectivity (2009, 34).

will present a new Kantian solution to these problems and propose my own version of a theory of Kantian art criticism.

Chapter I Judgments of Perfection: From Leibniz to Kant

My central aim is to demonstrate that Kant's aesthetic theory yields a theory of art criticism and that this theory presents an alternative both to the existing theories of his time and to contemporary theories. The initial impression one gets from Kant's theory of taste, however, is that it leaves no room for a non-trivial account of art criticism due to his description of aesthetic experience. His break with the rationalist tradition, which dominated the German aesthetic scene at the time, only strengthens this impression because this break implies Kant's dismissal of the rule-guided criticism endorsed by the rationalist paradigm.

One of the revolutionary aspects of Kant's aesthetic theory is precisely this rejection of the principal tenets of the rationalist view. Kant rejects (i) that judgments of taste are cognitive and objective judgments, (ii) that truth conditions are applicable to them, (iii) that there are rules of aesthetic appreciation and criticism, (iv) that a justification of aesthetic assessments can be given by means of proofs, and (v) that it is possible to construct aesthetics and art criticism as a science. All these fundamental tenets of rationalism follow from the rationalist assumption that beauty consists in the

perception of perfection in an object. Hence at the core of Kant's overthrow of rationalist aesthetics lies his refusal to reduce beauty to perfection. He replaces this conception of aesthetic experience by another according to which a judgment of taste does not involve the subsumption of an object under any determinate concept but instead expresses our mental state when we reflect on the representation of an object that we find subjectively purposive for our cognitive faculties. According to Kant, no determinate concept determines one's aesthetic evaluations of an object. Furthermore, the content of aesthetic experience is non-conceptual, and therefore analyzing the subjectively purposive form of the object into its further elements cannot help our understanding of how our judgments come about. Consequently, it seems as though expertise in art history and criticism, which is widely considered to be a distinctive mark of art critics, cannot have any relevance for the aesthetic appreciation of artworks on the Kantian model. This is because the relevance of expertise depends on whether classifying an artwork under appropriate concepts or categories of criticism, such as that of artforms, genres, sub-genres, periods, styles, schools, movements, and so on, is germane to its aesthetic appreciation. Kant's no determinate concept requirement seems to preclude the role that classification might otherwise play. Such a democratic theory of appreciation creates the impression that everybody is an art critic but only in a Pickwickian sense: everybody has the capacity to be an art critic but nobody seems to be able to provide reasons justifying their judgments.

From a contemporary point of view, judging art in isolation without regard to art history and criticism makes us miss out on most of what is relevant about the merits of a work, which cannot be appreciated without placing it in the artworld, locating it with respect to tradition, with respect to the contemporary art scene, and so on. Imagine, for

example, what would be involved were we to aesthetically engage with works such as Marcel Duchamp's *Fountain* or Andy Warhol's *Brillo Boxes* in isolation. In isolation, one is a urinal and the other a counterfeit Brillo box, but neither would be appreciated as an artwork. As Richard Wollheim writes,

> a heroic proposal, deriving from Kant, the aim of which is to ensure the democracy of art, is to define the ideal critic as one whose cognitive stock is empty, or who brings to bear upon the work of art zero knowledge, beliefs, and concepts. The proposal has, however, little to recommend it except its aim. It is all but impossible to put into practice, and, if it could be, it would lead to critical judgments that would be universally unacceptable (1980, 194).

It is this image, the image of the Kantian art critic with an "empty cognitive stock," that I want to correct. I believe that this initial assessment loses its force once we recognize that Kant actually thinks that the use of determinate concepts is called for in the aesthetic appreciation of artworks. I will show that, within the Kantian framework, judgments of perfection, which are formed on the basis of determinate concepts, have a crucial role to play in aesthetic assessments. I will defend, in Chapters II and III, the thesis that Kant assigns a vital role to judgments of perfection in forming not only informed *impure* but also informed *pure* aesthetic judgments about artworks. In the current chapter, however, I am primarily interested in laying out what judgments of perfection are. I trace what they are by examining the evolution of the conception of judgments of perfection throughout the development of rationalist aesthetics. First, I give a brief history of rationalist aesthetics and art criticism, starting from its intellectual roots and moving to its most developed versions in Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten's and Moses Mendelssohn's theories. Following this discussion, and on the basis of this background, I present an analysis of Kant's modifications to the notion of judgments of

perfection and pinpoint the type of judgment of perfection he considers to be relevant in making aesthetic assessments. Since I will be examining the rationalist theory of art criticism, this will present an occasion to show that Kant could not have been an advocate of rationalist criticism due to the alterations he made to the judgments of perfection. Therefore, if there is such a thing as Kantian art criticism it is in fact different from his rationalist predecessors' and contemporaries' theories.

I. 1. Intellectual Roots of Rationalist Aesthetics: Leibniz and Wolff

In tracing the intellectual roots of rationalist aesthetics I turn to Leibniz and Wolff.[4] It has generally been acknowledged that Leibniz's hierarchy of knowledge and ideas, and particularly his description of clear and confused knowledge, provided the

[4] There exists a debate as to where the intellectual roots of rationalist aesthetics can be traced. The guiding question in this debate is: what led the German *Frühaufklärung* to turn to the question of aesthetics? In her book *The Founding of Aesthetics in the German Enlightenment: The Art of Invention and the Invention of Art*, Stefanie Buchenau mentions three hypotheses that had been entertained in the scholarship (2013, 10-13). The first hypothesis, which has already been discarded, is that the main ideas of Kantian aesthetics were already becoming prevalent on the German intellectual scene (before the KU was written!) and this affected the thinkers at the time and motivated the investigation of aesthetic issues. As Buchenau puts it, this hypothesis conflates effect and cause (10). According to the second hypothesis, the initiating factor for the interest of the German *Frühaufklärung* in aesthetics was its increased familiarity with the ideas on aesthetics originated in France, Britain, and Italy. See Paul Oskar Kristeller (1951, 496-527; 1952, 17-46) for a defense of this hypothesis. Buchenau rightly points out that the influence of Batteux, Vico, Hume, etc. is overstated because their works postdate Wolff's writings which are plausibly the main influences since they are even acknowledged to be so by his students. The third hypothesis, while admitting the European effect, locates the main influence in the metaphysics of Descartes, Leibniz, and especially Wolff. According to this hypothesis, debates on sense perception are what lead to the development of aesthetic notions and their philosophical treatment. I take this hypothesis as a point of departure in my explanation of the intellectual roots of rationalist aesthetics. For earlier commentaries, which make use of this hypothesis, see Ernst Cassirer (1916, 1951) and Alfred Baeumler (1923). In recent years philosophical commentaries on rationalist aesthetics also follow the same lead. For more innovative and detailed interpretations and commentaries, see Frederick C. Beiser (2009), Christoph Menke (2012), Buchenau (2013), and Paul Guyer (2014): Buchenau gives a detailed analysis of Wolffian metaphysics in explaining its influence on aesthetic rationalists. She takes Wolff's development of *ars inveniendi* out of its earlier treatments by Descartes, Bacon, Leibniz, and Tschirnhaus to be the main influence on the rationalist tradition. Beiser's survey of rationalist aesthetics also starts with a chapter on Leibniz and a chapter on Wolff. Menke, before giving a detailed account of Baumgarten's aesthetics, first visits Descartes' metaphysics and its influence. Guyer, in his *A History of Modern Aesthetics*, identifies Leibniz and Wolff as the main influences on rationalist aesthetics.

rationalists with the rudimentary ideas concerning aesthetic experience, thereby opening up the possibility for theorizing.

In *Meditations on Knowledge, Truth, and Ideas*, Leibniz distinguishes between different kinds of knowledge: "Knowledge is either obscure or clear; clear knowledge is either confused or distinct" (1969, 291). Knowledge is obscure when it does not suffice for recognizing the thing represented. For instance, lack of acquaintance could be the reason why we have an obscure concept of *mutilidae*. This kind of concept that we develop on the basis of one or more instances cannot suffice for us to recognize or re-identify the *mutilidae* (especially female *mutilidae*) we see in other instances and distinguish it from an ant. Having clear knowledge of a thing enables us to re-identify the thing represented. If in recognizing the object we can enumerate all the marks that suffice to recognize it, this indicates that the knowledge is not only clear but also distinct. However, if we cannot enumerate these marks, then the knowledge is clear but confused. Leibniz classifies our knowledge of sensible qualities, such as colors, odors, flavors, as clear and confused knowledge. Aesthetic judgments are grounded in this kind of knowledge, according to Leibniz:

> … we sometimes see painters and other artists correctly judge what has been done well or done badly; yet they are often unable to give a reason for their judgment but tell the inquirer that the work which displeases them lacks 'something, I know not what' (291).

The mentioned *je ne sais quoi* of aesthetic experience, its ineffability, can appear to contradict the cognitivist commitments of aesthetic rationalism. Nevertheless it does not. First of all, even though Leibniz admits that artists do not seem to be able to give reasons for their judgments, he also claims that their judgments are bearers of truth and

falsity. As Christoph Menke observes, here Leibniz accepts the idea that "sensible perceptions and judgments can be called 'correct' without being clear and distinct and, thus, without our defining the criteria by which the perceptions and judgments are being made" (2012, 18). Secondly, despite the fact that Leibniz does not comment much more on this topic, he definitely does not rule out the possibility of developing an account that could give us insight into how these judgments are formed. He says, "[y]et it is certain that the concepts of these qualities are composite and can be resolved, for they certainly have their causes" (1969, 291). This theoretical possibility is what encouraged the pursuit of rationalist aesthetics, which started as an investigation of these causes.

Investigation of the causes of aesthetic experience is also a reflection of the rationalists' commitment to the principle of sufficient reason. The principle of sufficient reason dictates that "nothing happens without a reason" (677) and therefore there should be a rational explanation for the cognitive state of having aesthetic pleasure. We should be able to determine its causes. In passing, Leibniz comments on the issue of pleasure and its possible causes. He claims that pleasure is confused perception of perfection in things and that perfection is unity in variety or plurality.[5] These ideas, later on, come to be articulated in various ways with modifications by the rationalists and constitute the main tenets of rationalist aesthetics. Even though the seeds of these ideas are present in Leibniz, lack of articulation and most especially his acceptance of the *je ne sais quoi* of the aesthetic experience make it hard to account for a direct transition from Leibniz to Baumgarten. The important transitional figure that is missing in this picture is Christian Wolff.

[5] See Leibniz (1969, 425-428).

Even though Wolff follows Leibniz in his description of sensations as clear but confused (DM, §214, 119), he rejects the *je ne sais quoi*, the indefinable aspect of aesthetic experience that escapes rational explanation (cf. Beiser 2009, 48f). As part of his endorsement of the idea of philosophy as a system, aesthetic pleasure and aesthetic creation are taken to be experiences that the system should account for.[6] However, they belong to different fields of philosophy: the issue of aesthetic pleasure is a subject of empirical psychology, while aesthetic creation falls under philosophy of the arts.[7] On an important note, Wolff does not distinguish between different kinds of pleasure, as his pupils later go on to do so, and instead works with a single conception of pleasure which encompasses all the pleasures ranging from the intellectual pleasure one gets from a mathematic proof to the pleasure one has in a well-designed clock to the pleasure caused by works of architecture, poetry, fable, and so on. These pleasures do not differ in quality[8] because they are all defined by Wolff as consciousness of the perfection of a thing (PE, §511, 389).[9] What gives pleasure its cognitive status and makes it analyzable is the fact that it consists in being conscious or aware of something in the object. That is

[6] Wolff states that philosophy as a science "gives reasons of things which are or occur" and thereby "ought to explain the reason why in any case one thing rather than another occur" (DP, §32, 18). In *Preliminary Discourse*, he lists different areas of philosophy and explains how they work as a system to give an account of everything that exists and occurs. By extension, the aesthetic pleasure and aesthetic creation are characterized to be the things that the system should account for.

[7] This categorization is not meant to suggest that these fields of philosophy do not interact. Indeed, Wolff's system philosophy is based on giving an account of how different fields of philosophy are interdependent and complementary to each other. The relation between empirical psychology and philosophy of arts do not constitute an exception to Wolff's vision of system philosophy.

[8] Beiser notes that "[a]ll aesthetic pleasure for Wolff is ultimately a form of *intellectual* pleasure; the pleasure that we have through our senses is really only a confused form of it" (2009, 63). In this sense, for Wolff, since there are no distinct kinds of pleasures there are no qualitative differences between aesthetic pleasures but only quantitative ones.

[9] Here Wolff says that he adopts Descartes' definition of pleasure, as articulated in a letter to Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia on September 1, 1645. For the complete letter, see Shapiro (2007, 106-109).

also the very reason why Wolff treats the subject of aesthetic pleasure in his *Psychologia empirica*.

Wolff defines philosophy in general as "the science of possibles insofar as they can be" (DP, §29, 17). For Wolff, this definition implies that philosophy is about "demonstrating why the possible can actually occur" (DP, §29, 17f) and this demonstration is equivalent to giving reasons for its occurrence (DP, §29, 18). Philosophy in this sense is defined as a reason-giving practice.[10] Psychology, as a branch of philosophy, specifically has as its subject matter the human soul, and consists in providing reasons why the things that are possible through the human soul actually occur (DP, §58, 35; §111, 56). Wolff divides psychology into two main fields, empirical and rational.[11] While empirical psychology is "the science of experientially establishing the principles from which the reason is given for those things which occur in the human soul" (DP, §111, 56), "in rational psychology we derive a priori from a unique concept of human soul all the things which are observed a posteriori to pertain to the soul and all the things which are deduced from these observations, insofar as they are proper to philosophy" (DP, §112, 57). By treating the issue of aesthetic pleasure under empirical psychology, Wolff endows it with a cognitive status. He defines the soul as the entity that is not only conscious of itself but of other things outside of itself (PE, §20, 15). The soul

[10] Here I should mention that 'reasons' for Wolff include more than what we usually associate with the term and "causes" also fall under the rubric of reasons. Thus, description of philosophy as a reason-giving practice also implies that philosophy is the science of finding causes.

[11] This division does not imply that these two fields have completely separate and distinct territories. Wolff characterizes the relation as complementary. He maintains not only that empirical psychology provides principles for rational psychology (PE, §4, 3) but also that one of the functions of empirical psychology is to examine and confirm the discoveries about human soul carried out *a priori* by rational psychology (PE, §5, 3). See Dyck (2011, 49f) for his explanation of the interdependency of empirical and rational psychology.

becomes conscious of other things through representing them by the use of its faculties. The difference between the faculties of the soul (sensation, memory, imagination, and understanding) is not a matter of having different functions. Wolff claims that the basic function of the soul, and hence of all its faculties, is representing. What differentiates among the faculties is a matter of the clarity and distinctness of their representations in the way Leibniz envisioned. The crucial point is that, for Wolff, every representation in the soul is demonstrable, that is, we can give a reason as to why such a representation occurs. By implication, the aesthetic pleasure that consists in consciousness of perfection in an object and thereby in the representation of the perfection of an object is open to cognitive analysis.

In his *Ontologia*, Wolff defines perfection as "agreement in variety, or the agreement, in one thing, of several things differing from each other" and in turn defines agreement as "the tendency to reach something that is the same" (Ontologia, §503, 229).[12] He illustrates this definition of perfection with an example in the *German Metaphysics*:

> one judges the perfection of a clock from its correctly displaying the hours and their parts. It is however composed of many parts, and these and their composition are aimed at the hands displaying correctly the hours and their parts. Thus in a clock one finds manifold things, that are all in concordance with one another (DM, §152, 79).[13]

The more we can explain the reasons for how the diverse properties of the clock correspond to each other, the more we can appreciate its perfection. We can provide

[12] "Perfectio est consensus in varietate, seu plurium a se invicem differentium in uno. Consensum vero appello tendentiam ad idem aliquod obtinendum" (Ontologia, §503, 229).

[13] As translated and cited in Guyer (2014, 52).

reasons as to why we give a certain cognitive response to an object by describing how the diverse properties of the object are unified in a perfect fashion to serve the end associated with the object. Indeed, Wolff maintains that if the perfection in question is a genuine one, we should be able to demonstrate that the thing is perfect and when that happens our pleasure becomes constant (PE, §513, 391).

Rationalist aesthetics directly appropriated this cognitivist account of aesthetic pleasure. Along with the idea that aesthetic pleasure is an analyzable cognitive state, the rationalists accepted Wolff's definition of beauty. Correlative to his definition of aesthetic pleasure, Wolff maintains that beauty consists in the perfection of a thing, insofar as it is able to produce pleasure in us (PE, §544, 420). It is the observability of perfection, "observabilitas perfectionis" (PE, §544, 420). This definition implies the dual nature of beauty. Beiser and Guyer have similar interpretations of this dual nature of beauty. Beiser maintains that Wolff's definition implies that beauty has a subjective and an objective aspect (2009, 63). In the same vein, Guyer states that for Wolff beauty is both an objective property and a relational property (2014, 55). The subjective aspect of beauty is grounded in Wolff's conceptualization of beauty as a relational concept. It is relational because without a subject perceiving the beauty, there would be neither pleasure, nor beauty. Nevertheless, beauty is an objective property as well because in the absence of a perceiver the object would continue to have perfection. In fact, Wolff requires an act of judgment to accompany the perception of perfection. This is the judgment that what is perceived is really in the object (PE, §516, 393-395). Beiser states that "the single phrase 'observabilitas perfectionis' neatly joins both these elements together, for it means that beauty is neither perfection nor pleasure alone, but both: the

pleasure from observing perfection" (2009, 63). The subjective aspect of beauty should not give the impression that Wolff takes aesthetics to be a subjective matter. Indeed, the awareness of the subjective aspect of beauty prompts the inquiry so as to determine the reasons why subjects feel in the way that they do. There should be something distinctive about *all* human beings that can explain what makes them capable of being in such a cognitive state.[14] Thus, Wolff's definition, which indicates the dual nature of beauty, gives aesthetic pleasure a cognitive status and renders it objective. These two features of aesthetic pleasure came to be integrated into rationalist aesthetics and became its main defining features.

Aside from the classification of aesthetic experience as both cognitive and objective, another important feature of rationalist aesthetics we encounter in its earlier versions is an emphasis on rule-guided aesthetic creation. The more mature articulation of rule-guided creation belongs to Baumgarten but the roots of this idea are to be found in Wolff's writings. The idea is simple enough: Given that we can explain why an object is perfect, this implies that we can come up with rules to follow in creating an object that is perfect. Wolff's ideas about aesthetic creation, however, are not limited to what can be derived from his treatment of the subject of pleasure in his *Psychologia empirica*. According to Wolff, the issue of aesthetic creation is a subject matter of a different part of philosophy, namely philosophy of the arts.

When Wolff talks about aesthetic creation he is not talking specifically about creation in what we call fine arts today. In Wolff's time, just as there were no distinctions

[14] As we will see later, in Baumgarten the explanation is going to invoke the limitations of our cognitive abilities.

being made between different kinds of pleasures, there were no attempts to classify different forms of art under different groups, such as fine arts, crafts, and so forth. For Wolff, art in general refers to the things produced by man and does not only involve what we consider to be fine arts, but also all other kinds of craft including woodcutting (DP, §39, 22; §71, 38). Philosophy of the arts is "the science of the things which man produces by using organs of the body, especially hands" (DP, §71, 38). Philosophy of the arts, which Wolff equates to technic or technology, "should give reason for the rules of art and of the works produced by art" (DP, §71, 38). On the one hand, according to Wolff, in explaining these reasons, the philosophy of arts should turn to experimental physics (DP, §113, 57). He asserts that the principles on which the production is based can be "discovered and confirmed experimentally in experimental physics" (DP, §113, 57). On the other hand, he takes *ars inveniendi* to be pertinent to this investigation. *Ars inveniendi*, which takes its principles from ontology, "is defined as the science of investigating hidden truth" (DP, §74, 40). Commentators, such as Buchenau and Beiser, appeal to Wolff's account of *ars inveniendi* (and its applicability not only to aesthetic creation but also to aesthetic assessment) as an account that is more applicable to the issue of creation in fine arts since it is hard to imagine what experimental physics can show us about, say, poetic creation. According to Buchenau, Wolff employs the notion of *ars inveniendi* in explaining the procedures in arts, such as agriculture and architecture,[15] and how they developed in such a way as to move from already known truths to unknown ones and through uncovering these grounds to form structures that can be admired.[16] One

[15] See Wolff 1725; 1755.

[16] Buchenau argues that even though Wolff did not offer a full-fledged account of artistic creation, his association of the philosophy of the arts with *ars inveniendi* influenced his disciples' views on artistic

of the most important lessons to be drawn from Wolff's discussion of philosophy of the arts is that he believed it is possible to establish philosophy of the arts as a science, which can systematically analyze every one of the arts and provide rules and principles that can be followed not only in producing them but also assessing them. The main effects of Wolff's belief can be discerned in rationalist aesthetics' commitment to regarding aesthetics and art criticism as science.

I. 2. The development of rationalist aesthetics

The Leibniz-Wolffian conception of perfection as unity-in-diversity and its reduction of beauty to the observability or awareness of perfection in the object bring forth the rationalist norm for aesthetic judgments: they are cognitive and objective even though they are based on confused (though clear) representations. This characterization of aesthetic judgment generated the idea that aesthetics and art criticism should be conceived of as scientific enterprises. I want to examine two different rationalist approaches aimed at realizing this idea, namely those of Baumgarten and Mendelssohn. This examination will lead to an analysis of the modifications they make to the notion of judgments of perfection and a discussion of the implications these modifications have for their views on aesthetics and art criticism.

I. 2. 1. Baumgarten

Without exception, all the early German enlightenment thinkers accepted the Leibniz-Wolffian explanation of sensory perception as consisting of clear, but confused representations. In *Reflections on Poetry*, where Baumgarten introduces the concept of 'aesthetics' for the first time in the literature, aesthetics is defined as the science of sense

---

creation. For instance, she states that certain ideas that we find later on in *Frühaufklärung*, such as that the poet uncovers hidden truths about nature through his or her poetry, has been influenced by Wolff.

perception (§116, 78). Being the counterpart to logic that is concerned with the things known through the higher faculties of cognition, aesthetics is concerned with the things perceived through the lower faculties of cognition. In his unfinished *Aesthetica*, Baumgarten states that the aim of aesthetics is perfecting sensuous knowledge and providing the means for achieving this (A, §14, 115).[17] He takes beauty to be the product of this process: It is the perfection of sensuous knowledge. Our sense perception is considered to be limited insofar as we cannot perceive things distinctly due to the richness of the material of perception that always diverts our attention. Arts, and in particular poetry, can bring all this material into focus by presenting this multiplicity in a unified fashion. What the arts do is to imitate nature and in so doing to create effects that are similar to those produced by nature (cf. §108-9, 75). The arts work as epistemic vehicles in obtaining sensuous knowledge. *Reflections on Poetry* consists of Baumgarten's analysis of how poetry can achieve this effect and its assessment through the new science of aesthetics.

He defines a poem as a perfect sensate discourse (§9, 39). Discourse refers to a series of words that designate connected representations (§1, 37). As a sensate discourse, a poem refers to sensate representations, which can be received through the employment of the lower part of the cognitive faculty (§§3-4, 38). After these straightforward definitions, Baumgarten gradually elucidates what the perfection of a poem involves. First, he comments, "a sensate discourse will be more perfect the more its parts favor the awakening of sensate representations" (§8, 39). Then he distinguishes between three parts

[17] A similar yet more specific definition of aesthetics appears in his *Metaphysics*: "The science of knowing and presenting [*proponendi*] with regard to the senses is AESTHETICS (the logic of the inferior faculty, the philosophy of graces and muses, inferior gnoseology, the art of thinking beautifully, the art of the analogue of reason" (M, §533, 205).

of a poem: sensate representations, their relationship, words as their signs (§10, 40). The rest of the book functions as an elucidation of how each part of a poem can contribute to the perfection of the whole. Baumgarten lists a wide range of ways in which parts of a poem can achieve perfection; the basic principles, however, are that the parts have to tend towards unity and they should become "extensively clear." The criteria evoke the Leibniz-Wolffian conception of perfection, namely unity-in-diversity. However, Baumgarten goes a step further by distinguishing different kinds of perfection. Even though unity-in-diversity is the general criterion for perfection of knowledge acquired through the use of either the higher or the lower faculties, the faculties achieve perfection in different ways. The perfect knowledge of the higher faculties has the characteristics of distinctness and clarity, while that of the lower faculties has confusedness and clarity as characteristics. The novelty of Baumgarten's account lies in the fact that the desired clarity of the knowledge for higher and lower faculties is of a different kind. While for higher faculties "intensive" clarity is at stake, for lower faculties it is "extensive" clarity. This distinction between different kinds of clarity is an important addition to the Leibniz-Wolffian account of aesthetic experience. Instead of defining the knowledge attainable by the lower faculties in terms of a lack or privation, Baumgarten offers a positive account.

What are these different kinds of clarity? Beiser states that intensive clarity depends on "analyzing a representation into its elements and representing each of them discretely at separate moments" while maintaining the logical connections between them (2009, 127). Extensive clarity of a representation, by contrast, depends on how many elements are represented, not at separate moments, but at the same time. Baumgarten gives us the following definition for extensive clarity: "When in representation A more is

represented than in B, C, D, and so on, but all are confused, A will be said to be extensively clearer than the rest" (§16, 43).[18] The important feature that connects extensive clarity with perfection is determinacy. Representing more (being extensively clearer) makes a poem more perfect because, by representing more, a poem adds to the determinacy of the overall representation so as to allow us to gain more perfect sensate knowledge. Baumgarten states that "the more the things are determined, the more their representations embrace" (§18, 43). With the increase in the determination of the object through more representations, there comes a corresponding increase in our comprehension of the object.

Baumgarten's aim in *Reflections on Poetry* is not limited to providing a general definition of poetic perfection and making rough suggestions for how to achieve it. Rather he goes into great details in spelling out how each part of a poem can contribute to its perfection and thus he gives us, as it were, a recipe for how to create and criticize a poem. First he lists the kinds of sensate representations that can make a poem more determinate and hence extensively clearer. The list includes particular representations (§19, 43), representations of species and of inferior genus (§20, 44), individual confused represented examples (§22, 46), confused complex concepts (§23, 47), representations of present changes (§24, 47), representations of dreams (§37, 51), representations of the wonderful (§44, 53), and so forth. In general, the list contains representations of concrete things and Baumgarten advises against use of general representations. For instance, according to Baumgarten's instructions, the representation "the little brown mouse under

[18] A similar definition of extensive clarity in *Metaphysics* is the following: "greater clarity to due to the multitude of notes can be called EXTENSIVELY GREATER CLARITY" (M, §531, 204).

my grandmother's peach colored loveseat" is more poetic than the representation "the mouse."

When it comes to the second important constituent of a poem, namely, the interconnection of sensate representations, Baumgarten tries to provide an exhaustive list of the ways in which the theme or the design of a poem can contribute to its perfection. He defines a theme as "that whose representation contains the sufficient reason of other representations supplied in the discourse, but which does not have its own sufficient reason in them" (§66, 62). The main criteria for the perfection of a theme are again tending towards unity and having extensive clarity. The theme can make a poem more perfect by giving unity to the representations involved through determining and hence connecting them (§68, 62). The representations must follow each other in an order similar to causes and effects (§69, 63). Baumgarten states, "the degree of similarity observable in the succession of representations is the degree of order in the poem" (§69, 63). The higher the degree of order in a poem, the greater its perfection. That is also why he suggests that having a single theme makes a poem more perfect (§67, 62). Baumgarten lists different methods that can be followed in creating this order and unity. The one he favors is the "lucid method" whose general rule is ordering the poetic representations so that they progressively represent the theme with an extensive clarity (§71, 63). To achieve this kind of orderliness the later representations involved in the poem ought set forth the theme more clearly than the earlier ones (§71, 63). It is imperative to maintain throughout the poem the rationale for choosing the representations one after another. In other words, if a certain representation does not conform to the design then it should be

left out. This is the rule of brevity: a poem is more perfect if it "has nothing in it that could be left out without loss of a degree of perfection" (§74, 65).

According to Baumgarten, the third ingredient of a poem, namely words, should also contribute to its perfection (§77, 67). There are two aspects of words: articulate sounds and meaning (§78, 67). For perfecting the poetic discourse Baumgarten advises the use of non-proper terms over proper terms[19] (§§81-82, 68), metaphors (§83, 68), allegories (§85, 69), and so on. In virtue of being articulate sounds, words can contribute to the perfection of a poem by exciting either pleasure or displeasure in the ear (§90, 69). Since the more discordant the poem sounds, the less clear it will be due to creating distraction, Baumgarten argues that a poet should aim to produce the highest pleasure in the ear in order to produce a perfected discourse (§95, 70).

Baumgarten's analysis of how the distinct ingredients of a poem can contribute to its perfection leads to the formation of a list of rules to be followed not only in creating a poem, but also in criticizing it. Suppose a poem has a quality that is considered to be a contributing factor to a poem's perfection under the general rules. The critic, in order to justify his or her assessment that the poem is perfect and hence beautiful, can give reasons in the form of "x has such and such quality." These types of reasons act as premises in a logical argument that is designed to justify the poem's beauty because they are backed up by general rules. So in Baumgarten's model, art criticism is regulated on the basis of general rules and the critic's job is to make inferences from the list of rules as to why a poem is beautiful or not and whether we are doing something right or wrong in

[19] Baumgarten maintains that it should be kept in mind that the use of non-proper terms should still be limited to avoid obscurity (§§81-82, 68).

developing an appreciation of it. However, it is hard to decide whether one can indeed derive all these rules from the general criteria of unity and extensive clarity, as Baumgarten claims to be doing. He often seems to be appealing to experience in order to derive them without acknowledging it. His appeal to experience does not exactly pose a problem. The problem is whether or not we can come up with an exhaustive list. Let's assume that we can, then the issue becomes whether this list would be useful at all. It seems as though we are stipulating the properties a poem should have on the basis of our experiences. This stipulation can result in inflation of rules that would fail to guide us in appreciation and criticism in the way Baumgarten envisioned it.

I. 2. 2. Mendelssohn

In comparison to Baumgarten, Mendelssohn presents us with a more sophisticated account of aesthetic experience. Much like his precursors, Mendelssohn accepts that the aesthetic experience is cognitive and hence open to rational analysis. He enriches this model by introducing further distinctions between different types of perfections and different types of pleasures arising from perceiving these perfections.[20] He believes that it

[20] It is these rather more sophisticated rationalist models such as Mendelssohn's that Kant appropriated and modified to form his conception of judgments of perfection. In fact, the Kant-Mendelssohn connection has been evaluated from different aspects in the scholarship. Some, such as Kai Hammermeister (2002, 18f), has argued that there is a close connection between them because Mendelssohn is a precursor of Kantian aesthetics given that he is more open to accepting the *je ne sais quoi* and hence the subjective dimension of the aesthetic experience. Hammermeister even claims that Baumgarten and Mendelssohn represent two different camps that dominated the mid-eighteenth century aesthetics in Germany: While Baumgarten represents the rationalist side "Mendelssohn represents the emotive side" (13). This reading assumes that Mendelssohn was moving away from the rationalist explanation of aesthetic experience and he was not actually that much of a rationalist after all. Others, such as Zuckert (2007a) and Rueger (2009), have suggested that Kant was closer to the rationalists than the sentimentalists and the close resemblance between Kant's and Mendelssohn's accounts attests to that. This view, contra the former view, gives Mendelssohn his due as a rationalist. Additionally, there are interpretations of Mendelssohn, which present him again as a rationalist while rejecting the sentimentalist readings of his account, such as Beiser's (2009, 196-244) and Aaron M. Koller's (2011) interpretations. I follow the line of interpretation offered by the latter view since I believe that the former view lacks credibility because as we will see Mendelssohn was a strong proponent of the rationalist project and his main aim was to revise it so that it could withstand sentimentalist criticisms.

is possible to derive rules of appreciation and criticism on the basis of an objective principle of taste. Unlike his predecessors, we see that Mendelssohn uses the term 'art' in its more contemporary sense to refer to fine arts. He still follows Baumgarten's views on art criticism, but expands on them so as to extend their application to all artforms. His rules are also formed on the basis of the concept of beauty and the principle that he thinks follows from it. On the basis of the general principle, according to which "the essence of the fine arts and sciences consists in an artful, sensuously perfect representation or in a sensuous perfection represented by art," he derives two sets of rules: artform-invariant and art-form specific rules (1997, 172f). Mendelssohn's critic uses the general rules that apply to all artforms and the ones that are specific to each artform to make rational inferences to justify his or her aesthetic judgments. As we will see, unlike his predecessors, Mendelssohn delimits the employment of rules in aesthetic creation.

Mendelssohn accepts the rationalist classification of aesthetic experience as based on perceiving perfection, but he goes a step further and differentiates between different kinds of pleasure, namely between sensuous gratification, aesthetic pleasure, and intellectual pleasure. They are different kinds of pleasure because they are grounded in perception of different kinds of perfection. Sensuous gratification, which has its source in both the body and the soul, is occasioned by the stimulation of a limb or a part of body by a sensuous object. Once the stimulation occurs, its effects are felt in the rest of the body because all the vessels and nerves are connected. Such bodily changes have their effects on the soul as well. He considers sensuous gratification to be based on "the improved condition of the state of our body" (48). He writes,

> it [the soul] will feel an improvement, a transition to a perfection, but it will grasp only in an obscure way how this improvement arose. Put all this together: it will arrive at an *indistinct but lively representation of the perfection of its body*; reason enough, according to our theory, to explain the origin of a pleasure (46).

The second type of pleasure, namely aesthetic pleasure or pleasure in the beautiful, is grounded in the perception of *sensuous perfection*, which is defined as *unity* or *sameness* in multiplicity (22). It is differentiated from the third type of pleasure, intellectual pleasure. The latter consists in perceiving *intellectual perfection* that is described as *harmony* in multiplicity (24).

Mendelssohn illustrates the difference between sensuous perfection and intellectual perfection by means of an example. When we observe trees in a garden and pay attention to the circular order in which the branches ascend and notice the simple proportions that give the sense of order, the perceived perfection is of sensuous nature (24). However, when we contemplate each of their properties, such as branches, blossoms, buds, leaves, etc., in connection with God's final purpose for creating the trees (the purpose that underlies the reciprocal harmony between them) we would be appreciating the intellectual perfection in the trees. While in perceiving the sensuous perfection "we perceive a large array of an object's features all at once without being able to separate them distinctly from each other," in perceiving the intellectual perfection we perceive the features distinctly and contemplate the connections between them in partaking of the whole (172). Similar to Baumgarten, Mendelssohn also claims that neither fully distinct nor fully obscure concepts are compatible with the feeling of beauty because perceiving distinctly would take away our attention from the unity, namely the object as a whole, while perceiving obscurely conceals the multiplicity of the properties

of the object (14). Given that beauty consists in the perception of unity in multiplicity, either kind of perception will result in the loss of the feeling of beauty. Following Baumgarten, Mendelssohn claims that what enriches the aesthetic experience are the extensively clearer representations because such representations "contain richer multiplicity, more relations opposite to one another" (14). Hence, when we perceive sensuous perfection, we are taken by the unity of the multiplicity of properties without connecting them to a final purpose. In contemplating the intellectual perfection, the order is being analyzed at a deeper level, in terms of harmony, because in this case we associate the order with a final purpose.

Once we notice that there are times when one and the same object does not carry both sensuous perfection and intellectual perfection, we get a better grasp of how they differ. According to Mendelssohn, even though there are objects in nature we do not find beautiful, and hence do not perceive as sensuously perfect, rational reflection reveals that everything in nature is intellectually perfect. For instance, Mendelssohn says that, although we can find a human form beautiful, when we look closely at the human skin we are usually struck by ugly shapes, such as pores on the skin and so on (24f). However, he claims, these ugly shapes "do not cease to contribute as much to the general final purpose as they can, they endure without fail neither excess nor deficiency" (24). What we appreciate intellectually is the final purpose in them: "Everything in nature aims at *one* purpose, everything is grounded in it, everything is complete" (24).

One apparent problem with this formulation of intellectual perfection is that it is not clear how we can attribute intellectual perfection to artworks, given that they are not God's creations. However, Mendelssohn unequivocally states that the pleasure we have

in certain artworks, especially music, is a composite of the three pleasures.[21] How can this problem be resolved? The reason Mendelssohn did not feel the need to differentiate between different kinds of intellectual perfections, one applicable to nature appreciation and one to art appreciation, is probably that both of them are judged with respect to a final purpose. While in nature the final purpose is God's purpose of creation, in art the final purpose is the artist's purpose of creation, which, Mendelssohn states, is to please (172).

In the Eleventh Letter of "On Sentiments," Mendelssohn cites "the imitations of human passions" as one of the sources of perfection in music (48). At first glance, it is rather hard to see how it can be the reason for intellectual pleasure. Later in "On the Main Principles of the Fine Arts and Sciences," we get a better picture. There, Mendelssohn starts off by talking about imitation. He writes that imitation by itself is considered to be pleasing because "each imitation conveys with it the concept of a perfection, and if our senses can perceive the faithfulness or similarity of the imitation, then it is capable of arousing a pleasant sentiment" (174).[22] However, the imitation cannot be the real source of intellectual pleasure in an artwork because it is not judged with respect to the final purpose of pleasing but instead we judge it with respect to "the common final purpose of faithfully representing a specific original image" (174). Therefore, judging whether a work is a good imitation or not can only work as a preparatory step in judging the true

[21] "Divine art of music! You are the only one that surprises us with all three of pleasures! What sweet confusion of perfection, sensuous gratification, and beauty!" (Mendelssohn 1997, 48).

[22] Jean-François Goubet argues that Mendelssohn places imitation within ontology by reducing it to simple and primitive notions such as similarity, resemblance, and likeness (2006). That is why imitation on its own can be judged to be perfect.

intellectual perfection in the work, which is "the artist's perfection that we perceive in [it]" (174). Mendelssohn writes,

> for all works of art are visible imprints of the artist's abilities which, so to speak, put his entire soul on display and make it known to us. This perfection of spirit arouses an uncommonly greater pleasure than mere similarity, because it is more excellent and far more complex than similarity (174).

The perfection of the artist lies in fact that there is a sufficient reason for everything in the work. Everything in the work is contributing to the final purpose, that is to please. We analyze every part of the work and perceive each distinctly one by one and see the connections between them. The imitation becomes pleasing not on its own but with respect to the rationale of imitation: The artist imitates to a degree that makes sense with respect to the delivery of the final purpose and in virtue of the final purpose we judge the imitation to be pleasing or not.

The same criterion applies to the displeasing parts of the work as well. Another source of perfection in music, says Mendelssohn, is the "artful combination of discordant tones" (48). It is very well possible that, considered separately, some parts of the work are not by themselves pleasing. The intellectual perfection of a work, however, lies in the fact that there is a sufficient reason for even the displeasing parts to exist. The reason is simple enough: they contribute to the final purpose of the work. Thus, the parts that are displeasing in isolation become pleasing in relation to the rest of the parts. The imitation and the displeasing parts become sources of perfection insofar as their existence contributes to the final purpose of the work and we perceive the artist's perfection in them. This is analogous to the way in which we perceive intellectual perfection in nature:

there is a sufficient reason for everything in nature even for the displeasing, we perceive "the infinite perfection of the master who produced them" in everything in nature, and this is the source of our intellectual pleasure (174f).

To recapitulate the distinction: Judging an artwork on the basis of intellectual perfection entails to distinctly perceive the parts of the work not at the same time, but separately and to contemplate or reflect on the way they harmonize with each other with respect to the final purpose of the work. In judging according to sensuous perfection, we confusedly but clearly perceive the parts all at once and with respect to the whole. Therefore, the feeling of beauty is a sensuous response to the order while intellectual pleasure is instigated by grasping why the order is there and consists in judging according a final purpose.

Apart from differentiating between different kinds of pleasure, Mendelssohn makes other important additions to the rationalist approach. Although not addressed in the secondary literature, the textual evidence makes it clear that Mendelssohn thinks that aesthetic appreciation can result from making both singular judgments and combinations of judgments of different sorts. Although it is quite possible to judge an object solely on the basis of sensuous perfection, he suggests that in some cases sensuous gratification and intellectual pleasure can precede the aesthetic pleasure and in other cases we can experience a combination of all three kinds of pleasures. For instance, in the Third Letter of "On Sentiments," Mendelssohn presents the judgment of intellectual perfection as a preparatory step towards enjoyment of beauty:

> Listen, now, my noble young man, to how I prepare myself to enjoy something pleasurable. I contemplate the object of the pleasure, I reflect upon all sides of it, and strive to grasp them

> distinctly. Then I direct my attention at the general connection among them; I swing from the parts to the whole. The particular distinct concepts recede as it were back into the shadows. They all work on me but they work in such a state of equilibrium and proportion to one another that the whole alone radiates from them, and my thinking about it has not broken up the manifold, but only made it easier to grasp (14f).

In the Fourth Letter, not only the intellectual pleasure but also the sensuous gratification is described to be a preparatory step towards aesthetic pleasure:

> *Choose*: among the objects that surround you, permit yourself such as are beneficial to your sojourn. *Feel* them: outfit yourself with intuitive concepts and judgments about their constitution. *Reflect*: entertain individual parts distinctly, and weigh their relations and connections relative to one another and to the whole. Then *enjoy*: direct your attention to the object itself. Guard against thinking about the makeup of individual parts at this moment. Allow the capacities of your soul to prevail. Through the intuiting of the whole the parts will lose their bright colors, but they will leave traces behind them which illuminate the concept of the whole and lend a greater liveliness to the pleasure which arises from this (18).

According to this picture, we *choose* an object because it satisfies the first phase of sensuous gratification; namely it stimulates our senses. Then we *feel* the object in realizing its effects on our body. Put otherwise, we feel sensuous gratification with respect to the improved condition of the state of our body. The sensuous gratification is followed by reflection where we perceive the object as a bearer of intellectual perfection (provided that it has that). We *distinctly* perceive the individual properties of the object, pay attention to their harmony. We do not contemplate on the properties all at once but separately, one by one. This analysis followed by the last stage where all the distinctness leaves its place to (extensive) clarity. In this stage we perceive the object in terms of its sensuous perfection. We pay attention to the sameness of the multiplicity of the

properties of the object and *confusedly* perceive them all at once. If the object has this kind of perfection we end up enjoying it.

It is equally possible to experience a combination of these three kinds of pleasures. Particularly, Mendelssohn's remarks on music in the Eleventh Letter are suggestive of the idea that it is possible to make combination judgments of sensuous gratification, beauty, and perfection. After reminding us of the division between different pleasures, Mendelssohn writes,

> All the fine arts draw from this sanctuary that refreshing potion by means of which they quench the soul's thirst for pleasure. How the muses must rejuvenate us, they who draw upon diverse sources in full measure and pour them out over us in a pleasant *combination*! Divine art of music! You are the only one that surprises us with all three of these pleasures! What a sweet *confusion* of perfection, sensuous gratification, and beauty! (48, emphases added)

Mendelssohn's enthusiastic tone in this passage suggests that he possibly believes that the objects capable of inducing all three kinds of pleasures are more desirable and even possibly possessing higher aesthetic value. I am fully aware that this interpretation is anachronistic, but it seems as though even the idea of forming combination judgments of intellectual perfection and sensuous perfection could imply that there are more informed ways of appreciating artworks. For instance, it is not too much of a stretch to presume that once we contemplate an artwork and the relations between its parts, and see the artist's perfection in it, then this judgment of intellectual perfection can lead to a more informed judgment concerning the work. These remarks are all speculations, but they are speculations that can become important in understanding Kant's views on informed aesthetic evaluations (see chapter II). Maybe the seeds of these ideas were partially in Mendelssohn, and Kant just pushed it a little further.

I. 2. 2. 1. Mendelssohnian Art Criticism

What are the implications of Mendelssohn's aesthetic theory for art criticism? His rational analysis of how and why we appreciate beauty leads to a formation of rules that "the artist's genius feels and the critic reduces to rational inferences" (1997, 169). As mentioned earlier, Mendelssohn differs from his rationalist predecessors in his views on aesthetic creation. He argues that aesthetic creation is not purely rule-guided. That is why in the quote above he claims that the artist *feels* the rules. According to him, rules should only be used while making preparations for the creative process, such as assisting the artist in choosing beautiful representations (18). He claims that when the artist is in the midst of production, he should pay attention only to the theme:

> At this moment he must take care not to have his rules all too distinctly before his eyes. They are not supposed to put a rein on his imagination, but rather are supposed to show it the way only from a distance and to call it back when it is in danger of losing itself (18f).

Thus, the function of rules in artistic creation is to help the artist to get set up and to keep him or her on track. However, in terms of appreciation and criticism the rules have a more definitive use.

Mendelssohn lists, on the one hand, general rules for any kind of fine arts and sciences to follow, and on the other hand, sets of particular rules that are specific to each artform. The general rules are derived from the main principle of fine arts and sciences and the artform-specific rules are derived again on the basis of this principle but with a consideration of the limitations imposed by the artform – limitations that are correlated with what objects can be expressed and how they can be expressed, given the medium. Art critics employ these rules in their evaluations of artworks. The reasons they provide

for why an artwork is or is not beautiful are grounded in these rules. Even though Mendelssohn's list of rules is more nuanced than Baumgarten's, the manner in which the rules are derived and employed are the same. They serve the purpose of establishing the logical connection between the critic's judgment, "object O is beautiful" and the critic's reason, "because O has such and such unified properties." Mendelssohn, just like his rationalist predecessors and contemporaries, thought that it must be possible to imitate the scientific procedure in aesthetics: Just like in science, where in order to demonstrate the validity of a proposition we make inferences from generalizations, in aesthetics we should be able to demonstrate the validity of our aesthetic responses by giving reasons which are backed up by a set of artform-invariant and artform-specific rules. Let's now see what these rules are according to Mendelssohn.

The general artform-invariant rules are derived from the main principle of the fine arts and sciences, which itself has been derived from their final purpose. Mendelssohn states, "… since the final purpose of the fine arts is to please, we can presuppose the following principle as indubitable: the essence of the fine arts and sciences consists in an artful, sensuously perfect representation or in a sensuous perfection represented by art" (172f). The general rules that follow from this principle are the following: (1) The paradigm of nature imitated by the artwork "must be, to a noticeable degree, either pleasant or unpleasant in and for itself" (175);[23] (2) the artwork "will have to have multiple parts" (175);[24] (3) "…the parts must harmonize in a sensuous manner to constitute a whole. That is to say, the order and regularity which they observe in their

[23] "The indifferent is rightly excluded since, in and for itself, it arouses no sentiments at all and this is capable of arousing merely lukewarm satisfaction with the imitation" (175).

[24] The reason for this rule is that "the monotonous, the meager, and the sterile are unbearable to good taste" (175).

succession must be apparent to senses" (175);[25] (4) "the whole must not overstep the determinate boundaries of the magnitude" (175);[26] (5) "the object of the fine arts must, furthermore, be decent, novel, extraordinary, fruitful, and so forth" (175);[27] and (6) the fine arts and sciences should imitate nature only to a certain degree and in every possible way must beautify nature (176).[28] These general rules are applicable to all artforms, whether the artwork is a musical piece or a poem or a painting.

Before outlining the artform-specific rules, Mendelssohn explains how he divides the fine arts and sciences into particular classes and then presents more specific definitions of each artform. Each artform expresses an object by means of signs of which there are two kinds: natural and arbitrary signs. While the former are grounded in the very properties of the signified object, the latter have nothing in common with the signified and have been adopted arbitrarily. Mendelssohn gives the examples of appropriate sounds, gestures, and movements that function as natural signs for emotions. The articulated sounds of all languages, by contrast, the letters, the hieroglyphic signs of the ancients, and some allegorical images are examples of arbitrary signs. He employs this distinction to differentiate between fine arts and fine sciences: the latter (poetry and

[25] The sufficient reason why the parts come together in the way they did should be clear to the perceivers. "As far as our senses are concerned, a hidden order is indistinguishable from a complete lack of order" (175).

[26] "Our senses must not lose themselves in either the enormous or the minute. Where the objects are too small, the mind misses the multiplicity, and where they are too big, it misses the unity in the multiplicity" (175).

[27] Mendelssohn makes this point; however, he does not further motivate the rule. He only comments that all these qualities that fine arts must possess "can be demonstrated with little trouble from the definition" (175).

[28] There are two reasons why artworks should not be mere replicas of nature: (1) Nature has an immensurable plan and to please us is not its sole purpose. Nevertheless, this is entire purpose of the artist. Thus, what the artist should do is to beautify nature in his imitations. He needs to "abstract the ideal beauty from the works of nature" (176). (2) The artist does not only represent beauties in nature but also what is considered to be unpleasant in and for itself. If the imitation of the unpleasant becomes too real, then the representation would become unpleasant itself (173).

rhetoric) employ arbitrary signs while the former (painting, sculpture, architecture, music, and dance) express their objects by means of natural signs. More specific distinctions between artforms are made with respect to which senses the signs affect (hearing or sight), and how the artforms express beauty (through movement or through forms). In introducing all these distinctions, Mendelssohn's aim is to reach a definition for each kind of artform in order to determine the rules that are specific to each. I do not want to give all the definitions and corresponding rules; looking at one specific form, namely poetry, should suffice to give a general idea.

Mendelssohn adopts Baumgarten's definition of poetry: "a poem is a sensuously perfect statement" (178).[29] The final purpose of poetry is same as that of all the other fine arts and sciences, that is, to please by means of sensuously perfect representations.[30] The general maxim according to which "[t]he worth of poetic images, similes, and descriptions and even that of individual poetic terms must be judged" is derived from this definition (178). The poet must choose expressions that are fit to "bring an array of features to mind all at once so that what is designated is felt by us in a more lively way than the sign" (178). Only by doing so can she render a statement sensuous and make us feel as if the objects presented are right in front of us. With respect to the subject matter of poetry, Mendelssohn says that the theme can be anything that we have a clear concept of:

[29] In my explication of Baumgarten I said that he defines a poem as perfect sensate discourse. Mendelssohn's definition can seem different from Baumgarten's but it is not. Mendelssohn's definition of 'statement' is identical to Baumgarten's definition of 'discourse' (see Baumgarten, §1, 37 and Mendelssohn 1997, 178).

[30] All of the more specific definitions of each fine sciences and arts accord with this general definition with the exception of rhetoric. Mendelssohn designates "to persuade by means of a sensuously perfect statement" as the ultimate purpose of rhetoric (178).

> [a]ll the beauties of nature, its colors, figures, and sounds, the entire gloriousness of creation, the cohesiveness of the immense system of the world, the commandments of God and his infinite properties, all the inclinations and passions of our soul, our subtlest thoughts, sentiments, and decisions (178).[31]

With these remarks, he concludes the list of rules that are applicable exclusively to poetry.

I. 3. Kant on Perfection

In my brief and selective presentation of the history of rationalist aesthetics and art criticism, I tried to give a general picture of how this paradigm functions. My aim was to expose what judgments of perfection are and what function they serve within this general framework. It is easy to see that the conception of judgments of perfection changed with the emergence of the different versions of rationalist aesthetics and came to be more refined, while the rationalists' reduction of beauty to perfection remained a constant feature. This reduction made it possible for the rationalists to argue for rule-guided appreciation and criticism.[32] Now I want to analyze Kant's take on judgments of perfection and the alterations he makes to the rationalist framework.

Kant's remarks on perfection are mainly located in the Third Moment of the Analytic of the KU. His primary aim in this Moment is to differentiate judgments of taste from other types of judgments by showing that they are grounded in a special type of purposiveness. For Kant, in a judgment of taste we find a representation of an object

[31] The subject matter of fine arts is more limited in comparison to poetry. There are two main reasons for this limitation: fine arts employ natural signs and works of fine art are tied to the limitations of the medium being used. Mendelssohn asserts, "each art must content itself with that portion of natural signs that it can express by means of the senses" (179). Mendelssohn gives the concept of a rose, a poplar tree, etc. as examples of objects that cannot be expressed by music.

[32] This is an apt characterization that applies to rationalists across the board, including the ones whose accounts I haven't discussed, such as Johann Christian Gottsched, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, and so on.

subjectively purposive for our cognitive faculties and this purposiveness is registered with pleasure. For the rationalists, as we have seen, the aesthetic pleasure results from the perception of perfection. It seems reasonable to assume that Kant substitutes "subjective purposiveness" for "perfection." However, this cannot be the case because for Kant perfection of an object cannot be evaluated without any recourse to concepts while subjective purposiveness is without a purpose. Therefore, when we judge an object on the basis of subjective purposiveness, it is imperative that we do not use determinate concepts.

In §10, Kant defines "purpose" or "end" as the object of a concept where the concept is the cause of the existence of the object (KU, AA 05: 220). Objects caused by concepts are ends or purposes. In this respect, "purposiveness" is the causality that concepts (the representations of a purpose) have when they function as (part of) the cause of the existence of a corresponding object. The concept of an object is purposive if the concept has the causality to produce the object. Kant also talks about objects as purposive. An object is purposive when the object is subsumable under the concept that figured in its cause. Likewise, we can talk about purposiveness in case of intentional production of objects. In these cases, the concept of an object acts as a cause in the mind of the producer to bring about the object. For instance, the concept of a paper cutter is a cause in the mind of the artisan for producing the particular paper cutter. If we abstract from such a mind and focus only on the causal relation of a concept and its object, we arrive at Kant's general definition of purposiveness. This way of conceptualizing purposiveness allows Kant to apply the notion of purposiveness to organisms. We can talk about organisms as purposive, *as if* they have been designed in the specific way they

are by an intelligent designer according to a concept. The purposiveness in this instance is without a purpose because no mind with purpose is literally involved in the production of organisms. This general notion of purposiveness also applies to aesthetic cases where there is no determinate concept involved. In aesthetic cases, another type of causality is involved. This causality of a representation does not bring about objects, but causes our faculties of imagination and understanding to maintain a harmonious and sustaining relation (KU, AA 05: 221). We call such representations subjectively purposive. They are "subjective" because the representation is suitable for our faculties and "purposive without a purpose" because no determinate concept of an object is involved in the causal propagation of the representation in the mind.

Let's compare Kant's pure judgments of taste to rationalists' judgments of beauty. Recall that rationalists claimed that these judgments consist of perceiving sensuous perfection. Kant's notion of subjective purposiveness has no connection to perfection. In judging an object in accordance with the principle of formal subjective purposiveness, we reflect on the representation of the object as a unity of diverse contingent properties.[33] However, this reflection is not guided by a concept of the object. Since we are not employing a determinate concept, the process of judging cannot involve comparing this representation to the representations associated with such a concept. For instance, judging a rose to be beautiful does not involve comparing our representation of this particular rose to all other representations we have of roses. Instead, it involves comparing the representation to our cognitive faculties (cf. EEKU, AA 20: 211-216; 219-221). In reflecting on the representation, the cognitive faculties of understanding and imagination

[33] Here I follow Zuckert's interpretation. See Zuckert 2007b.

are brought together in an optimum relation where they agree without the mediation of a determinate concept (KU, AA 05: 238). The implication of this harmonious relation is that we find the representation to be subjectively purposive for our cognitive faculties. It is the purposive form that we find beautiful and this form is the source of aesthetic pleasure. Hence, the judgment of beauty is not a cognitive judgment as rationalists claim it is. In contrast to the rationalist conception of beauty as perceived perfection in an object, Kantian beauty is not a property in the object (KU, AA 05: 189; 05: 211f; 05: 218). The judgment of beauty for Kant is expressive: it expresses the state of mind one finds herself in considering an object to be subjectively purposive. In this regard, rationalists' truth conditions are not applicable to them.

On this note, Kant is following sentimentalists.[34] If the judgment is expressing a mental state, to say that truth condition applicable to them would imply that it is true or false that the person who makes the judgment is experiencing pleasure. Even if in the cases where we do not agree with one's judgment that an object is beautiful, we do not actually think that the person with whom we are in disagreement is not feeling pleasure. That is absurd. Instead, we would be thinking that it is not appropriate to form an appreciation of the object in the way that this person did. However, in contrast to expressivists such as Hume, Kant does not claim that judgments of beauty are affective

[34] David Hume also makes a similar point by differentiating between matters of fact and matters of sentiments and arguing that truth conditions are applicable only to the determinations of understanding which have reference to matters of fact. He states that "[a]ll sentiment is right; because sentiment has a reference to nothing beyond itself, and is always real, wherever a man is conscious of it. But all determinations of the understanding are not right; because they have reference to something beyond themselves, to wit, real matter of fact; and are not always conformable to that standard. Among a thousand different opinions which different men may entertain of the same subject, there is one, and but one, that is just and true; and the only difficulty is to fix and ascertain it. On the contrary, a thousand different sentiments, excited by the same object, are all right: because no sentiment represents what is really in the object" (1987, 230).

responses to the objects. There are such kinds of aesthetic judgments, but they are not judgments of beauty. Instead they are judgments of the agreeable. In the case of the agreeable, we relate the representation of an object to the feeling of pleasure and displeasure (EEKU, AA 20: 225). In the case of beauty or taste, we relate the *reflection* on the representation of an object to the feeling of pleasure and displeasure. Since judgments of taste are related through reflection or free play to the feeling of pleasure, such judgments "belong to the higher faculty of cognition and indeed to the power of judgment" (EEKU, AA 20: 225). That is also why they are based on a special principle, namely the principle of subjective purposiveness without a purpose. This principle is what secures the intersubjective universal and necessary validity of judgments of taste. Therefore, the Kantian truth conditions, in contrast to rationalist truth conditions, would pertain to the subject, not to the object.

Kant challenges the main idea behind the rationalist project: aesthetic pleasure results from cognitive judgments that aim at subsuming an object under the concept of beauty and this is done by means of recognizing the perfection in the object. This being said, he nevertheless discusses concepts of perfection at some length because, as we will see in Chapters II and III, he allows judgments of perfection to be combined with or incorporated into judgments of taste. In the Third Moment, Kant differentiates between three main kinds of perfection: qualitative perfection, quantitative perfection, and what I call "accidental perfection." He asserts that all are concerned with objective purposiveness of an object. He defines objective purposiveness as a type of purposiveness that requires an end. Kant writes that objective purposiveness "can be recognized *only* by means of the relation of the manifold to a determinate end, thus only

through a concept" (KU, AA 05: 226, my emphasis). He divides objective purposiveness into two categories, external and internal and further distinguishes two different types of internal objective purposiveness; all of these distinctions map on the distinction between three types of perfection. Now I want to analyze each type of perfection, in order to pave the way for the next chapter, where I will be discussing the function of judgments of perfection in aesthetic assessments. In order to determine which type of perfection is germane to making informed impure and pure judgments of taste, I want to present an explanation of each.

Let's start with external or relative objective purposiveness, which, I believe, is equivalent to what can be called "accidental perfection."[35] It concerns the utility or the usefulness of the object (KU, AA 05: 226). When we make a judgment of external objective purposiveness we judge the object on the basis of a concept concerning the use of the object. However, there is a catch. The catch is that the purpose that is assigned is not the purpose the object *ought* to serve. The purposiveness is regarded to be relative because it is "contingent in the thing itself to which it is ascribed" (KU, AA 05: 368). It is being assigned to the object not on the basis of its intended function or use, but rather arbitrarily. Kant gives examples of finding colorful bird feathers to be good for the decoration of one's clothing or considering colored soils or juices of plants for painting oneself – I assume he means for make-up – as instances of assigning external purposiveness to objects (KU, AA 05: 369). The satisfaction in these cases is mediate because the ends according to which one judges lie in other things. Put otherwise, the satisfaction in bird feathers is mediate because the person who judges the instrumental

[35] Of course, this is my label. Kant does not count external objective purposiveness as a sort of perfection at all.

goodness of the feathers checks whether they fulfill the purpose of decoration, which is an end that is not internal but external to the object. The end to which the object serves as means is satisfying for her, namely decorating her clothes, not the feathers for their own sake. Therefore, the satisfaction in the object derives from the satisfaction in the (rather arbitrary) end for which it is a means. The perfection that can be assigned to an object on the basis of external purposiveness also can at most be *accidental perfection*. For instance, one can judge an ice-cream lid to be a good Frisbee, indeed a perfect Frisbee if one has a tendency to exaggerate, but this does not mean that skimming nicely through the air is the intended purpose of an ice-cream lid. It is only by accident that it serves this purpose; it is merely an *accidentally* perfect Frisbee.

Internal objective purposiveness is distinguished from external objective purposiveness mainly because the former presupposes a concept of what the object *ought* to be, not the concept of what the object happens to be. Internal objective purposiveness can be formulated in two different ways: either as a qualitative perfection or as a quantitative perfection. In §15 we get the following definitions of each:

> Now as an end in general is that the **concept** of which can be regarded as the ground of the possibility of the object itself, thus in order to represent an objective purposiveness in a thing the concept of **what sort of thing it is supposed to be** must come first; and the agreement of the manifold in the thing with this concept (which supplies the rule for the combination of the manifold in it) is the **qualitative perfection** of a thing (KU, AA 05: 227).
>
> **Quantitative** perfection, as the completeness of any thing in its own kind, is entirely distinct from this, and is a mere concept of magnitude (of totality), in which **what the thing is supposed to be** is thought of as already determined and it is only asked where **everything** that is requisite for it exists (KU, AA 05: 227).

Even though Kant seems to suggest that we have two different conception of internal perfection, quantitative perfection turns out to be an empty conception. Kant claims that quantitative (or ontological) perfection that takes *to be a thing* and *to be an end* as identical is nonsensical (KU, AA 05: 394).

According to qualitative perfection, each object is perfect because the concept according to which we judge its perfection has only one member, namely the object itself. Kant states that according to the Wollfians ("the academy"), who equate purposiveness with quantitative perfection or "the transcendental perfection of things," x has quantitative perfection means x has "in itself everything that is necessary in order to be that kind of thing and not any other" (KU, AA 05:394). Therefore, everything is quantitatively perfect. Everything is purposive and "must be conceived as ends" (KU, AA 05: 394). The problem with equating purposiveness with quantitative perfection is that "if to be a thing and to be an end are identical, then there is at the bottom nothing that particularly deserves to be represented as an end" (KU, AA 05:394). Kant concludes that this formulation, hence the idea of quantitative perfection, is nothing but "merely a childish game played with words instead of concepts" (KU, AA 05: 394).

The second type of internal objective purposiveness is what Kant calls qualitative perfection. Similar to the way in which we judge an object according to external objective purposiveness, we need a concept of an end in judging the qualitative perfection of an object. However, unlike the former, which requires a concept of external or arbitrary end, the latter requires a concept of an internal end, which contains the ground of the internal possibility of the object. This concept we need to employ is a kind concept,

namely the concept of the kind of thing the object is or ought to be, such as the concept of a jacket, a dog, etc.

This by no means entails that there is only one fixed kind concept we can use in judging an object. In the *Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant asserts, "one thing can have several qualitative perfections" (MS, AA 06: 386). This indicates that there are several different ends that can be assigned to the same object. For instance, one can judge a jacket on the basis of the concept of a jacket, a winter jacket, or a down jacket. Correspondingly, the internal end that is assigned to the jacket can change.

The judgment of qualitative perfection is regulated by the consideration of the object as being an instance of a certain kind, and it has the form "this is good" or "this is perfect." The agreement of the object with the kind concept is what makes us to judge it as objectively purposive. In other words, what is expressed in the judgment is the object's suitability for the purpose or function attached to being a kind of something. Unlike external objective purposiveness, which is concerned with the functions the object happens to serve, internal objective purposiveness focuses on the functions the object *ought* to serve. In making a judgment of qualitative perfection, we reflect on the way in which the properties of the object come together in making it the kind of thing that it is. However, this judgment is not only about determining whether or not the object has the properties that make it of a certain kind. It results from reflecting on "the way in which the multiple properties of the object are represented as unified, according to the rule

provided by the concept" (Zuckert 2007b, 215). In this sense, we do not treat the object as an aggregate of properties but rather as a unity of properties.[36]

This judgment bears some resemblance to Mendelssohn's judgment of intellectual perfection. In both cases, we need to distinctly perceive each property of the object separately and how they connect up with each other in harmony for rationally conceptualizable reasons (cf. Zuckert 2007a, 450). These reasons for Kant are derived from the determinate kind concept under which we subsume the object. By classifying the object under a certain kind concept, we determine the functions and purposes affiliated with being that kind of thing. These purposes function as reasons pertaining to why we expect the object to have these properties and why they are organized in the manner they are. For Mendelssohn, the reasons are derived from the final purpose. In the case of natural objects, the final purpose is God's purpose in creation. In the case of artifacts, the final purpose is the artist's or the artisan's purpose in creation. While the forms of the judgments concerning both qualitative perfection and intellectual perfection seem to resemble each other, Kant argues that perfection of an object cannot be assessed without reference to the kind of an object it is supposed to be, while Mendelssohn does not require this. Even though when judging artworks Mendelssohn asks us to take into consideration what type of thing the object is, in the last instance we cannot enumerate the determinate marks the object should have in order to be perfect since perfection is always thought in relation to the final purpose of the artist, which is to please, and not in relation to the determinate concept of poetry, painting, music, and so on. We have been told that to be pleasing means to be perfect but we are asked to define the latter in relation

[36] See Zuckert (2007b, 218-222).

to the former. All we have as the possible mediator is the further definition of perfection as unity in multiplicity. Hence, the reasoning is circular and all we get is a vague concept of perfection as unity in multiplicity. For this reason, in her analysis of Mendelssohn's aesthetic theory, Zuckert rightly concludes thus: "We can identify no determinate marks from this vague concept that would allow us to judge that an object is a unity of multiplicity (to which properties should we attend, and how are they unified?). Perfection on Mendelssohn's definition, then, could not constitute the predicate of an objective judgment" (2007a, 459). This is a problem any rationalist account needs to face. Without using determinate kind concepts, one cannot assign perfection to an object. Perfection by itself is too vague to function as a predicate. This is why Kant thinks that aesthetics cannot become science (KU, AA 05: 304; 05:354f). Rationalist aesthetics is a project that is doomed to fail.

Kant, on the other hand, by characterizing the judgment of qualitative perfection as a cognitive judgment which employs a determine concept, redefines perfection so that it can serve as a predicate of this judgment (cf. Zuckert, 458f). The kind concepts employed can be elucidated by specifying each mark the object is supposed to have in order to be categorized under this concept. This allows us to identify not only the set of properties required, but also how they should be unified. Hence, in making a judgment of perfection there are certain steps involved: (1) We need to determine what kind of thing the object O ought to be through observing the properties O has. We perceive O's properties and on this basis come to think that having those properties is standard for any object that is classified under kind K, thereby concluding that the object is of kind K. (2) By classifying the object under K, we get access to the purpose of the object. In relation

to this purpose, we determine what types of properties are required for serving this purpose and how they should be unified. This, in turn, allows us to set up expectations. (3) The judgment of perfection, thus, involves reporting on whether or not O meets these expectations. In doing so, we compare our representation of O to all the other representations that are associated with K. This, of course, does not imply that we are comparing representations one by one. Instead, we are comparing our representation of O to a model or archetype. As Kant asserts, since perfection can be thought only relationally, "[i]n all perfection what matters is always that one has before one's eyes a purpose, a model, a proto- and an archetype. Regarding this, one can properly judge, and say whether one thing, and which thing, is more perfect than another" (V-Lo/Blomberg, AA 24: 50).

This model can be formed in two distinct ways, namely *a priori* or *a posteriori*, depending on the type of the object under consideration. It is important to note at this juncture that Kant distinguishes between three different kinds of judgments of qualitative perfection and that he does so because the kind concepts presupposed in these judgments are of different types. These are judgments of technical, practical, and teleological perfection (Zuckert 2007b, 215). The latter two are concerned with moral kinds and organic kinds, respectively, and the former with inorganic kinds. It is clear that the model or the archetype one uses to compare a moral kind to is formed *a priori* without pertaining to experience (KrV, A 315/B 371). For instance, Kant asserts, just as Plato had argued, that the true origins of concepts of virtue are in our minds alone and we compare whatever is given in our experience to this model. However, when it comes to organic

and inorganic kinds, the kind concepts we use are formed *a posteriori*.[37] I do not want to go into details at this point but I think it would suffice to say that this model we have is tantamount to an average image of an organization of multiple properties that is formed through various encounters with objects we placed under the same kind concept. It is an image that comes to one's mind when recalling what a dog is, what a vacuum cleaner is, etc. For instance, just as we have an average idea of what a Shiba Inu looks like, we have an average idea of what a vacuum cleaner looks like, given the purpose of such a device. This average idea, this model, is associated with our concept of a Shiba Inu and concept of a vacuum cleaner. Hence, when I claim, "this is a perfect/good vacuum cleaner," what I do is to compare this vacuum cleaner with the idea of an average vacuum cleaner I have in mind.

We need to be careful, however, when we say that perfection serves as a predicate of a judgment of qualitative perfection within the Kantian framework. To say that it serves as a predicate does not entail that it is used predicatively. Adjectives such as "perfect," "good," and "bad" that are used in judgments of qualitative perfection are not predicative adjectives. Instead they are attributive. Peter Geach defines attributiveness in terms of what is not predicative: An adjectival phrase is predicative whenever it occurs in a sentential context [x is AB] (A stands for an adjective while B for a noun) which is such that you can separate this into x is A and x is B (1956, 33). Predicative adjectives do not require a contrast class or any qualification. There are no conditions that need to be specified in applying them. Geach gives the example of "x is a red car" as a proposition involving the predicative adjective "red." Once we apply the splitting-up test he devised,

[37] I do not want to get into the details at this point since I discuss this in detail in Chapter III but I need to mention here that there is one exception to this and it is the human form.

we can see that "x is a red car" can split up logically into "x is red" and "x is a car," which indicates "red" is being used predicatively in this sentence. The attributive adjectives fail the split-up test. For instance, the proposition "y is a small elephant" does not split into 'y is an elephant' and 'y is small' because in substituting animal in the place of elephant and then combining the propositions together we end up with a clearly false proposition "y is a small animal." The issue is that applying attributive adjectives necessarily requires a contrast class. We need to presuppose a concept in attributing the property to the object. In this sense, judgments of qualitative perfection require a concept and attribute goodness to the object in relation to the presupposed concept. In fact, the whole problem with Mendelssohn's account is that he thought that "perfect" is a predicative adjective. This is exactly what Kant rejects. Realizing that perfection is used attributively in judgments of perfection for Kant helps us to appreciate the fact that judgments of perfection are a type of value judgment, more specifically attributive good judgment.

It is clear that Kant rejects not only the idea that beauty is reducible to perfection but also another characteristically rationalist idea, that judgments of perfection involve predicative uses of perfection. His rejection of the former indicates that he does not approve of rule-guided art criticism. Since pure judgments of taste are formed without pertaining to concepts, they are not governed by objective principles. There is only a subjective principle of taste, and it cannot be used to provide a proof as to why one's judgment is right or wrong. Indeed, the rationalist truth conditions are not applicable to judgments of taste, since judgments of taste do not involve subsuming objects under concepts. Additionally, by rejecting that perfection can be used predicatively, he shows

that the rationalist judgments of perfection cannot be backed up by any rules. Predicative perfection is too vague to allow us to determine what type of properties and what type of unifying relation between them are required to call an object perfect. However, by modifying judgments of perfection and turning them into good-of-its-kind judgments or attributive good value judgments, Kant really does turn them into proof-apt objective judgments.

The last question I want to address before concluding this section is which type of judgment of perfection is germane to aesthetic appreciation according to Kant. Asking this question can seem a bit puzzling given that I have explained just a few pages ago that Kant rejects the notion that beauty is reducible to perfection. However, Kant's discussion of different kinds of objective purposiveness is followed by §16 where he introduces the distinction between free and adherent beauty for the first time. In reading Kant's description of judgments of adherent beauty and later on his exposition of judgments of artistic beauty, we see that Kant thinks that judgments of perfection are pertinent to both of these judgments. I have listed three major kinds of judgments of perfection in this section, namely accidental perfection (relative/external objective purposiveness), quantitative perfection, and qualitative perfection (internal objective purposiveness). Which one is germane to aesthetic assessments? My explication of quantitative perfection had already crossed it out as a suitable candidate since we have seen that quantitative perfection is not a species of objective purposiveness at all. It is the judgment of qualitative perfection that Kant takes to be relevant to judgments of adherent beauty and artistic beauty. Kant's descriptions of both judgments clearly fits with his description of

judgments of qualitative perfection, which reports the agreement of the manifold in the object with the concept of what sort of a thing the object *ought* to be:

> "There are two kinds of beauty: free beauty (*pulchritudo vaga*) or merely adherent beauty (*pulchritudo adhaerens*). The first presupposes no concept of what the object ought to be; the second does *presuppose such a concept and the perfection of the object in accordance with it*. The first are called (self-subsisting) beauties of this or that thing; the latter, as adhering to a concept (conditioned beauty), are ascribed to objects that stand under the concept of a particular end" (KU, AA 05: 230, emphasis added).

> "[I]f the object is given as a product of art… then, since art always presupposes an end in the cause (and its causality), *a concept must first be the ground of what the thing is supposed to be*, and, … in the judging of the beauty of art *the perfection of the thing will also have to be taken into account*" (KU, AA 05: 311, emphasis added).

It must already be obvious that it is qualitative perfection, namely the only type of internal objective purposiveness we are left with after eliminating the quantitative perfection, that is germane to assessments of both adherent beauty and artistic beauty since the type of concept being used in each case is that of what the object ought to be. Nevertheless, one can ask why it is not external objective purposiveness. Judgments of external objective purposiveness make use of the concept of what the object happens to be, not what it ought to be. Just a paragraph after the presentation of the free-adherent beauty distinction, Kant talks about free beauties by contrasting them with adherent beauties. He asserts that flowers are free beauties because we do not need to know what sort of thing a flower is supposed to be and we pay no attention to its natural end while judging it solely by means of taste. He says, "this judgment is not grounded on any kind of perfection, any internal purposiveness to which the composition of the manifold is

related" (KU, AA 05: 229). By contrast, the judgment of adherent beauty is grounded in internal purposiveness, i.e. qualitative perfection.

Since I have more or less clarified what type of perfection Kant is referring to while talking about adherent beauty and artistic beauty, the next step is to clarify the exact functions he assigns to judgments of perfection in aesthetic assessments. This will be the subject of the next two chapters.

Chapter II Informed Impure Judgments of Taste

Kant's exposition of the free-adherent beauty distinction shows that judgments of adherent beauty make use of judgments of qualitative perfection. In this section, I want to specify the role they play in such judgments. Since Kant's description of judgments of artistic beauty is closely connected with his discussion of judgments of adherent beauty, this analysis will also bring about a partial exposition of his theory of artistic beauty.

I want to proceed by spelling out the problems with Kant's free-adherent beauty distinction and his theory of artistic beauty that arise from apparent textual inconsistencies. We will see that the main problems scholars have identified with Kant's theory of artistic beauty are derivative of the problems concerning the free-adherent beauty distinction. These problems render the very status of artistic beauty questionable. I will then articulate some of the solutions proposed to make sense of these inconsistencies – Donald Crawford's interpretation, the incorporation view, and the conjunctive view – and expound their virtues and vices. One immediate merit of these accounts is that, instead of criticizing Kant, they try to make sense of the textual evidence and tell a more coherent story by focusing on the free aspect of the evaluations of adherent beauty (and

hence artistic beauty). We will see that both the incorporation view and the conjunctive view provide a satisfactory answer to the question responsible for much of the debate, namely whether adherent beauty, and by implication artistic beauty, is a kind of beauty at all. I argue that these interpretations should not be considered as rivaling, but rather as complementing one another. The compatibility of these interpretations does not imply that Kant's theory can lend itself to various interpretations but rather that his theory is rich enough to accommodate them. The important lesson to be drawn from this chapter is that treating artistic beauty as adherent beauty opens up the possibility of making informed impure judgments of taste regarding artistic beauty. The incorporation view and the conjunctive view, by assigning various roles to judgments of perfection, show us different ways in which we can form informed, albeit impure, aesthetic judgments.

II. 1. Inconsistencies and Problems

The apparent inconsistency between the Third Moment of the Analytic of the Beautiful in the KU, (§§10-17), and the section on fine arts and genius (§§43-53) gives rise to problems that put into question the status of artistic beauty. The already problematic free-adherent beauty distinction in §16, which has led some commentators to ask whether adherent beauty is a kind of beauty at all, resurfaces in the issue of artistic beauty. As we have seen in the previous chapter, in judging free beauty, no presupposition of the concept of what the object ought to be is required. Since no concept restricts the free harmonious play of the faculties of understanding and imagination, what we appreciate is solely the subjective purposiveness of the object. Hence, the purity of the judgment remains intact. Adherent beauty, by contrast, requires such a concept. As I claimed in the previous chapter, Kant asserts that when we make a judgment of adherent

beauty, we judge the object with respect to internal objective purposiveness, namely qualitative perfection. This is problematic because Kant rejects rationalist aesthetics by arguing that a judgment of beauty should not be confused with a judgment of perfection. Furthermore, given that Kant insists repeatedly that beauty is judged without a concept, the question arises as to why we are calling adherent beauty beauty at all (Guyer 2002, 358).

Indeed, Ruth Lorand, taking the distinction to be between two kinds of beauty, complains that adherent beauty fails to fulfill the main requirements of beauty Kant describes in the Four Moments. Beauty is judged on the basis of formal subjective purposiveness and without recourse to any concepts. Furthermore, the pleasure we have in it is disinterested. According to Lorand, only free beauty conforms to these classifications and adherent beauty falls short in every respect. Indeed, she argues that if the free-adherent beauty distinction is between two kinds of beauty then it is an impossible distinction. She writes that

> [t]here is a simple and basic logical requirement concerning any distinction between two kinds within a class: the two kinds must have at least one property they both share; i.e., the property which makes them both members of the same class. It is consequently clear that two such kinds cannot contradict each other in every respect (1989, 32).

Hence, she concludes that since adherent beauty and free beauty do not share anything in common, the distinction between them as kinds of beauty is impossible. The implications for artistic beauty are also clear: if artistic beauty is adherent beauty, it is perhaps not a kind of beauty in the Kantian sense at all.

There are further problems attached to characterizing artistic beauty as adherent beauty. In §16 Kant classifies a few artworks as free beauties: "designs *à la grecque*, foliage for borders or on wallpaper…, fantasias (without a theme), … all music without text" (KU, AA 05: 229). He says that these are examples of free beauty because "they signify nothing by themselves… do not represent anything, no object under a determinate concept" (KU, AA 05: 229). In §48, however, Kant gives us a definition of beauty which seems completely at odds with this claim: "a beauty of nature is a beautiful thing; the beauty of art is a beautiful representation of a thing" (KU, AA 05: 311). The obvious conclusion to derive is that if artistic beauty is a representation and free beauty represents nothing, then artistic beauty is not free beauty. But if this is the case, how can we account for the examples of free artistic beauty Kant gives? Is he bluntly contradicting himself? Another related worry regarding these examples is that, if they are examples of free beauty because they represent nothing, and the rest of representative art is not, then Kant seems to be privileging these trivial works of art over masterpieces. As Henry Allison puts it, we find ourselves inquiring whether or not "Kant's location of representative art (however that may be understood) in the category of merely adherent beauty commit(s) him to the view that foliage on borders is somehow aesthetically superior to the works of Michelangelo or Shakespeare" (2001, 140).

The third problem is that Kant's use of these examples, especially when we keep in mind the formalism of §14, seems to contradict Kant's statements about aesthetic ideas in the sections on fine art and genius. In §14, Kant states that

> in painting and sculpture, indeed in all the pictorial arts, in architecture and horticulture insofar as they are fine arts, the design [*Zeichnung*] is what is essential, in which what constitutes the

> ground of all arrangements for taste is not what gratifies in sensation but merely what pleases through its form (KU, AA 05: 225).[38]

This famous passage has been taken to be an indicator of Kant's formalism, which endorses the view that proper appreciation consists in looking at the mere form of the object and hence that the other aesthetic qualities, for instance, the content of the representation of the object, should not enter into our evaluations of the beauty of an object. This formalist depiction of Kant is inconsistent with his claim in §51 that "beauty (whether it be beauty of nature or of art) can in general be called the expression of aesthetic ideas" (KU, AA 05: 320). Why is it inconsistent? Because what is implied in this assertion is that objects of artistic beauty are symbolic presentations of rational ideas, for which no adequate intuition could be found, through aesthetic ideas that are intuitions for which no determinate concept can be found (KU, AA 05: 314). The symbolic presentation is possible because the ways in which we reflect on aesthetic ideas and rational ideas correspond. This means that in judging beauty we are not only judging the form, namely the aesthetic idea, but also the rational idea that the former aims to represent, namely, the content. The appreciation on the basis of both, form and content, obviously contradicts the formalist model. All these problems strengthen the suspicions regarding the status of artistic beauty: If artistic beauty is adherent beauty, perhaps it is not a kind of beauty after all.

II. 2. Extant Solutions

There have been several attempts in the scholarship to resolve the type of anomalies that arise from seemingly conflicting remarks Kant makes on artistic beauty

[38] Guyer and Matthews translate *Zeichnung* as 'drawing' but I prefer to use the word 'design' instead because I believe it fits better with the context of this passage.

and the free-adherent beauty distinction. These accounts, instead of criticizing Kant as Lorand did, try to give a more charitable reading of the relevant passages and construct a more consistent theory. I will analyze the most noteworthy interpretations one by one and show that there are valuable lessons to be drawn from them.

II. 2. 1. Crawford's Interpretation

One of the interpretations geared to overcome the problem about the free-adherent beauty distinction was proposed by Donald W. Crawford. Unlike Lorand, who takes the distinction to be between two kinds of beauty, Crawford suggests that it is a distinction between two kinds of *judgments* of beauty.[39] He states that a judgment is adherent when the purpose of a thing is presupposed for the appreciation and it is free when we abstract from the purpose of the object. This suggestion is also supported by Kant's claim that "a judgment of taste in regard to an object with a determinate internal end would thus be pure only if the person making the judgment either had no concept of this end or abstracted from it in his judgment" (KU, AA 05: 231). Accordingly, we can make pure judgments of taste regarding objects we previously judged as adherent beauties, including artworks, through such kind of an abstraction. In the scholarship there seems to be general agreement with Crawford's proposal that the free-adherent distinction is between two kinds of judgments.[40] However, Crawford continues to treat the judgment of adherent beauty as a judgment of perfection and hence as a non-genuine aesthetic judgment. In this sense, Crawford does not really engage with the problems concerning adherent beauty; he

[39] See Donald W. Crawford (1974, 114-117).

[40] Guyer is a commentator who does not agree with Crawford's suggestion that the free-adherent distinction is between two kinds of judgments (1997, 220-225). I am not going to get into this debate here. But I want to mention that other than referring to the abstraction quote no adequate explanation is given as to why the distinction is between two judgments. In the next chapter, I want to change this and provide an explanation based on Kant's claims in §17.

only suggests a possible, though admittedly problematic, way to transform our judgments of adherent beauty into judgments of free beauty.

The implication of Crawford's view is clear: when we are judging artworks as adherent beauties, we don't find them beautiful or experience aesthetic pleasure in the sense in which Kant understands these terms: as responses to, or indications of, the subjective formal purposiveness of a representation. Such purposiveness, Kant stresses, is fundamentally different from the kind of purposiveness found in judgments of qualitative perfection:

> In general, therefore, the concept of perfection as objective purposiveness has nothing at all to do with the feeling of pleasure, and the latter has nothing to do with the former. A concept of the object necessarily belongs to the judging of the former, while such a concept is not necessary at all for the judging of the latter, which can be created by merely empirical intuition. By contrast, the representation of a subjective purposiveness of an object is even identical with the feeling of pleasure (without even involving an abstract concept of a purposive relation), and between the latter and the former there is a very great gap. For whether what is subjectively purposive is also objectively purposive requires an often extensive investigation, not only in practical philosophy but also in technique, whether in nature or in art, i.e., to find perfection in a thing requires reason, to find agreeableness requires mere sense, and to discover beauty in it requires nothing but mere reflection (without any concept) on a given representation. Thus the faculty of aesthetic reflection judges only about the subjective purposiveness (not about the perfection) of the object (EEKU, AA 20: 228f).

This is only one of the many passages in the KU where Kant opposes the reduction of beauty to qualitative perfection. If Crawford is right in assuming that the judgment of adherent beauty is a judgment of perfection, then given the above passage we have no other option than to conclude that this judgment has nothing to do with aesthetic

pleasure.[41] Therefore, the question whether adherent beauty is a kind of beauty is left unanswered.

Furthermore, Crawford's abstraction method as it stands cannot work. First of all, when it comes to artistic beauty, Crawford is suggesting that we can make pure judgments of artistic beauty through abstracting from all the concepts we use. Forming pure judgments of taste through abstraction seems to be the only possible way to aesthetically appreciate an artwork. Allison rejects this view by saying, "it ignores the fact that the 'abstraction' called for is from the very conditions under which something can be judged as a work of art" (2001, 297). After all, if we were making judgments of taste by ignoring the fact that the artwork is art, then we would be admitting that a pure judgment of taste in this case is based on self-deception. As Kant indicates, "something in it [artistic beauty] must be thought of as an end, otherwise one cannot ascribe its product to any art at all; it would be a mere product of chance" (KU, AA 05: 310). How could a pure judgment of taste, formed through abstracting from the very fact that something is art and thereby accepting that it is a product of chance, be an appropriate judgment to make?

[41] Even though Kant rejects that judgments of perfection involve exercising taste and have anything to do with aesthetic pleasure, he does not rule out that there is an element of pleasure involved in making judgments of perfection, namely intellectual pleasure. Kant gives the following distinction between different types of pleasures in the *Anthropology From a Pragmatic Point of View* under the section titled "The feeling of pleasure and displeasure. Division:" "1) *Sensuous pleasure*, 2) *intellectual pleasure*. The former is either introduced A) through *sense* (enjoyment), or B) through the *power of imagination* (taste); the second (that is, intellectual pleasure) is either introduced a) through representable *concepts* or b) through *ideas*, – – and thus the opposite, *displeasure*, is also introduced in the same way" (Anth, AA 07: 230). A positive judgment of perfection involves determining an artwork to be good of its kind and evaluating it as an intellectual achievement. This can result in an intellectual enjoyment similar to the enjoyment one takes in sciences (see V-Anth/Fried, AA 25: 572) or one that can come in the form of esteem, approval, or admiration.

Secondly and more importantly, I think that there is something deeply flawed in the abstraction method, at least as Crawford understands it. If the judgment of adherent beauty is solely a judgment of perfection, we cannot procure a judgment of taste simply by abstracting from the concepts we use. Kant rules out this option in §15. On Crawford's account, a judgment of objective purposiveness (perfection) can transform into a judgment of subjective formal purposiveness without an end by abstracting from the relevant concept of an end. Therefore, Crawford equates subjective purposiveness without a purpose with formal objective purposiveness without an end. But in §15, Kant states loud and clear that "to present a formal **objective** purposiveness without an end, i.e. the mere form of a **perfection**… is a veritable contradiction" (KU, AA 05: 228). For Kant, objective purposiveness or perfection requires the concept or end of the object. We cannot judge something to be perfect or not without comparing it to the concept of what it ought to be because it is only by reference to this concept that we can set the standards for something to be perfect. Basically, perfection without any qualification is a veritable contradiction in terms.

As we saw, however, Kant does suggest that we can turn judgments of adherent beauty into judgments of free beauty by means of abstraction. Since Crawford's account does not seem adequate to ground Kant's suggestion, we should look at interpretations that do not reduce judgments of adherent beauty to judgments of perfection.

Let's consider again the paragraph in which Kant presents the distinction:

> There are two kinds of beauty: free beauty (*pulchritudo vaga*) or merely adherent beauty (*pulchritudo adhaerens*). The first presupposes no concept of what the object ought to be; the second does presuppose such a concept and the perfection of the object in accordance with it.

> The first are called (self-subsisting) beauties of this or that thing; the latter, as adhering to a concept (conditioned beauty), are ascribed to objects that stand under the concept of a particular end (KU, AA 05: 230).

Kant does not state that the judgment about adherent beauty is *solely* a judgment of perfection. It is very well possible that these judgments have some ingredients other than judgments of perfection. The same is true for Kant's description of judgments of artistic beauty:

> [I]f the object is given as a product of art, and is as such supposed to be declared to be beautiful, then, since art always presupposes an end in the cause (and its causality), a concept must first be the ground of what the thing is supposed to be, and, since the agreement of the manifold in a thing with its inner determination as an end is the perfection of the thing, in the judging of the beauty of art the perfection of the thing will also have to be taken into account (KU, AA 05: 311).

Kant clearly says that the perfection of the thing has to be taken into account but he does not say that the judgment of artistic beauty is equivalent to the judgment of perfection. Indeed, in several places in the KU, Kant states that the same principle is in use while judging natural beauty and artistic beauty, and it is the principle of subjective purposiveness without a purpose.

In the First Introduction, for instance, Kant tells us that "whether in nature or in art… to discover beauty in it requires nothing but mere reflection (without any concept) on a given representation" (EEKU, AA 05: 229). Similarly in the KU: "… we can generally say, whether it is the beauty of nature or of art that is at issue: **that is beautiful which pleases in the mere judging** (neither in sensation nor through a concept)" (KU, AA 05: 306). These passages point towards the idea that the same principle grounds our

evaluations of each kind of beauty and Kant affirms this in the First Introduction: "The judging of artistic beauty will subsequently have to be considered as a mere consequence of the same principles which ground the judgment of natural beauty" (EEKU, AA 20: 251). In §58, Kant claims that this principle cannot be the rationalist principle, which presupposes the realism of purposiveness. Even though both the rationalist principle and the Kantian principle of taste are *a priori* principles and presuppose the rationalism of the principle of taste, the Kantian principle presupposes the idealism of purposiveness (KU, AA 05: 347). If the principle of taste were the principle of the realism of purposiveness, i.e. internal objective purposiveness, then the object of our satisfaction, as pointed out earlier, "would not differ from the **good**" and beauty would be a property of the object (KU, AA 05: 346). However, the judgment of taste is not a cognitive judgment and hence it does not involve a determination of the object but of the subject and her feeling (EEKU, AA 20: 223). Therefore, beauty is not a property of the object (KU, AA 05: 347). This implies, according to Kant, that the principle of taste cannot be objective purposiveness and the judgment cannot pertain to the perfection of the object, but to the subject (KU, AA 05: 347). Not surprisingly, he further elucidates why it is the idealism of purposiveness that grounds our aesthetic evaluations of nature. The important passage for our purposes comes after this elucidation. Kant writes,

> [i]n beautiful art the principle of the idealism of purposiveness can be recognized even more distinctly. For that here its aesthetic realism by means of sensations (in which case it would be merely agreeable instead of beautiful art) cannot be assumed is something that it has in common with beautiful nature (KU, AA 05: 350).

The ground of aesthetic judging for fine arts is not the reality of ends, but their ideality, hence the purposiveness that grounds them is the idealism of purposiveness, i.e. the

formal subjective purposiveness, which is also what grounds our assessments of natural beauty.

Such remarks indicate that objective purposiveness cannot be the ground of our evaluations of artistic beauty. Nonetheless, claiming that they are grounded in subjective formal purposiveness without making any qualifications is not going to fly in the face of Kant's claim that "in the judging of the beauty of art the perfection of the thing will also have to be taken into account" (KU, AA 05: 311). Even though it is clear that judgments of adherent or artistic beauty cannot be solely based on internal objective purposiveness, there should at least be some role that judgments of perfection play. There are two interpretations that aim to find such a role and thereby give an account of judgments of adherent beauty that does not construe them as being at odds with judgments of free beauty: the incorporation view and the conjunctive view.

II. 2. 2. Incorporation View

The incorporation view formulated by Rachel Zuckert has its roots in Paul Guyer's interpretation of adherent beauty. Guyer's interpretation was aimed at showing that even though judgments of adherent beauty are (impure) aesthetic judgments because we need to presuppose concepts of purpose, these concepts do not fully determine our responses.[42] As I explained earlier, according to the rationalists we can derive rules from the concepts of purpose that subsume the object in question. Our responses to the object are completely governed by these rules. Guyer claims that this cannot be the case for Kant's adherent beauty (1997, 219). He asserts that

[42] Guyer initially presented this interpretation in his book, *Kant and the Claims of Taste* (1997, 219f); a restatement with some additions can also be found in "Free and Adherent Beauty: A Modest Proposal," (2002, 357-366). However, it is proposed for the first time by Eva Schaper (1979, 78-98).

> …the concept of the object that is presupposed by the judgment constrains or restricts what forms we can find beautiful in an object of a certain sort by considerations deriving from its intended function, but such constraints are not sufficient to determine what forms we will find beautiful in such an object (2002, 358).

Within these constraints, we will still be making a pure judgment of taste, expressing our appreciation of the subjective purposiveness of the object. Guyer gives the example of an edifice that is designed as a cathedral (359). As a cathedral the edifice is expected to have a cruciform floor plan. Since there is no direct correlation between having a cruciform floor plan and being beautiful, Guyer argues that even though a beautiful cathedral must satisfy this constraint, to count as beautiful it must induce the free play within the limits imposed by the constraint. Hence, as Guyer puts it, "an object's satisfaction of constraints imposed on its form by its intended function is just a necessary condition for our pleasure in its beauty, but makes no direct contribution to our pleasure in it" (357). This interpretation, which takes the relationship between adherent beauty and purpose to be a negative one, allows for adherent beauty and thereby artistic beauty to qualify as a kind of beauty.

Zuckert's incorporation view simultaneously accepts Guyer's interpretation of the negative role of judgments of perfection and supplements it with an interpretation of a positive role that such judgments can play in judging adherent beauty. In general, similar to Guyer, she claims that the judgment of adherent beauty is a special type of aesthetic judgment, which incorporates "the judgment of the object as perfect… into an (overarching) representation of the object as an individual, of the object's purposive form" (2007b, 203). According to Zuckert, there are two roles that the judgment of the object's perfection plays. First is the negative type of role as a constraint on aesthetic

judging. This is not different from Guyer's suggestion; however, Zuckert further explores the merits of Guyer's restrictive account. As mentioned above, his account grants the objects about which we form positive judgments of adherent beauty the status of beauty. But it also explains some of the circumstances under which a negative judgment of adherent beauty ensues. For instance, Zuckert writes,

> our judgment that a house is beautiful might be constrained by the concept of a house as defined by its purposes of shelter and living, so that characteristics inconsonant with that purpose, e.g., dangerously leaning walls, will prevent us from judging the house to be beautiful (204).

She also talks about the merit of the restrictive account in explaining situations in which the restrictions imposed on an object's form undercut the possibility of making a judgment of taste which, without this intervention, would perhaps have been carried out. This is a case that Kant mentions in §16: "One would be able to add much to a building that would be pleasing in the intuition of it if only it were not supposed to be a church" (KU, AA 5: 230). So we see that depending on the kind concept under which we subsume the object, different restrictions on the form can be imposed and according to them we can end up with a positive or negative judgment of adherent beauty.

Since according to this quote subsuming an object under one kind concept rather than another can lead to positive judgment instead of a negative one, it seems that judgments of perfection can have a positive role in aesthetic evaluations, namely "as influencing the way in which the properties that render the object perfect are taken up as part of the play of properties in beautiful form" (204).[43] She depicts this positive

[43] See Malaband (2002, 66-81) and Wicks (1997, 387-400) for other positions that attempt to give such a positive role to judgments of perfection in judgments of adherent beauty.

contribution of the conceptual judgment not as a possibility, but instead as something we ought to do in making a judgment of adherent beauty. She writes,

> [i]f we are, in the case of dependent beauty, judging the object as belonging to its kind, i.e., interpreting some of its sensible properties as making it one of that kind, then this interpretation ought to play some role in the holistic aesthetic appreciation of the object (205).

For instance, she says,

> [a] proper Protestant church, simple and regular in color, line, shape, and arrangement, that is, might be insufficiently rich and varied – too boring or plain – to be found freely beautiful. But if one does take its church-hood into account, Kant implies, one might find it beautiful (206).

One crucial thing to keep in mind is that even though the judgment of perfection has a beauty-contributing role it does not determine our aesthetic response. Zuckert writes,

> [i]n representing dependent beauty, then, we appreciate an object 'as' a church, house, or car; the properties that make it an adequate member of its kind are taken to be aesthetically relevant as such *within* aesthetic judging. None of these properties is taken to be determinative of the beauty of the object independently of its relation to indeterminately many of the object's other properties, but only as incorporated into an over-arching representation of the object's purposive form (207).

Of course, this allows for adherent beauty and hence artistic beauty to count as beauty.

I agree with Zuckert regarding her general proposal that in judging adherent beauty the positive judgment of perfection, which is incorporated into a judgment of taste, plays a positive role, given the present textual evidence. Nevertheless, I do not agree with Guyer and Zuckert regarding the negative role judgments of perfection play in incorporation judgments. I agree that a negative judgment of perfection can result in a nullification of a positive judgment of taste or can be used to explain a work's failure to

evoke one. However, I do not think that the judgment that results from such nullification is an incorporation judgment. As we have seen, Zuckert in her own explanation states that a negative judgment of adherent beauty ensues when a judgment of taste is overridden by a negative judgment of perfection. Hence, there is no incorporation occurring in these instances. In fact, this explanation she gives is in line with the conjunctive view, not the incorporation view.

II. 2. 3. Conjunctive View

According to the conjunctive view, in judging adherent beauty we make two combined judgments: a judgment of taste and a judgment of perfection. The taste component remains pure, thereby guaranteeing that adherent beauty, and hence artistic beauty, is a kind of beauty. This interpretation is based on Martin Gammon's article "Parerga and Pulchritudo adhaerens: A Reading of the Third Movement of the 'Analytic of the Beautiful." Even though Gammon does not comment on the issue of artistic beauty, he presents a commentary on the Third Moment that is based on his reformulation of the free-adherent beauty distinction. He attempts to show that in judging adherent beauty we make a complex judgment which comprises two independent functions: the estimation of beauty and the estimation of perfection.

Gammon claims that, in the case of free beauty, our perception of the object leads to a judgment of taste with respect to its form because the object does not give rise to any further judgment concerning its end as an object of utility (1999, 164). In the case of adherent beauty, however, the perception of the object gives rise to a "primary estimation of the conceptual finality of the object as such" – a judgment of perfection – and only then do we judge the form of the object as beautiful (164). The judgment of the beautiful

is "adherent" to the judgment of perfection about the object but the two judgments are independent from one another.[44] The aesthetic object offers two independent grounds for judgment, as to beauty and as to perfection. That is why, Gammon claims, similar to Crawford but in a manner consistent with Kant's text in §16, Kant allows for abstraction to transform judgments concerning adherent beauty into judgments of taste. Because the judgment of taste and the judgment of perfection are independent from each other in judging adherent beauty, we can abstract the former from the latter and end up with a pure judgment of taste as if the object were a free beauty (164). In this sense, it is not (as in Crawford) the judgment of perfection, but rather the combination judgment that turns into a judgment of taste because once we abstract from the concepts we use, the judgment of perfection drops out.

Gammon's interpretation of the distinction is adopted and applied to the case of artistic beauty by Henry Allison.[45] For Allison, the judgment of artistic beauty is a judgment of adherent beauty and therefore it is a conjunction of two judgments. When we judge the beauty of a building we sometimes additionally judge it in terms of its intended function, for instance being a church. We will be making two combined judgments: a judgment of taste regarding the building and a judgment of perfection regarding the building by comparing it to our concept of a church (our concept of what a church ought to be). Therefore, the judgment of adherent beauty is a combination of both. Allison says, "this more complex evaluation is no longer *purely* a judgment of taste, but this does not

[44] Contra Gammon's interpretation, Zuckert claims that what adheres is the estimation of the objective purposiveness of the object: "[T]he object's perfection plays a *subordinate* role in judgments of dependent beauty… as a component of our representation of beautiful purposive form" (2007b, 207, footnote 48, emphasis added).

[45] See also Alex Rueger (2008) for application of conjunctive view to the issue of artistic beauty.

undermine the *purity* of the taste component itself" (2001, 141). Why does it not undermine the purity? Because, even though having such and such a function constrains the aesthetic value of the building, it does not become the determining ground of our pure judgment of taste regarding the building (141). That is, the judgment of adherent beauty, and hence artistic beauty, comprises both the evaluation of objective purposiveness (perfection) and the evaluation of subjective purposiveness (free beauty).

Under the conjunctive view the Kantian account resembles Mendelssohn's in some respects. Recall that Mendelssohn also argues that the appropriate judgments regarding artworks can involve combination judgments of sensuous gratification, beauty, and perfection. As we have seen in the previous chapter, the contents of these judgments are different in the Kantian framework. Despite these differences, the structural similarity provides evidence that it is not a farfetched assumption that Kant adopted the conjunctive view concerning judgments of adherent beauty from Mendelssohn.

The main textual evidence for the conjunctive view comes from §16 where Kant in several places tells us that the judgment of adherent beauty is a combination judgment. The first place in which he mentions "combination" occurs in a passage where he is comparing judgments of adherent beauty to combination judgments of taste and sense:

> Now just as the combination of the agreeable (of sensation) with beauty, which properly concerns only form, hindered the purity of the judgment of taste, so the *combination* [*Verbindung*] of the good (that is, the way in which the manifold is good for the thing itself, in accordance with its end) with beauty does damage to its beauty" (KU, AA 05: 230, emphasis added).

Further down in the same section, additional support for the conjunctive view appears:

> To be sure, taste gains by this *combination* of aesthetic satisfaction with the intellectual in that it becomes fixed and, though not universal, can have rules prescribed to it in regard to certain purposively determined objects. But in this case these are also not rules of taste, but merely rules for the unification of taste with reason, i.e., of the beautiful with the good, through which the former becomes usable as an instrument of the intention with regard to the latter, so that the determination of the mind that sustains itself and is of subjective universal validity can underlie that which can only be sustained through strenuous resolve but is objectively universally valid. Strictly speaking, however, perfection does not gain by beauty, nor does beauty gain by perfection; rather, since in comparing the representation by which an object is given to us with the object (with regard to what it ought to be) we cannot avoid at the same time holding it together with the subject, the entire faculty of the powers of representation gains if both states of mind are in agreement (KU, AA 05: 231, emphasis added).

These passages attest to the fact that the judgment of adherent beauty involves a combination of a judgment of taste and a judgment of perfection. Particularly, the last sentence of the second quote makes it obvious that in making a judgment of perfection (i.e. "comparing the representation by which an object is given to us with the object (with regard to what it ought to be)") we are simultaneously making a judgment of taste ("holding it together with the subject"). Here Kant does not seem to suggest that one judgment gets incorporated into the other; instead his claims clearly indicate the independence of the judgments from one another.

One of the main merits of the conjunctive view lies in its explanation of how negative judgments of adherent beauty can arise. As I mentioned, Zuckert herself uses the explanation advanced by the conjunctive view, namely that a negative aesthetic assessment of a work can arise from a negative judgment of perfection overriding a positive judgment of taste. In the example Zuckert uses from the KU, one can find a

building to be beautiful until realizing that it is supposed to be a church. Our negative judgment of perfection of the building as a church (due to its lack of certain qualities) hinders our aesthetic engagement with the work. Kant also gives the example of New Zealanders' tattoo designs. He asserts that

> a figure could be beautified with all sorts of curlicues and light but regular lines, as the New Zealanders do with their tattooing, if only it were not a human being; and the latter could have much finer features and a more pleasing, softer outline to its facial structure if only it were not supposed to represent a man, or even a warrior (KU, AA 05: 230).

The tattoo designs when considered in isolation, without placing them under any concept, can be found beautiful. However, the problem with these designs stems from them appearing on a human being. Then our conception of what a human being ought to be leads us to a negative judgment of perfection because according to Kant – as many commentators suggest – this kind of tattooing hinders the dignity of human beings. A negative judgment of adherent beauty is formed because a negative judgment of perfection overrides our positive judgment of taste.[46] It is not that we do not find the object beautiful due to the restrictions on the object's form; but rather, one judgment undercuts another judgment.

I believe that all of the extant accounts contribute to a better understanding of Kant's free-adherent beauty distinction and its implications for artistic beauty.

[46] Philip Malaband criticizes the conjunctive view, by arguing that if we allow judgments of adherent beauty to be combination judgments and make judgment of taste a necessary condition for adherent beauty, then the notion of adherent beauty becomes superfluous (2002, 66-81). But first of all, Malaband seems to misrepresent the conjunctive view. For the conjunctive view, a positive judgment of taste is a necessary but *nonsufficient* condition for making positive judgments of adherent beauty. Second of all, as we see in the conjunctive view's explanation of the formation of the negative judgment of adherent beauty in this instance, the conjunctive view does not render adherent beauty redundant. The fact that a judgment of taste concerning an object will be overridden by the presence of a negative judgment of perfection refutes Malaband's redundancy claim.

Particularly, the incorporation view and the conjunctive view, by finding an intrinsic solution to the problem of whether adherent beauty is a kind of beauty, show that it is subjective purposiveness without a purpose that grounds our appreciation in the last instance, even though perfection of the object has a role to play. Both the incorporation view and the conjunctive view have good enough textual support to back up most of their claims. Hence, in my view, they are not rival interpretations. Instead they complement one another and I take this to be an indicator that Kant's aesthetic theory is rich and diverse enough to cover a broad range of aesthetic responses.

II. 3. How to Make Informed Impure Judgments of Taste

Another important merit of the incorporation and conjunctive views is that they show us that it is possible to make informed, albeit impure, judgments of taste regarding artworks. The first question to address in this regard is, of course, what type of kind concepts we are allowed to use while making such judgments. After all, Kant himself does not exactly use the language of criticism. He does not talk about genres, subgenres, or make references to movements or schools of art. But these types of critical categories are the very categories we refer to while making aesthetic assessments of artworks. The whole language of art history and criticism is based on defining these categories and classifying works according to their category-membership. I believe that there are two good reasons for supposing that Kant's account sanctions the use of the categories of criticism, such as artforms, genres, subgenres, styles, oeuvres, movements, lineages, traditions, and so on, as kind concepts we can employ.

First of all, they are by definition kind concepts. A kind concept defines what it means for an object to be of that kind and what type of properties it ought to have. The

categories of criticism do exactly that. For instance, when we place a work under the category of De Stijl, we presuppose that this work would be a pure abstraction and have a composition moving in vertical and horizontal directions and be composed of only primary colors and black and white. Secondly, Kant explicitly talks about the role of classification of artworks under appropriate kind concepts involving artforms and if one is accepting, for instance, the artform of music to be a kind concept, then one should also accept other kind concepts that fall under it, such as Punk-Rock, Riot Grrrl, Glam Punk, Oi!, Old School, New School, etc. Kant groups various artforms under three different categories and lays out the various expectations attached to these categories and to the category of each specific artform. He defines beauty in general as "the expression of aesthetic ideas" (KU, AA 05: 320). Since the primary function of the beautiful arts is to express, Kant thinks that we can divide them into groups by using an analogous method to the one that is used in grouping linguistic expressions. By analogy with the categorization of linguistic expressions into the word, the gesture, and the tone due to their uses in communicating thoughts, intuitions, and sensations, respectively, Kant thinks that it is possible to categorize the different forms of beautiful arts into three main categories: "the art of speech, pictorial art, and the art of the play of sensations" (KU, AA 05: 320f). He places rhetoric and poetry under the first, plastic arts, including sculpture, architecture, painting, the art of pleasure gardens, indoor decoration under the second, and music and the art of colors under the third category. The idea behind this categorization is that there are certain expectations attached to these categories and we should take them into account in judging a particular artwork. For instance, in judging a sculpture we need to realize that this work, insofar as we categorize it under sculpture,

expresses ideas through shapes in sensible intuition. A work of architecture does so as well; however, consideration of how it expresses ideas becomes secondary to that of how it fulfills its function. These categorizations inform us as to what types of judgments are appropriate to make because these categories indicate what type of properties we should look for in these works. Furthermore, Kant does not claim that these categories are the ultimate or absolute set of categories we can come up with and that they are not open to modification or change. He makes a rather modest claim and writes that he is only experimenting (KU, AA 05: 320). In this sense, we will still be within the reach of Kant's artistic theory, even if we use contemporary categories of art criticism, such as that of genres, sub-genres, styles, movements, and so on, as well as that of new artforms that were not in existence in Kant's time, such as photography, cinema, conceptual art, and performance art. Kant's theory can survive this modification since the set of judgments we can use are strictly Kantian ones.

What are these judgments though, and more specifically, what do the incorporation and conjunctive views tell us about informed aesthetic judgments? There are a few things that are certain: These judgments are impure. Furthermore, as I have just laid out, it is completely acceptable to use contemporary categories of criticism while making judgments of perfection concerning artworks. Indeed, it only makes sense to use them since they are the appropriate kind concepts to use. What is to be explored now are the specific functions judgments of perfection play in informed assessments of artworks.

Zuckert suggests that Kendall Walton's account in "Categories of Art," could be of help in spelling out this role, particularly their positive role (2007b, 206). Walton claims that non-aesthetic properties of artworks can be grouped under "standard,"

"variable," and "contra-standard" properties. Which non-aesthetic properties of an artwork are standard, variable and contra-standard depends on the category-membership of the work in question. A standard property is one in virtue of which a work belongs to some category x. It is the necessary property the work should possess in order to be classified under the category x since Walton claims, "the lack of that feature would disqualify, or tend to disqualify, a work from that category" (1970, 339). A variable property is a property which neither qualifies nor disqualifies the work's membership in the category x; it is an accidental feature of the artwork with respect to the category x. A contra-standard property with respect to the category x is one whose existence tends to disqualify its membership in the category x. Walton is not making a strong, rigid claim since there is no necessity relation that can be discerned: having a contra-standard property relative to category x does not necessarily disqualify the work's membership in the category x. Walton argues that depending on the category membership, an artwork can manifest different aesthetic qualities because its aesthetic properties depend not only on the work's non-aesthetic ones, but also on which of these properties are standard, variable, and contra-standard. For instance, Picasso's *Guernica*, when appreciated under the category of "Guernicas," where the figures on its surface are standard and its flatness is variable, would strike us as cold, stark, lifeless or serene and restful, whereas when appreciated under the category of painting, where what is standard and what is variable are reversed, we perceive it to be violent, dynamic, vital, and disturbing.

According to Zuckert, using the distinction between standard and variable properties can help us understand the role of judgments of perfection in forming informed impure judgments of taste. She does not get into much detail, but claims that by placing a

work under different categories, different features becomes standard and variable and this tells us what to pay attention to and what to ignore while making a judgment of taste. I want to get into the details of how this can happen because we cannot adopt Walton's account without making necessary modification to it or without spelling out which aspects of his theory are in clear contrast with Kant's account and must be abandoned. I believe highlighting these differences will help us to understand the Kantian model in a better way. Walton's main aim is to show that aesthetic properties are perceptual and supervene on non-aesthetic properties. He explains how it is possible for an artwork to manifest different aesthetic properties in reference to his thesis that depending on its category-membership an artwork can have different aesthetic properties because which of its properties are standard, variable, and contra-standard changes in accordance with which category the work is placed in. Therefore, Walton is committed to the view that aesthetic properties are perceptual and that they are in the object (1970, 335). Of course, he discusses various aesthetic properties, both thick and thin ones. Kant himself does not talk about a whole range of them and focus mainly on beauty; but here he is in complete disagreement with Walton that beauty is a perceptual property of an object. The question is whether we can adopt Walton's distinction of standard and variable properties without committing ourselves to the idea that aesthetic properties are perceptual and by maintaining our adherence to Kant's aesthetic expressivism. I think it is possible to do so but it requires some legwork.

First of all, we need to remember that the judgment of perfection expresses the degree of agreement between the object and what it ought to be. After classifying the work under the appropriate category or categories, we already single out which of its

properties are standard and variable. To use a much quoted example of Ernst Hans Gombrich (1984, 296f), we can classify Mondrian's *Broadway Boogie-Woogie* under the category of abstract painting or the category of De Stijl. Its straight lines, balanced rectangular grid while being standard with respect to the category of De Stijl, its colorful grid is variable. The judgment of perfection takes into account not only the standard but also the variable properties. One can think that the standard properties are not so important in our evaluation; however, those are the very properties on the basis of which we make the classification and additionally determine whether or not the work is a good instance of its kind. If the work lacks the standard properties relative to De Stijl then we cannot subsume it under this category. One of the main challenges for De Stijl paintings is to produce a non-representational, yet nonetheless expressive, composition in a two-dimensional space by using a color palette involving primary colors, black, and white. If our contrast class consists only of paintings classified under De Stijl, *Broadway Boogie-Woogie* strikes us as energetic, as if it is itself buzzing with sound. Most of the paintings in this category look serene, cold, or orderly. *Broadway Boogie-Woogie*, due to its colorful grid, starts to look energetic only in relation to what we compare it. If our comparison class were the general class of abstract paintings this assessment would not have been made since the grid, monochrome or colorful, is variable. However, this appearance of being energetic is not an aesthetic quality.[47] Rather it is an impression it makes on us. From the Kantian perspective, these impressions are categorized under the concept of being energetic on the basis of the comparison we make. Indeed, Kant lists comparison or contrast as one of the causes that increase sense impression (Anth, AA 07:

[47] After all, Walton (1970) does not produce an argument as to why these properties should be aesthetic other than implicitly claiming that they are instantiated by works of art.

162). Unlike contradiction, which consists in the linking of mutually antagonistic concepts, contrast is the juxtaposition of mutually contrary sense representations under one and the same concept, in this case the concept of De Stijl (Anth, AA 07: 162). As Gombrich puts it, in the case of *Broadway Boogie-Woogie*, "this impression is in fact grounded on our knowledge of the restricted choice open to the artist within his self-imposed discipline" (1984, 297). After this determination, a judgment of perfection can ensue: one can judge *Broadway Boogie-Woogie* to be a good example of its kind given that it meets the expectations one has for a De Stijl painting, namely an expressive, yet non-representational, composition using a very restricted number of elements. However, this value judgment we make, that is "*Broadway Boogie-Woogie* is a good example of a De Stijl painting" is not an aesthetic judgment. This having been said, it informs our aesthetic judgment insofar as it *directly* tells us the relevant qualities of the painting we should pay attention to. We make a restricted and impure judgment of taste by means of reflecting on the organization of the relevant properties of the painting, which are picked out with respect to the judgment of perfection, and how it presents the affect of being energetic. If we did not go through the steps of classification in a non-aesthetic evaluation, we would not be able to form this aesthetic judgment. We would not be able to even pinpoint what the work presents.

It is also possible for a work, which would have induced the free play of the cognitive faculties otherwise, not to do so once the standard and variable properties we attend to change due to placing it under an appropriate category. For instance, one could have found a piece of music beautiful until realizing that it is intended to be sonata. Properties that are variable with respect to the category of music could be standard for the

category of sonata. Hence, the lack of these properties, which would not have bothered us a bit, should count against the work after we place it under the relevant category. For instance, it can lack the typical transitions within movements and clear distinctions between movements, such that it can be devoid of an appropriate development. Hence, within the restriction imposed by the category of sonata, we can no longer judge the work to be beautiful.

I think that analyzing these types of instances demonstrates the role judgments of perfection can play in making informed aesthetic assessments as depicted by the conjunctive view. We can discern in this example that a positive judgment of taste is overridden by a negative judgment of perfection. There are two possible responses one can have in these situations: either we can greet the work with indifference or we can find it unpleasant or ugly.

Kant states that

> [w]e always find a trichotomy with that which is related to pleasure and displeasure – plus A – minus A, and – 0 – indifference, which is neither beautiful nor ugly. Pleasure is something positive, displeasure really <*realiter*> opposed. The mind is indifferent when representations produce neither pleasure nor displeasure (V-Met/Dohna, AA 28: 676).

Hence, it is entirely possible to be indifferent towards an artwork. Kant also states that there is no such thing as being absolutely indifferent (V-Met-L1/Pölitz, AA 28: 253). Only in comparison can we be indifferent towards the object. Hence, the judgment of indifference is always a negative judgment. We are indifferent to an object on the basis of the judgment that "this object is not beautiful/ugly/agreeable/disagreeable." In the cases where the negative judgment of perfection precludes us from making a positive or

negative aesthetic assessment of a work, we become indifferent towards the work. Of course, I am not suggesting that once a negative judgment of perfection overrides our initial judgment of taste, we all of a sudden become indifferent towards to the work. Nevertheless, our initial assessment of the object as being beautiful can deteriorate over time.

Another likely reaction that can be triggered by a negative judgment of perfection is displeasure, namely finding the work ugly.[48] Similar to the case of indifference, we can judge something to be ugly only in comparison. Kant hints at this when he says "[u]gliness is merely relative in comparison with others" (V-Anth/Mron, AA 25: 1378). For instance, I can judge a poem to be beautiful. However, if I am told that this poem ought to be a sonnet then I may judge it to be poor in that respect if it strays from iambic pentameter. I can aesthetically appreciate a movie, thinking how its comical scenes are wonderfully crafted until I get told that it is supposed to be a film noir. In all these instances, it is not just that the aesthetic pleasure has evaporated or that I become utterly indifferent towards the work. Rather I am quite displeased. Of course, the judgment of the ugly does not imply experiencing completely negative emotions. Kant does not give many examples of the ugly (other than the examples that speak for his racism and misogyny); however, he gives this example of a house: "[i]f I see an ugly house, then that

[48] Some commentators suggested that as there are pure judgments of beauty, there are pure judgments of the ugly. For some noted elucidations of this view, see Theodore A. Gracyk (1986), Hud Hudson (1991), Christian Wenzel (1999), Allison (2001, 54; 71f), Sean McConnell (2008), and Alix Cohen (2013). I do not want to get into this debate here partially because my focus in this section is *impure* judgments of ugliness (hence I do not really need to deal with the possibility or impossibility of pure ugliness in Kant), and partially because I am convinced that there exists a cogent criticism of this view. According to Guyer, it simply does not make sense with respect to Kant's theory that there are pure judgments of the ugly where these judgments result from regarding the object contrapurposive, due to the experienced disharmony between our imagination and understanding (2005, 146). According to Kant, for cognition to be possible the faculties should be in harmony with each other, hence disharmony is an indicator of absence of cognition or experience per se. But if we do not experience the object, how can we find it ugly?

does not cause me any pain, for I can laugh heartily about it and amuse myself" (V-Anth/Collins, AA 25: 178). Hence, finding something ugly because it does not live up to what it ought to be does not mean that I am not going to be amused by how terrible it is.

There are various types of responses one can have to the ugly as well as to the beautiful, depending on the object. Some of these responses are indeed informed. I want to conclude this section by noting one more time the important role judgments of perfection play in forming informed, albeit impure, judgments of taste. As outlined by the incorporation and conjunctive views, judgments of perfection, which are nothing but good-of-its-kind value judgments, function in different capacities: Sometimes they restrain the possible forms of objects we can aesthetically appreciate; sometimes they uncover different salient features of a work depending on the different categories we subsume the object under; and sometimes they revoke the aesthetic judgment. Hence, these two complementary interpretations of Kant's adherent-free beauty distinction not only solve the main problem concerning the status of adherent beauty and thereby artistic beauty that bothered scholars over the years, they also demonstrate the possibility of informed aesthetic assessment. Furthermore, as the examples I have discussed should make clear, to make judgments of adherent beauty is actually more appropriate than to make judgments of free beauty when it comes to certain artworks. After all, abstraction seems to be the only method we can employ to transform judgments of adherent beauty into judgments of free beauty and if we form judgments of free beauty regarding certain artworks by abstracting from the relevant concepts of criticism, we would not be focusing on the relevant standard or variable features of these artworks. Indeed, doing so will necessarily mean that we are not judging these works appropriately. As to the other

problems that arise from various other apparent textual inconsistencies, I want to provide solutions upon discussing Kant's views on aesthetic ideas in the next chapter.

Chapter III Informed Pure Judgments of Taste

We have seen that according to the conjunctive and incorporation views judgments of perfection play a crucial role in making informed, although impure judgments of taste regarding artworks. Additionally, there are strong indications that in the evaluation of certain artworks judgments of adherent beauty are more appropriate to make than judgments of free beauty. In the current chapter on Kant's theory of artistic beauty, I want to raise a concern with the extant accounts. I will argue that even though they address various important aspects of Kant's free-adherent beauty distinction and his theory of artistic beauty, a quintessential feature of his theory gets neglected. These accounts examine only the aesthetic responses to the objects that line up with, or fall short of, the expectations we have about what they ought to be. I will demonstrate that Kant's descriptions of works of genius do not fall within either of these categories. The distinguishing features of these works, viz. originality and exemplarity, become unrecognizable on these interpretations because originality and exemplarity, as I will argue, lie in the work's ability to exceed one's expectations concerning its form and content. As it stands, we currently have two options: (1) to treat works of genius as

adherent beauties by subsuming them under existing critical categories of art, or (2) to treat them as free beauties by abstracting from these categories. Both of these options are nonstarters since (1) means that these works are not original or exemplary, provided that they can be subsumed under critical categories, while (2) entails that we will never appreciate their originality or exemplarity if we are lacking a contrast class. I solve this problem by proposing alternative transformation methods distinct from that of abstraction, namely concept expansion and repudiation. This additional account of transformation leads to a rather surprising outcome: Works of genius are paradigm cases where one can and indeed ought to form informed pure judgments of taste.

In making a case for informed pure judgments of taste, first, I address the issue of why it is inappropriate to form judgments of adherent beauty and judgments of free beauty via abstraction concerning works of genius. I explicate the limitations of the abstraction method after clarifying how it is supposed to work. Then I articulate my own account of transformation in the course of presenting Kant's theory of genius and aesthetic ideas. I demonstrate the role judgments of perfection play in forming informed *pure* judgments of taste. I conclude by responding to the problems left unresolved in the previous chapter.

III. 1. The Method of Abstraction

Explicating how the method of abstraction can be used to transform judgments of adherent beauty into pure judgments of taste requires addressing a set of questions. One of these is whether all artworks are adherent beauties. This is an easy question to answer in the negative given that Kant lists some artworks as free beauties. However, the existence of free artistic beauty does not rule out the possibility of what I will call

intrinsically adherent beauty. An investigation into its possibility has an umbilical relation to the enquiry into the method of abstraction since if there are inherently adherent beauties then there are limits to employing abstraction. Taking as my starting point the issue of inherently adherent beauty, I aim to demonstrate the conditions for employing abstraction.

At the end of §16 where the free-adherent beauty distinction is introduced, Kant seems to give us an unrestricted license to employ abstraction in transforming judgments of adherent beauty into pure judgments of taste: "A judgment of taste in regard to an object with a determinate internal end would… be pure only if the person making the judgment either had no concept of this end or abstracted from it in his judgment" (KU, AA 05: 231). This is, for all one can tell, a general claim; no limitations seem to be implied by it. In §17, however, Kant discusses what appears to be an exception or limitation and at the same time explains why we can employ abstraction. Eva Schaper also notes this exception, which is the only example of intrinsically adherent beauty: the human form. Schaper writes, "he [man] both belongs to a natural species and is a member of the 'kingdom of ends;' moreover of a man only is it possible to speak of an *ideal* of perfection, an ideal therefore of dependent beauty" (1979, 90). She suspects that the reason why we can form only judgments of adherent beauty about the human form has something to do with the fact that human beauty does not fit within either the category of nature or the category of art (90f). I do not think that the exceptional status of the human form has anything to with the differences between artistic and natural beauty. Rather I will argue that it has something to do with the conditions of abstraction.

First, let's see what the conditions of abstraction are. Kant claims that abstraction from a concept is possible when the end of the object is not completely determined and fixed by this concept (KU, AA 05: 233). It could only be fixed if the concept can determine the end *a priori* (KU, AA 05: 233). Such *a priori* determination is impossible when it comes to most of the empirical concepts. First of all, they are *a posteriori* concepts and hence they can change due to encounters with new objects that can be placed under them. Accordingly, the ends that they assign to the objects subsumable under them can change. Second, given that an object can have several qualitative perfections, in judging an object we can use several different kind concepts that determine what the object ought to be. Therefore, there can be several different ends or purposes that can be assigned to the object. For instance, one can judge an artwork on the basis of the concept of pictorial art, the concept of religious art, the concept of symbolist art or the concept of stained glass. Correspondingly, the internal end that is assigned to the work can change. In short, provided that the ends of an object can be many and are determined *a posteriori*, they are not fixed; and because they are not fixed, one can easily abstract from the concepts that dictate these ends. That is why at the end of §16 Kant gives us an unrestricted license for abstraction by asserting that a person can make a pure judgment of taste regarding an object with a determinate end if she abstracts from the concept of this end in her judgment or does not have this concept to begin with.

An important implication of Kant's claims in §16-17 is that, as long as the concept presupposed in the judgment of adherent beauty is not an *a priori* concept or does not determine the end *a priori*, this judgment can be transformed, through abstraction, into a judgment of free beauty. Put otherwise, everything that can be judged

to be adherently beautiful on the basis of perfection can also be judged to be freely beautiful. In §17, however, Kant presents an exception to this rule: It is an instance of adherent beauty that can apparently *never* be judged as free beauty. The existence of an *intrinsically* adherent beauty seems to contradict the outcome of §16 I have just presented. However, it does not. §17 is about a distinct kind of adherent beauty, human beauty. The human being is an exception because we know what it means for a human being to be absolutely good in itself in all aspects. Our *a priori* concept of moral perfection determines and fixes the end assigned to the human being. That is why we can never abstract from this concept. The idea of moral perfection always accompanies our thoughts regarding human beings. Thus, the judgment of adherent beauty estimates not only the beauty of the object but also its goodness. It is a peculiar case because, for once, it looks as though we have a rule according to which we can judge. The rule is the ideal of beauty we have in our minds.

Kant defines an ideal in general as the "representation of an individual being as adequate to an idea," which signifies "a concept of reason" (KU, AA 05: 232). The ideal of beauty is the representation of the ideal human being who embodies the average human form that signifies moral perfection. As Rachel Zuckert argues, here Kant is presenting us with one version of the "beauty is good" claim: physical beauty should also indicate or symbolize moral beauty.[49] This ideal is not represented by determinate concepts but instead by an individual representation that has two components: "the aesthetic normal idea" and the rational idea. The aesthetic idea is the image we have in our mind of a human being with average features; it acts as an ideal because it comes to

[49] See Zuckert (2005, 107-130).

symbolically present the rational idea, namely moral perfection.[50] There are a few claims Kant makes here which have very interesting implications: He claims that the only ideal of beauty is that of the human form because only in its case the end, moral perfection, is determined and fixed *a priori* by concepts (KU, AA 05: 233). Because one of the two ingredients in the ideal of beauty is fixed, in judging any individual human being, we can never abstract from our conception of the ideal of beauty. We judge on the basis of a fixed idea and check whether the human being in question falls short of this ideal or not.

I take the implications of these claims to be that the kind of beauty that can *only* be judged adherently is that of a human being and the rest of objects (natural or artistic) can be judged both adherently and freely. This is the case because, for the rest of the beauties, we cannot form an ideal (KU, AA 05: 233). Kant asserts that the ideals of objects other than human beings, such as beautiful flowers, beautiful furnishings, a beautiful view, a beautiful residence, a beautiful tree, beautiful gardens, are "incapable of being represented, presumably because the ends are not adequately determined and fixed by their concept, and consequently the purposiveness is almost as free as in the case of **vague** beauty" (KU, AA 05: 233). The ends of such objects are not fixed because the empirical concepts we use in judging these object do not determine their ends *a priori*. Consequently, because the ends of all objects – other than human beings – are not fixed, we can abstract from the concepts, which determine these ends, and hence form pure judgments of taste regarding them. This is a clear indication that the rest of the objects,

[50] Kant states that the aesthetic normal idea is the image of a human being with average features. It looks like an image that is created through the juxtaposition of all the images of human beings that we have encountered in our life (KU AA 05: 234f.).

including artworks whose concepts are empirical and do not determine ends *a priori,* can be judged both adherently and freely.[51]

I do not intend to suggest that the transformation through abstraction necessitates abstracting from all the concepts we employ. There are some concepts whose presence does not interfere with pure judgments of taste. For instance, in judging all artworks we need to presuppose the concept of art. Recall from the previous chapter that this was Allison's point in criticizing Crawford's use of the abstraction method to form pure judgments of taste regarding artworks. Kant clearly states that since an artwork is produced in accordance with the artist's intentions, the concept of being such a product, namely being art, should be presupposed in judging artworks. Evidently we cannot abstract from this concept since otherwise we would not be treating the work as an intentional product but a product of chance (cf. KU, AA 05: 310). As mentioned before, if the condition for forming a pure judgment of taste regarding an artwork were to ignore the fact that it is art, then we would need to reckon with the absurd implication that such judgment necessitates self-deception. However, as I will demonstrate, this concept does

[51] In opposition to the position presented here, Guyer argues, "it is not always in one's power to abstract or divert one's attention from a concept that applies to an object" (2005, 90). He deduces this from an example Kant gives in the KU. He claims, "[i]t might be adduced as a counterexample to this definition that there are things in which one can see a purposive form without cognizing an end in them, e.g., the stone utensils often excavated from ancient burial mounds, which are equipped with a hole, as if for a handle, which, although they clearly betray by their shape a purposiveness the end of which one does not know, are nevertheless not declared to be beautiful on that account. Yet the fact that they are regarded as a work of art is already enough to require one to admit that one relates their shape to some sort of intention and to a determinate purpose. Hence there is also no immediate satisfaction at all in their intuition" (KU, AA 05: 236). Contrary to Guyer's conviction, I believe the reason why Kant seems to insist that we cannot abstract from the use of the utensils is not that he thinks that they are also instances of inherently adherent beauty. The passage can be interpreted differently. Kant clearly states that these objects cannot be called beautiful due to the presupposed purpose. I think what Kant wants to say is that they are not examples of beautiful or liberal art but instead examples of remunerative or mechanical art even though we do not know the purpose some of their parts serve. While the former kind of art has the feeling of pleasure as its aim, the latter "performs the actions requisite to make it [an object] actual" (KU, AA 05: 305). The presupposed, though unknown, purpose of the utensils indicates that they are not created for aesthetic contemplation and hence they are not objects of aesthetic pleasure. Hence, our lack of acquaintance with the possible specific purposes of some artifacts does not necessarily qualify them as objects of beautiful art.

not determine our judgment and hence we do not need to abstract from it to make a pure judgment of taste regarding an artwork.

Kant implies in several different places in the KU that we should also presuppose that the object we judge is a product of nature when we are making a pure judgment of taste regarding natural beauty. In §42, Kant claims that if someone notices that she has been deceived about an object, taking it to be a product of nature when it is actually a product of art, then "taste can no longer find anything beautiful in it or sight anything charming" (KU, AA 05: 302). He gives the example of a nightingale song: if we were to find the bird's song initially bewitchingly beautiful, once we realize that it is a human being who is imitating the song, our aesthetic appreciation would wither away completely. This is a clear indication that in making pure judgments of taste regarding natural beauty, we also presuppose the concept of nature. If this concept is not restricting our judgment, why should the concept of art do so?

Guyer gives a convincing argument for accommodating the fact that the intention of the artist cannot act as a determinate concept to restrict the free play. From the definitions of art Kant provides in §43, Guyer derives the following definition of a beautiful artwork: it is "an object intentionally produced by human skill with the aim of producing pleasure in the members of its audience by engaging their higher cognitive faculties and inducing a harmonious play between their imagination and understanding" (1994, 277). According to this definition, recognizing the intention cannot stand for recognizing a specific intention of the artist, such as recognizing Brancusi's intention of capturing pure flight in creating an abstract sculpture of a bird that breaks with the traditional norms of sculpture. The intention that we need to be aware of is that of

producing pleasure through free play. The recognition of this kind of intention, Guyer concedes, cannot determine the response to a work of art because the existence of the intention does not guarantee the occurrence of pleasure since it is possible for the work to fail to induce pleasure.[52] The possibility of failure shows that our judgment of taste concerning the work cannot be determined by the awareness of the intention. Guyer concludes that

> there is no way in which recognition of the intention alone can determine the response to a work of fine art; yet precisely where that intention is successfully accomplished, it will also be the case that no mere concept alone can be seen as fully determining the response to the work (278).

Hence, even if the intention succeeds, the concept of inducing pleasure through free play is not determinate enough to restrict our judgment.

There can be other concepts, similar to the concept of art, that can be presupposed but would not determine our judgment. Depending on the work, it might be possible that in judging a particular artwork the determinate concept of its artform may not interfere with our judgment at all. The reasons for this may be various. Perhaps other concepts are more relevant than the concept of its artform in judging this object. The concept perhaps does not tell us anything at all about which properties of the work are variable and which standard. We are perhaps referring to other categories of criticism to tell us that. If this is the case, then some concepts, even though they are determinate and really do pick out the object in question, do not determine our judgment about the object. Some might dispute this by claiming that whenever we place an object under a determinate concept this concept necessarily determines our judgment. However, I find it difficult to see why this

[52] Anthony Savile makes the same point in (1993, 93).

is supposed to be the case, after all even Kant's own examples of pure judgments of taste – e.g. this rose is beautiful – indicates the presence of a concept that does not interfere with the pure judgment of taste.

Ted Cohen, by employing Kant's distinction between two predicates, shows why this is completely compatible with Kant's account. Kant writes,

> In every judgment… there are two predicates that we compare with one another, of which one, which comprises the given cognition of the object, is the logical subject, and the other, which is to be compared with the first, is called logical predicate (Refl, AA 17: 616).

For instance, in the judgment "this skirt is short," the logical subject is "skirt" and the logical predicate is "short." Even though, Kant here says "every judgment," he is referring specifically to every determinate judgment. Cohen applies this distinction to reflective judgments, particularly to judgments of taste. He rightly claims that even though there is no logical predicate in a judgment of taste (after all the judgment expresses only the state of mind in reflecting on the object), there is a logical subject, which is a concept (1990, 142). He adds that since the conceptual activity of comparing the logical predicate to the logical subject is what grounds the determinate judgment, by eliminating the logical predicate we can eliminate the activity. Hence, without this activity the determinate concepts we use as subject-concepts do not necessarily determine the judgment. This is not to suggest that we are required to know what kind of a thing the object ought to be for making an aesthetic assessment about it. In fact, there can be cases where we do not know what kind of thing the object is, perhaps due to lack of familiarity or lacking the kind concept under which this object is supposed to fall. In aesthetically judging such objects, as well as the objects we are able to subsume under determinate

concepts, the activity of comparison is between the reflection on the representation of the object and our cognitive faculties.

In more detail: In reflecting on the object, the imagination is engaged in aesthetic subsumption, i.e. "schematizing without a concept", even if we have already subsumed the object under a determinate concept (KU, AA 05: 287). Just as in the case of empirical concept formation, in identifying the properties of the object the imagination compares the patterns or rules governing the apprehension of these properties, namely their schemata (cf. Allison 2001, 25). In empirical concept formation, a concept is formed by reflecting on what is common to schemata and by abstracting from what is different in them. By contrast, in a judgment of taste, the reflection on the unity of the properties of the object (which we can identify through the schematization activity) is related to the understanding without the mediation of a determinate concept. Empirical concept formation involves three cognitive activities while aesthetic evaluation involves only two. Kant writes,

> [t]o every empirical concept, namely, there belong three actions of the self-active faculty of cognition: 1. the **apprehension** (*apprehensio*) of the manifold of intuition; 2. the **comprehension**, i.e., the synthetic unity of the consciousness of this manifold in the concept of an object (*appreceptio comprehensiva*); 3. the **presentation** (*exhibitio*) of the object corresponding to this concept in intuition. For the first action imagination is required, for the second understanding, for the third the power of judgment, which, if it is an empirical concept that is at issue, would be the determining power of judgment (EEKU, AA 20: 220).

In the case of judgments of taste, the second cognitive activity, namely comprehension, drops out because "the **apprehension** of its manifold in the imagination agrees with the **presentation** of a concept of the understanding (through which concept be

undetermined)" (EEKU, AA 20: 211). "[S]ince no determinate concept restricts them to a particular rule of cognition" the relation between the imagination and the understanding is characterized as free (KU, AA 05: 217). Hence, as long as we do not allow the determinate concepts under which we subsume the object in question to dictate the set of properties we will reflect on – as they do in judgments of adherent beauty – the judgment we form will be a pure judgment of taste and we will regard the object as a free beauty.

III. 1. 1. Products of Genius

In theory, we should be able to judge works of genius either as adherent beauties or as free beauties. However, neither of these judgments as depicted by the existing interpretations seems to be able to accommodate appropriate appreciation of works of genius. For the production of beautiful art, Kant says, genius is required (KU, AA 05: 311). In §46, genius is defined as a talent for producing works, which display "originality" and "exemplarity." Neither of these characteristics, however, is perceptual. This having been said, they are the means for judging beauty (Refl, AA 16: 125). Hence, the original exemplarity of a work is determined in relation to other works. When we subsume an artwork under existing categories of art, these kind concepts directly single out the rules according to which the work is produced and should be judged. Indeed, Kant seems to think that "every art presupposes rules which first lay the foundation by means of which a product that is to be called artistic is first represented as possible" (KU, AA 05: 307). What makes an artwork original, however, is that it breaks with these rules. Hence, Kant states that genius is indeed "a **talent** for producing that for which no determinate rule can be given, not a predisposition of skill for that which can be learned in accordance with some rule, consequently that **originality** must be its primary

characteristic" (KU, AA 05: 307f). In this sense, a work, insofar as it breaks with the existing rules, cannot be placed under existing categories of criticism, which endorse these rules. However, originality by itself is not enough to make something into a work of genius, for Kant asserts that

> since there can also be original nonsense, its products must at the same time be models, i.e. **exemplary**, hence, while not themselves the result of imitation [*Nachahmung*], they must yet serve others in that way, i.e. as a standard or a rule for judging (KU, AA 05: 308).

This description of exemplarity seems to be at odds with the originality requirement. For one thing, Timothy Gould diagnoses that if "works of genius must be imitated… [t]hese works of originality must be made in one aspect, precisely in order that they can be received as models – that is, received unoriginally" (1982, 183).[53] Second, it seems as though the work, upon becoming exemplary, upon becoming a model or standard, can no longer be original.

In order to alleviate the first worry, which also puts the integrity of exemplary originality at stake, Martin Gammon gives an extensive analysis of the development of Kant's views on exemplarity and its relation to imitation [*Nachahmung*], emulation [*Nachfolge*], replication [*Nachmachung*], aping [*Nachäffung*]. Gammon argues that a work of genius

> can serve either as a pattern (*Muster*) for imitation (*Nachahmung*) by future artists, as a "standard or rule for estimating" their work, as Kant specifies in §46; or, as an archetype (*Urbild*) for the emulation (*Nachfolge*) by future geniuses. If a genial creation is treated as a mere "pattern" for creativity, then one will merely imitate the manner of its performance; but if

[53] See also Guyer (1996, 295-296).

> one emulates it as an archetype of taste, then one can ignite one's own "true original" (1997, 587).

The genius can play this dual role not only because she breaks with the old rules but also because she possesses "a principle of novelty in rules, because it gives new rules" (V-Anth/Pillau, AA 25: 784). Genius should break with the old rules, but we need to qualify what this means. Kant writes,

> The initiates [*adepten*] of genius, who must necessarily make appeals to genius, [but] also can only estimate their [own] genius by the appraisal of people, are those who have a *communal* [*gemeinschaftliche*], but not a c*ommunicable*, inspiration [*Eingebung*], [and thus share] only a *sympathetic intelligibility*. One must let this inspiration drive their work, but without fretting over it, because one does not actually contradict the spirit [of one's predecessors], and yet one refutes [*wiederlegen*] it. The artful trick is this: breaking free from science and erudition in consideration of [one's] original spirit, and being critical of others and of any deep secret religious conviction, which gives consideration to idle talk (as cited in Gammon 1997, 587; Refl, AA 15: 391f.).

Hence, breaking with old rules does not involve contradicting them, but employing them as a source of inspiration and thereby of refutation. As Gammon points out, the archetypal exemplarity and originality of the predecessors is not contradicted in a work of genius since her talent is ignited by their example; instead the work refutes the dominance of their example as a pattern for future creativity since it proffers a new pattern for imitation (587). Therefore, contrary to Gould's worries, the work of genius is not necessarily received unoriginally given that due to its archetypal status it does indeed inspire other works of genius. As Kant clearly states, "the product of genius is an example… for emulation by another genius, who is thereby awakened to the feeling of his own originality" (KU, AA 05: 318). It does not imply that there is unoriginal

reception. Indeed, Gammon lists the possible ways in which a work of genius can be received, which include:

> as an archetype (*Urbild*) for the emulation (*Nachfolge*) of future geniuses, as a pattern (*Muster*) for imitation (*Nachahmung*) of future artists, as model (*Modell*) or precept (*Vorschrift*) for the replication (*Nachmachung*) by schools, and as an expression of peculiarity (*Eigenthumlichkeit*), which may serve for the aping (*Nachäffung*) of counterfeits, plagiarists, and "tyros" (588).

Gammon's answer to the first worry dismisses the second worry I raised as well. Since the archetypal status of a work of genius is never contradicted, it never ceases to be original. In Gammon's words, "the exemplarity of the genius in fact reinforces its claims to originality, rather than undermines them" (588f). Further evidence for the inalienability of exemplarity and originality can be found in Kant's reflections on artistic succession. Kant writes,

> **Succession**, related to a precedent, not imitation, is the correct expression for any influence that the products of an exemplary author can have on others, which means no more than to create from the same sources from which the latter created, and to learn from one's predecessor only the manner of conducting oneself in so doing (KU, AA 05: 283).

Kant continues by adding that, since we seem to lack concepts or precepts that can guide taste, it is "most in need of the examples of what in the progress of culture has longest enjoyed approval" (KU, AA 05: 283). In this sense, the work of genius never ceases to be original and exemplary. I also take Kant's claims regarding exemplary originality to signal a twofold approach to products of genius. We do not judge the work of genius only with respect to its antecedents or precedents (since otherwise we cannot determine their originality), but also with respect to its successors (since otherwise their exemplary influence cannot be articulated). However, these features cannot be recognized if the

judgments available to us are limited to the ones characterized by the existing accounts of judgments of adherent beauty.

The conjunctive view and the incorporation view both tell us that we form judgments of perfection concerning artworks by presupposing the relevant categories of criticism and that these judgments are either combined with or incorporated into judgments of taste. But, in virtue of being original, a work of genius is not subsumable under the existing categories of art in this manner. Were it a good example of its kind, it would not be issuing a new rule but endorsing one of the existing rules. The work, insofar as it is original, is transgressing the rules and the transgressive or revolutionary aspect of the work cannot be captured by the existing categories. Hence, the work must exhibit contra-standard properties that resist subsumption. Walton argues that there are two responses these types of works can elicit: we can either create a new category where the transgressive contra-standard features of the work become standard, or expand the relevant category (1970, 352f). These two responses result from the exemplarity of the work and prove that the work is not original nonsense. In this sense, because works of genius resist subsumption under existing categories, they cannot be appreciated as instances of adherent beauty. However, one could claim that the new category or the expanded category still determines our judgment. This objection reverses the order of explanation: We do not decide on the standard and variable properties of the object with respect to the new or expanded category. Rather it is the other way around. Additionally, we cannot abstract from the categories we employ in forming a pure judgment of taste because if we do, then we would be abstracting from the very conditions under which we can judge an artwork to be original and exemplary, and hence beautiful. Without

presupposing the old rules, how could we know what the work is transgressing or amplifying? One can also argue that we do not need to abstract from the existing relevant categories of criticism because they do not determine our judgment, just as the concept of a rose does not necessarily determine our judgment "this rose is beautiful." However, this objection is based on a false presupposition. The existing categories of criticism do not function in the subject-concept capacity. If they did, then the work would be subsumable under them. Hence, we seem to have a new problem on our hands: we do not know how to appropriately judge products of genius.

III. 2. Transformation without Abstraction

The first step in addressing this problem is to note that even though abstraction is (almost) always *possible*, it may not always be *appropriate*. Although we (almost) always can abstract, sometimes – under certain conditions – we ought not to do so. I want to show in more detail that, for works of genius, abstraction, although possible, is inappropriate and that Kant promotes pure judgments of taste as the correct judgments to make when it comes to such works. The question then is how the transformation into pure judgments of taste can take place *without* employing abstraction. I propose that the transformation occurs due to concept expansion and repudiation.

In order to appreciate why we ought to treat works of genius as free beauties and how to do so, we need to examine Kant's theory of genius and aesthetic ideas in more detail. Kant states that genius, which is required for producing beautiful art, not only possesses spirit but also taste. Spirit is the principle that animates the mind by purposively setting the mental powers into motion, into a free play (KU, AA 05: 314). It can animate the mind in such a way because spirit is the faculty for the presentation of

aesthetic ideas (KU, AA 05: 314). What are aesthetic ideas? To start with, "ideas… are representations related to an object in accordance with a certain (subjective or objective) principle, insofar as they can nevertheless never become a cognition of that object" (KU, AA 05: 342). They are divided into two main categories: rational ideas (or concepts of reason) and aesthetic ideas. Rational ideas are related to a *concept* in accordance with an *objective* principle without yielding a cognition of the object, whereas aesthetic ideas are related to an *intuition* in accordance with a mere *subjective* principle of the correspondence of the faculties of imagination and understanding (KU, AA 05: 342). Just as we lack adequate intuitions that can be subsumed under rational ideas, we also lack adequate determinate concepts that can subsume aesthetic ideas (KU, AA 05: 314). Aesthetic ideas are products of the imagination that result from transforming what is given in experience into an idea without yielding to the laws of association (KU, AA 05: 314). In creating aesthetic ideas, the imagination is productive and hence creative and/or inventive. It not only break with the laws of association, it creates new associations. This freedom from the law of association, I contend, makes it possible for the aesthetic ideas (a) to "strive towards something lying beyond the bounds of experience, thus seek to approximate a presentation of concepts of reason (of intellectual ideas)," such as "the ideas of invisible beings, the kingdom of the blessed, the kingdom of hell, eternity, creation, etc.", and (b) to present things "of which there are examples in experience, e.g., death, envy, and all sorts of vices, as well as love, fame, etc., beyond the limits of experience, with a completeness that goes beyond anything of which there is an example in nature" (KU, AA 05: 314). This brings out another important function of spirit: Spirit

is the faculty in charge for presenting rational ideas and empirical concepts through aesthetic ideas.

The immediate question that arises is how it is possible for genius to carry out the task of presenting (*darstellen*) rational ideas through aesthetic ideas, given that we cannot find adequate representations for rational ideas. The answer is: through symbolic presentation (*Darstellung*; hypotyposis). Kant states that the demonstrable concepts, such as empirical concepts and pure concepts of the understanding, can be presented by giving the corresponding intuition to the concept. Empirical concepts are made sensible by giving examples, while pure concepts of the understanding require schemata (KU, AA 05: 351). For instance, I can point to my friend Rene's dog, Emma, to demonstrate the empirical concept of a dog. The schema of causality, which consists in succession of the state of affairs in accordance with a rule, demonstrates the reality of the pure concept of causality (KrV, A 144/B 183). Neither kind of presentation, however, is apt for presenting rational ideas since they are indemonstrable, that is, there is in principle no intuition that corresponds to such ideas. Kant asserts that symbolic presentation serves the purpose. Different from the schematic presentation where the representation and the concept have corresponding contents, in symbolic presentation it is the ways in which we reflect on rational ideas and aesthetic ideas that stand in correspondence, not the contents. Put otherwise, aesthetic ideas can present rational ideas by mere analogy, that is "the transportation of the reflection on one object of intuition to another, quite different concept" (KU, AA 05: 352f), namely, a rational idea. For instance, Gustave Moreau's *Oedipus and the Sphinx* presents the idea of the power of reason against temptation

because there is a correspondence between the ways in which one reflects on the painting (i.e. an expression of an aesthetic idea) and on the rational idea.

Kant suggests that aesthetic ideas can present rational ideas with the help of "supplementary representations of imagination," which he calls "aesthetic attributes of an object whose concept, as an idea of reason, cannot be adequately presented" (KU, AA 05: 315). By giving "the imagination cause to spread itself over a multitude of related representations, which let one think more than one can express in a concept determined by words… [aesthetic attributes] yield an aesthetic idea, which serves… [the] idea of reason" (KU, AA 05: 315). For instance, the sphinx (the poser of riddles) as the attribute of moral temptation animates our idea of moral temptation and our mind associates this idea with the given representation, which arouses a multitude of sensations and supplementary representations.

An aesthetic idea, even though composed of such attributes, is more than this collection. It is "the organization, or unity of these attributes, that in virtue of which they constitute a single aesthetic idea, in contrast, say, to a random 'heap' of disconnected images" (Allison 2001, 283). This organization is the unity of diverse non-aesthetic internal properties, such as having an almost archaic detailed and linear style, diagonal axis, and sensual colors, alongside aesthetic attributes, such as the Sphinx symbolizing moral temptation, and Oedipus, the Greek tragic hero, symbolizing the power of reason and beauty, that come together in a unique fashion to symbolically present a rational idea. In order to count as beautiful this organization should be such that, when we reflect on it, it directs us to reflect on the rational idea that it aims to present.

On an important note, even though Kant devotes special attention to the presentation of rational ideas, this should not give the impression that aesthetic ideas cannot present other things and that beautiful art should only have rational ideas as its thematic content. As mentioned earlier, aesthetic ideas can present empirical concepts and emotions.[54] Kant's examples attest to this fact. Kant's examples include "death, envy, and all sorts of vices, as well as love, fame" (KU, AA 05: 314), "furies, diseases, devastations of war, and the like" (KU, AA 05: 312), and affects (KU, AA 05: 328f). In fact, the only exception seems to be "that which arouses loathing" (KU, AA 05: 312).

To illustrate, Kant gives the example of absolute music as expressing affects.[55] He places absolute music under the category of the art of the play of sensation by analogy to its linguistic equivalent, tone. The idea behind this is the following: Depending on the different intonations used by a speaker, we can tell whether or not s/he is sarcastic, happy, excited, sad, angry, etc. This is the case because the tone used by the speaker "designates an affect of the speaker and conversely also produces one in the hearer, which then in turn arouses in the latter the idea that is expressed in the language by means of such tone" (KU, AA 05: 328). The modulation creates something like a "language of sensations," to use Kant's words (KU, AA 05: 328). By analogy with its linguistic equivalent, Kant claims, music expresses affects, which he defines as "the feeling of pleasure or displeasure in the subject's present state that does not let him to rise to *reflection*" due to its suddenness (Anth, AA 07: 251). Kant writes, "the art of tone puts that language [of sensations] into practice for itself alone […] as a language of affects,

[54] For a more detailed elucidation of how such presentation takes place, see Samantha Matherne (2013, 21-33).

[55] What follows in the next two pages is a reprint of the material that will appear in Tuna (forthcoming b).

and so, in accordance with the law of association, universally communicates the aesthetic ideas that are naturally combined with it" (KU, AA 05: 328f). In music, the aesthetic idea refers to "the form of composition of […] sensations (harmony and melody)" created by means of

> a proportionate disposition of them (which, since in the case of tones it rests on the relation of the number of vibrations of the air in the same time, insofar as the tones are combined at the same time or successively, can be mathematically subsumed under certain rules) (KU, AA 05: 329).

The different movements within the composition can create different affects in the hearer, but they all contribute to the formation of the central theme, which constitutes its dominant affect (KU, AA 05: 329). For instance, Mozart's Symphony No.40 in G Minor has a highly emotional tragic affect overall, while its first movement has the affect of distress, and the third, anger. In this way, the composition (as the expression of the aesthetic idea) presents the concept of a certain affect. To be more specific, we can say that the first movement of Symphony No.40 is able to stimulate the affect of distress or urgency through its formal structure, namely by using a throbbing violin melody following the short-short-long rhythmic pattern repeatedly. The issue is that this presentation is not a demonstration even though the concept being presented is an empirical one. The first movement of Symphony No.40 is not an example of the affect of distress or urgency. The presentation is symbolic and involves a transfer of reflections, i.e. when we reflect on what is expressed by the composition, this directs us to reflect on the affect of distress or urgency it aims to present.

There is no guarantee that every organization of a multitude of properties presenting rational ideas, empirical concepts, or emotions will be regarded as beautiful. Given that depicting a sphinx in minute detail does not automatically make the object beautiful, the organization, in order to count as beautiful, should indicate originality and exemplarity. Thus, genius is the capacity of bringing all of these contingent attributes and/or properties together in an original and exemplary fashion. Kant states that the "originality of talent… can consist either in the product itself and the materials, or in the form; genius really pertains to the latter, for we ourselves cannot produce materials" (V-Anth/Pillau, AA 25: 784). Hence, the genius displays originality insofar as the creation of aesthetic ideas comprises not only breaking with the laws of association and the rules of artistic convention but also establishing new associations that have not been imagined by others. Originality indicates that there are no direct rules available for genius to follow for producing beautiful art – otherwise she would not be breaking with the existing rules but merely reproducing or imitating them (KU, AA 05: 307). However, as I indicated before, untamed originality can have negative consequences, namely it can produce original nonsense. That is why possessing spirit is not enough for producing beautiful art, and genius also needs to possess taste. It is through possessing taste that genius displays exemplarity: the work must be such that it can serve as an archetype, a pattern, a model or as an expression of peculiarity to others (KU AA 05: 308). For the production of an original and exemplary work, an optimal relation between imagination and understanding is required. The imagination finds not only an aesthetic idea but also an expression for this idea (KU, AA 05: 317). The state of mind of the genius in finding the aesthetic idea is "unnameable" or incommunicable because she cannot "bring… [this] representation of

imagination to concepts," that is, she cannot "expound" it (KU, AA 05: 344). The imagination needs to hit upon the expressions for the aesthetic idea and present that which is "unnameable." However, the imagination cannot carry out this task without the understanding. It is only with the guidance of the understanding that the imagination transforms what is "unnameable" into something universally communicable (KU, AA 05: 317).

Furthermore, in order to produce something unique that can serve as an example, the genius should be acquainted with the traditions of good art. If the genius lacks knowledge of art history and criticism, how would it be possible for her to create something that has not been thought by others? In fact, Kant states that such knowledge is required for the production of beautiful art: "[I]t has been quite rightly noticed that for beautiful art in its full perfection much science is required, such as, e.g., acquaintance with ancient languages, wide reading of those authors considered to be classical, history, acquaintance with antiquities, etc." (KU, AA 05: 305). These historical sciences, which include acquaintance with the products of beautiful art, refer to the body of art historical and critical knowledge in modern terminology. They, Kant says, "constitute the necessary preparation and foundation for beautiful art" (KU, AA 05: 305). However, he claims that possessing such knowledge and employing it only to mechanically create something academically correct by following the rules cannot constitute the essential condition of art. In the same vein, Kant disparages those who think that they can create something original by rejecting all the rules completely:

> Now since the originality of his talent constitutes one (but not the only) essential element of the character of the genius, superficial minds believe that they cannot show that they are

> blossoming geniuses any better than by pronouncing themselves free of the academic constraint of all rules, and they believe that one parades around better on a horse with the staggers than one that is properly trained (KU, AA 05: 310).

Hence, "determinate rules are required, from which one may not absolve oneself;" however they must be used for inspiration, as a springboard, not for imitation. This also again makes it certain that genius must necessarily possess both spirit and taste and that neither is sufficient on its own to produce beautiful art.[56] As Kant states, "[g]enius can only provide rich **material** for products of art; its elaboration and **form** require a talent that has been academically trained, in order to make a use of it that can stand up to the power of judgment" (KU, AA 05: 310).

The foregoing exposition of Kant's theory of aesthetic creation constitutes the preparatory step towards understanding Kant's account of aesthetic reception and recognizing what makes it possible to appreciate works of genius as instances of free beauty without abstracting from the concepts we use and thereby what makes it possible to make informed pure judgments of taste regarding works of genius. How do we judge such works? Kant asserts that in judging such works as beautiful, the aesthetic idea is added to the rational idea that it aims to present and "aesthetically enlarges the concept [of reason] itself in an unbounded way" (KU, AA 05: 315). He says that this addition of

[56] In §50, Kant discusses the cases in which the genius does not have the guidance of understanding in creating artworks. He states that "taste… is the discipline (or corrective) of genius, clipping its wings and making it well behaved or polished; but at the same time it gives genius guidance as to where and how far it should extend itself if it is to remain purposive" (KU, AA 05: 319). Otherwise, the works genius creates would be "nothing but nonsense" (KU, AA 05: 319). Kant's characterization of taste as the corrective of genius made commentators wonder whether or not genius here is limited merely to an imaginative capacity. In order to solve this problem, Allison argued that Kant is working with two different notions of genius: a "thick" and a "thin" conception. According to him, Kant has a thin notion of genius in §50 whereas in the rest of the KU he works with the thick notion of genius, which requires both imagination and understanding. See Allison (2001, 298-301), for his discussion of these two notions of genius. Since Kant uses the thick notion of genius for setting out what is necessary for the creation of beautiful art I will be working with that notion.

the aesthetic idea corresponds to an addition of "that [which] is unnameable, the feeling of which animates the cognitive faculties and combines spirit with the mere letter of language" to the rational idea (KU, AA 05: 316). This means that the expression of the aesthetic idea, which is the work itself, arouses certain feelings, which recall to the mind the feelings stemming from reflection on a rational idea. This rational idea turns out to be what the aesthetic idea aims to present. It also makes us realize that there are several other representations, which arouse the same feelings in us, which can now be seen as different attributes of the same rational idea. Through these new associations the rational idea gets expanded and we find further pleasure in this expansion.

In order to explain what Kant means by "aesthetic expansion of (determinate/indeterminate) concepts" I want to contrast it with the *logical* expansion of empirical concepts. Logical expansion can take place in two ways: The conceptual content can be expanded either *extensively* or *intensively*. For Kant, because human cognition is discursive, it takes place through (general or partial) representations, which take what is common to things, namely marks, as the ground of cognition (Log, AA 09: 58). The marks in things, which constitute a part of the cognition of those things, are divided into two kinds: coordinate and subordinate (Log, AA 09: 58f). The coordinate marks are immediate marks of things and their combination is called an aggregate (Log, AA 09: 59). The subordinate marks are the ones that are represented in the thing only by means of the other marks and their combination is called a series (Log, AA 09: 59). The *extensive* expansion of a concept corresponds to the addition of more coordinate marks to the concept. For instance, the addition of more coordinate marks, such as having a coat with dark blotches or patches separated by light hair, having a long neck and legs, and

being a mammal, extensively expands the concept of a giraffe. The *intensive* expansion of the concept of 'giraffe' takes place when we add other properties to this concept, such as being warm-blooded, through derivation from the mark of being a mammal. Both kinds of expansion make the concept more distinct, either extensively or intensively distinct (Log, AA 09: 59).

A rational idea, however, which is an indeterminate concept, cannot become more distinct. Therefore, its conceptual content cannot be expanded either extensively or intensively. For either kind of expansion to work, we need to be able to provide adequate intuitions to the concepts, which carry the same marks. However, as we have seen, by definition, nothing in sensible intuition is adequate to rational ideas. What is adequate for them are aesthetic attributes or symbols. Since genius makes use of new symbolic associations that we did not think of before, the aesthetic expansion of rational ideas corresponds to the addition of more aesthetic attributes to rational ideas. In the case of empirical concepts or emotions, their presentation *via* aesthetic ideas likewise cannot be equivalent to intensive or extensive expansion. I admit that sometimes presentations can *additionally* involve adding logical attributes (cf. KU, AA 05: 315). However, what is special about artistic presentation is that it involves adding aesthetic attributes, this being the main means for expanding the empirical concepts. The aesthetic expansion achieved by adding of aesthetic attributes cannot be equivalent to extensive or intensive expansion because aesthetic attributes are neither immediate marks of the things nor marks logically derived from other marks. Aesthetic expansion is unique in the sense that it involves adding innumerable marks to concepts, which are not their logical attributes nor have immediate existing associations with these concepts. Furthermore, if aesthetic expansion

was at all similar to intensive or extensive logical expansion, then it would not have been possible for the artist to make things of which there are examples in experience sensible "with a completeness that goes beyond anything of which there is an example in nature, by means of an imagination that emulates the precedent of reason in attaining to a maximum" (KU, AA 05: 315). If aesthetic expansion and logical expansion were identical, then the concept would be presented in same way we experience it and we would not have experienced aesthetic pleasure. It is in this experience of the aesthetic expansion of rational ideas and empirical concepts by addition of aesthetic attributes beyond the marks of these concepts that we find pleasure. Kant talks about the role of aesthetic expansion of concepts in the process of judging artworks in this manner in §53. There, while commenting on poetry, he states that the art of poetry

> *expands* the mind by setting imagination free and presenting, within the limits of a given concept and among the unbounded manifold of forms possibly agreeing with it, the one that connects its representation with a fullness of thought to which no linguistic expression is fully adequate, and thus elevates itself aesthetically to the level of ideas (KU, AA 05: 326, emphasis added).

However, unlike in the case of natural beauty where "the mere reflection on a given intuition, without a concept of what the object ought to be, is sufficient for arousing and communicating the idea of which that object is considered as an expression," when it comes to art we need a concept (KU, AA 05: 320). After claiming that beauty "in general" can "be called the expression of aesthetic ideas," Kant says that "only in beautiful art this idea must be *occasioned* [*veranlaßt*] by a concept of the object" (KU, AA 05: 320, emphasis added). As the wording suggests, our reflection on the given intuitions, namely, on aesthetic ideas is only occasioned or triggered by the concept; but

this does not entail that the concept guides the whole process. Since Kant is not very explicit about what this concept might be, I am going to entertain some possible options and explain why and how neither of them can guide the entire process of appreciation.

The possible candidates are the concept of art, the rational idea or the empirical concept the work presents, and the categories of criticism. (i) If the concept is the concept of art then the process of reflection needs to be triggered by the concept that indicates that the object is not a product of chance but created for the sake of inducing the free play in the audience. As we have seen earlier, Guyer gives a convincing argument that this concept cannot determine our aesthetic responses. (ii) If this concept is a rational idea that the aesthetic idea aims to present, given that it is an indeterminate concept, it cannot also determine our response to the work. (iii) If the concept is an empirical concept which the work aims to present, then this concept cannot determine our judgment either since, through the aesthetic expansion, it becomes something more than what is exemplified by its actual instantiations in nature. However, our judgment can be triggered by it, since without being acquainted with this concept we would not be in a position to identify that it is presented by the work and appreciate its expansion through aesthetic ideas. This does not mean that the concept can determine our judgment of taste though. If it had that power, then we would not be able to aesthetically engage with the work itself because we would be continuously demanding a logical representation of the concept and would feel perhaps irritated when aesthetic attributes, which have no immediate connection to the concept, get associated with it. Hence, the reason why this concept cannot determine our judgment has to do with the fact that artistic presentation (which is first and foremost based on metaphorical descriptions) is radically different than mere depiction. (iv)

Another possibility is that this concept refers to kind-concepts, i.e. categories of criticism. I think that it is very well possible that we approach the object with certain expectations, which are determined by the experiences that we have had with different artworks. Furthermore, I also believe that we need categories of criticism in order to trigger our reflection on aesthetic ideas and determine whether the work in question is original and exemplary, hence beautiful.

The question becomes how we can ensure that a concept of this kind is not going to determine our response to the work. I argue that the categories of criticism we employ get expanded or repudiated each time we encounter a work of genius since the work of genius, which should be both original and exemplary, always exceeds our expectations. Indeed its originality and exemplarity is grounded in its success in exceeding our expectations. Works of genius exceed our expectations concerning aesthetic ideas due to the fact that, in creating them, genius not only breaks with the laws of association but also establishes new associations. This in turn opens up the possibility for a rational idea, an empirical concept or an emotion, to be presented in unexpected ways and leads to an aesthetic expansion of this presented concept. In other words, these works exceed our expectations concerning what can be presented and how it can be presented. One obvious question is how we determine that the work exceeds our expectations. I think that it can be done *only indirectly* and this indirectness accounts for the purity of the informed judgments we make concerning these works.

The main thing we need to keep in mind is that for Kant the new is always understood relationally. In this sense we need to appeal to some categories in order to appreciate the way in which the work exceeds our expectations. The judgment of taste

cannot, however, be the judgment by which we can determine this. After all, it is not based on a determinate concept. This is the point where the judgment of perfection becomes central. Our reflection on the given intuition (i.e. the aesthetic idea) is occasioned or triggered by the relevant categories. Recall that in the case of an informed *impure* judgment of taste, the function of a judgment of perfection on the basis of objective classification is to *directly* single out the properties constitutive of the aesthetic idea expressed by the object. A judgment of perfection cannot function in such capacity for judging original and exemplary works, which resist classification and are not good examples of any extant artistic kind. In these cases, the relevant categories, namely the categories that will be amplified in order to subsume the work or the categories that are repudiated by the work, *indirectly* single out the contra-standard properties of the work. These contra-standard properties, which will become standard with respect to the amplified category or the new category, are constitutive of the aesthetic idea expressed by the work. Hence, we determine whether or not the work exceeds our expectations with respect to what the work presents (the indeterminate or determinate concept or emotion) and how it is presented (the aesthetic idea) *only relationally*, via frustrated attempts at making judgments of perfection.

The reason why categories of criticism cannot determine our responses to works of genius even though they should be used to occasion or trigger our reflection on aesthetic ideas can be most clearly seen in those instances where a work's original exemplarity lies in the fact that its contra-standard features motivate us to reevaluate completely the critical categories we use and warrant formation of a new category to subsume the work. One of the most oft-discussed works, due to its transgressive contra-

standard features that defied aesthetic classification, Duchamp's *Fountain*, exemplifies such an instance. The characteristics of the work, namely being anesthetic and ready-made, become its defining contra-standard features and ground its claim to originality only when considered in relation to the art historical narrative. The presupposition of the relevant categories, by indirectly making the contra-standard features salient, triggers our reflection on the aesthetic idea presented in the work and this reflection also makes it possible for us to see what is being presented by the work. Without presupposing them, we would perhaps be baffled by the ridiculous mistake being made in placing the urinal in the exhibition room of an art gallery instead of its bathroom. Only by presupposing the categories does our reflection on the aesthetic idea (which is expressed by something that is anaesthetic and ready-made) direct us to reflect on our conception of art, namely what it involves and what it can do, and broaden our conception by means of a suggestion that "it might be possible for art to be a form of expression purely for mind, rather than the eye" (Dutton 2009, 194). Note that the existing categories are not used in the same way when we make judgments of perfection. A judgment of perfection is a report on whether or not a work is a good example of its kind. In the case of *Fountain*, the categories are used to show why the work is uncategorizable under the existing categories and why we need to form a new category, such as conceptual art. This having been said, the genial status of the work cannot be determined only in relation to prior categories of art; to fully appreciate it we also need to refer to its subsequent influence. This is one of the core reasons why we appreciate the work as it is. *Fountain* has a unique place in the history of aesthetics. Its influence is recognizable not only by means of the subsequent influence it

has had on the creation of indiscernible works of art but also in the change of general attitude of audiences towards artworks (anything can be art, so be cautious!).

As illustrated in this example, the initial categories, which trigger the process of judging by contradistinguishing the properties of a work, cease to determine our judgment. In an encounter with an original and exemplary artwork, the relevant categories we use either expand extensively, by means of the addition of more particulars to the aggregate, or are repudiated and we form a new category for the work in question. This allows for free play to take place without interruption. It is free because our imagination is being entertained and is not restricted by our understanding since the category, in getting expanded or repudiated, ceases to determine our judgment. What happens in these situations is that our initial attempt at making a judgment of perfection is cancelled out and we end up with a pure judgment of taste *without abstraction* when we realize that the concepts we started with are not extensive enough to subsume what is given in the artwork. Or, to put it more accurately, we end up with an informed pure judgment of taste.

In short, just as there are no rules for genius to follow in producing beautiful artworks, so too there are no rules that we can follow in appreciating them either. We judge a work of genius on the basis of an aesthetic idea and a rational idea. However, none of these ideas are fixed and indeed they get further expanded once we judge the artwork. This expansion is possible because, in judging artistic beauty, even though we start with a concept (whatever it may be), this concept only occasions or triggers the aesthetic ideas; moreover, as I said, it does not determine the whole process. In making a judgment of perfection we check whether or not there is an agreement of the manifold

with the concept we have. In judging it, our concept is not getting expanded. We check whether or not the object fits into this concept. However, in forming a judgment regarding a work of genius, the object does not fit into our conception, forcing us to change the kind of judgment we use. The frustrated attempts at making judgments of perfection indirectly lead to a transformation in the initial judgment of taste we make without reference to any category. Perhaps we start with a positive judgment of taste or a negative judgment, or a mistaken judgment of adherent beauty. Only after realizing that the work resists our attempts at making judgments of perfection about it, one of these initial judgments, an uninformed one or a flawed one, is transformed into a informed pure judgment of taste because (1) this work aesthetically expands our conception of rational ideas/empirical concepts/emotions by associating them with different attributes and (2) it exceeds our expectations concerning aesthetic ideas because the genius breaks with the laws of association in forming them. If this were not the case, the work would not display the originality and exemplarity that are requisite for being beautiful. More importantly, we make no use of abstraction when we are forming an informed pure judgment of taste. As a matter of fact, we *should not* abstract from the concepts we use when we are forming a judgment of taste because if we abstract from these concepts, we can never appreciate the object as original and exemplary. We need these concepts to trigger the process. Once our concept gets expanded or repudiated, we can say that the work is original and exemplary, and hence beautiful.

III. 3. Resolving Some Remaining Problems

In this chapter and Chapter II I have been addressing problems that have been raised against Kant's account of free-adherent beauty distinction and his theory of artistic

beauty due to apparent textual inconsistencies. Chapter II was meant to alleviate the worry about the status of adherent beauty and artistic beauty as kinds of beauty. In this chapter, the worry I raised concerned the inability of extant interpretations of Kant's account to explain how to judge products of genius. We have seen that these works cannot be judged as free beauties by employing abstraction or as adherent beauties, namely as good examples of their kinds. I solve this problem by proposing an additional account of transformation, which does not rely on the method of abstraction but instead on the use of categories of criticism. My general aim in these two chapters was to show that we can form informed impure and pure judgments of taste and that judgments of perfection make informed aesthetic assessments a possibility. Now I want to wrap up my exposition of Kant's theory of artistic beauty. First, I am going to provide solutions to other worries raised against his account that I did not have a chance to address in Chapter II because their solution required a discussion of Kant's account of aesthetic ideas and an exposition of my interpretation of the aesthetic evaluation of products of genius. Second, I am going to use my account to moot some other worries that may be raised.

One problem, which seems to be trickier to answer, is caused by the incompatibility between Kant's characterization of free artistic beauties in §16 and the definitions of beauty in §48. If we accept Kant's definition of artistic beauty as the beautiful representation of a thing, then we cannot account for the examples of free artistic beauty, which are characterized as free because they do not represent anything. A closer look at Kant's characterization however reveals that Kant qualifies his no-representation claim by saying that these beauties represent "no object under a determinate concept" (KU, AA 05: 229). Therefore, the claim is not that they do not

represent anything but that what they represent cannot be placed under a determinate concept.[57] Here Kant is not saying that these examples of free artistic beauty are not representations. In §48 Kant's aim in using representation talk is to stress the creative aspect of genius, which is not present in mere taste. In saying "a beauty of nature is a beautiful thing; the beauty of art is a beautiful representation of a thing" Kant wants to emphasize the fact that beautiful art is not an imitation of beautiful things in nature (KU, AA 05: 311). Indeed it becomes obvious in the following paragraphs that artistic beauty is considered to be beautiful not according to what it represents but how it represents since Kant claims that "beautiful art displays its excellence precisely by describing beautifully things that in nature would be ugly or displeasing" (KU, AA 05: 312). This creative aspect indicates that in the production of beautiful art something more than taste is required. Therefore, the word "representation" in the context of §48 indicates being a creatively produced product. It is a product of neither imitation nor chance. If we understand representation in this sense, it is hard to see how wallpapers and fantasias are not representations, given that they are produced by an artist with the intention of inducing pleasure in the audience. Therefore, Kant uses the word "representation" in different senses in §16 and §48.

It is also possible to reconstruct Kant's claim in §16 in such a way that it will no longer seem to contradict his claim in §48: these works are beautiful representations of things that cannot be placed under determinate concepts. One can still ask how it is possible that both these examples and the works of genius can fulfill the no-determinate-

[57] This way of framing things is not new to Kant's style in the KU: After repeatedly claiming that beauty is judged without a concept, Kant qualifies his claim by saying that it is not without a concept but without a determinate concept (KU, AA 05: 339). Again we see the same thing happening in §16.

concept requirement. This requirement is a necessary condition for something to be judged as free beauty. However, there are different ways to satisfy this condition. The condition can be satisfied because (1) I do not have a determinate concept to start with; (2) I abstract from the concept; or (3) the concepts that trigger the process of judging will cease to determine the judgment due to expansion or repudiation as it happens in the case of works of genius. If the examples that Kant gives of free artistic beauties in §16 are works of genius, the no-determinate-concept requirement can be satisfied because of (3), and if they are not, I can judge them to be free beauties because of (1) or (2).

A further worry I discussed in relation to the representation problem was whether or not Kant was privileging foliage on borders over masterpieces of representational art.[58] Given that Kant's no-representation claim in §16 means "not representing an object under a determinate concept," representational artworks do not represent anything in this sense just as foliage on borders or absolute music does not. First, if a representational artwork is meant to present a rational idea, it is clear that it is not representing an object under a determinate concept. Second, if it is intended to present a determinate concept or emotion, the representational content is so rich that it presents this concept or emotion by adding various aesthetic marks beyond the limits of ordinary experience and expanding it in an unbounded way. Hence, again the work cannot be taken to represent an object under a determinate concept because the aesthetic idea expressed by this representational work of art cannot be adequately captured by a determinate concept. Additionally, if what we mean by representation is to be a creatively produced product, namely one that expresses aesthetic ideas, then representational art as well as all the examples of free beauties Kant

[58] Schaper was the first to provide a solution to alleviate this worry (1979, 78-98).

gives in §16, are representational in the same sense. My previous explanation of Kant's account of absolute music and how it presents affects through aesthetic ideas also validates my claim that the artworks Kant lists as examples of free beauty are representational in the sense of being a creatively produced product. Hence, Kant's account cannot have the implication that foliage on borders is aesthetically superior to masterpieces of representational art.

The last problem I mentioned in Chapter II concerned the compatibility of the formalism of the Third Moment and the more complex aesthetic appreciation model that Kant elaborates when introducing his theory of aesthetic ideas. The allegedly formalist passage occurs in the midst of Kant's discussion of another kind of impure judgments of taste, which are combinations of judgments of taste and sense. Kant divides aesthetic judgments into two categories: empirical and pure (KU, AA 05: 223). The judgments of sense, which fall under the first category, assert the agreeableness or disagreeableness of the object. They are grounded in private conditions pertaining to the subject alone and hence are merely subjective (KU, AA 05: 212). The pure judgments of taste, which lay claim to universality, assert the beauty of the object. In §§13-14, Kant asks how and why the satisfaction in the beautiful is independent from the satisfaction in the agreeable when their relation to ends are considered. The question is whether or not the empirical satisfaction we have in the object is mixed into the determining ground of what is supposed to be a pure judgment of taste. The empirical satisfaction can concern the pleasurable sensations that the charms of the object produce (for instance, finding a color or a tone agreeable); or it can concern completely personal emotional responses (for instance, the warm feelings that a scarf can produce because it resembles the scarf that

your grandmother used to wear). What would it mean for the empirical satisfaction to ground a pure judgment of taste? It would mean that pure judgments of taste are assimilated to judgments of sense. The satisfaction in the beautiful would be immediately produced by the empirical intuition of the object (EEKU, AA 20: 224). If this were the case, then in a pure judgment of taste "the purposiveness… [would not] precede the feeling of pleasure… but is instead grounded on it" (KU, AA 05: 223). This would mean that the judgments of taste could not lay claim to universality. By using the conclusion of the Second Moment, namely that the satisfaction in the beautiful is universal, Kant rejects this claim.[59]

Kant asserts that there are two arguments one can deploy in order to block the conclusion that the satisfaction in the beautiful is independent from the satisfaction in the agreeable: (1) "charm is not merely a necessary ingredient of beauty, but even entirely sufficient by itself to be called beautiful" (KU, AA 05: 224), or (2) "the beauty that is attributed to the object on account of its form may well be heightened by charm" (KU, AA 05: 225). Against the first argument, Kant says that it is possible to make pure judgments of taste regarding colors or tones but this does not mean that the charms that an object has are enough to make us call it beautiful. If I reflect on the colors as "vibrations of the ether immediately following one another," namely by pertaining to the scientific explanations available for me, then I can regard them as purposive (KU, AA 05:

[59] In pure judgments of taste, the satisfaction is produced by the harmonious play of the two faculties of cognition, namely, the imagination and the understanding, in the power of judgment (EEKU, AA 20: 224). Instead of the representation of the object – as in the case of judgments of sense, – the *reflection* on the representation of the object is related to the feeling in pure judgments of taste (EEKU, AA 20: 225). This process, which involves the higher faculties of cognition, is governed by the principle of subjective purposiveness. In reflecting on the representation of the object we find the object purposive and this results in pleasure. Thus, in the case of pure judgments of taste, the awareness of the purposiveness is equivalent to the feeling of pleasure. That is why, unlike judgments of sense, the judgments of taste can lay claim to universality.

224). The satisfaction I will have in them will be pure and hence I will consider them to be beautiful themselves. However, I can also perceive colors by sense and relate this representation to the feeling of pleasure and find satisfaction in them on the grounds of my personal preference. In these cases, I regard them as charms. It is a matter of which perspective I take in approaching colors or tones that determines whether they are charms or beauties; and this does not entail that charms by themselves can be called beauties and are what can make an object beautiful. The alternative would be a category mistake.

Kant asserts that, if the second argument holds, then combining our judgment of taste with a judgment of sense will improve or heighten the satisfaction in the beautiful. The judgment of sense that is combined with the judgment of taste can be either (a) about separate internal properties of the object (KU, AA 05: 225) or (b) about external ornamental additions to the object (KU, AA 05: 226). Case (b) is equivalent to combining my judgment of taste concerning Matisse's *Green Stripe* with a judgment of sense that expresses my subjective feelings concerning its silver frame. Kant states that, my appreciation of the silver frame, even if it is truly beautiful, has nothing to do with my judgment of taste concerning the painting. If it is beautiful, it can have decorative value; if it is ugly it can detract my attention from the genuine value of the painting; but in the last instance it does not add to or diminish the genuine value of the painting (KU, AA 05: 226). Case (a) is equivalent to combining my judgment of taste concerning Matisse's *Green Stripe* with a judgment of sense which expresses my subjective feelings concerning the mauve and orange juxtaposition in the background. The question now is whether or not my satisfaction is improved with my judgment of sense. Kant does not think that my satisfaction is improved because my judgment of sense is not about the

painting itself but rather about one of the properties of the painting with respect to my private preference. I just happen to like the juxtaposition of the two colors together. For instance, when I am wearing an orange dress I always tend to combine it with a mauve bag. Does this preference of mine, and hence my finding the painting's use of colors preferable, have anything to do with the painting itself?

It is in this context that Kant's allegedly formalist claims take place. The famous passage (quoted earlier) where Kant claims that the design or the composition constitutes the proper object of the pure judgment of taste can be understood in a new light. Kant is not claiming that the appropriate appreciation consists of evaluating the mere form of the object and that the other aesthetic qualities, for instance the representational content of the object, should not be taken into account. Instead he is claiming that the design that brings all the internal properties of the object together is my main object of appreciation: "the design is what is essential, in which what constitutes the ground of all arrangement for taste is not what gratifies in sensation but merely what pleases through its form" (KU, AA 05: 225). The consideration of the internal properties of the object is important not because they are by themselves agreeable and add something more to my appreciation of the object but because of their role in the overall design, since after all the design encompasses the arrangement of them. That is why Kant asserts that

> the purity of colors as well as of tones as well as their multiplicity and their contrast seem to contribute to beauty does not mean that they as it were supply a supplement of the same rank to the satisfaction in the form because they are agreeable by themselves, but rather they do so because they merely make the latter more precisely, more determinately, more completely intuitable, and also enliven the representation through their charm, thereby awakening and sustaining attention to the object itself (KU, AA 05: 225-6).

In this sense, the internal properties of the object enter into my considerations insofar as they play a role in the overall design, namely, the way in which they come together in a purposive fashion. The consideration of them as charms cannot have any influence on the judgment of taste because otherwise the determining ground of the judgment would cease to be the subjective purposiveness that I assign to the overall design. Therefore, Kant's aim in privileging design in the famous allegedly formalist passage has nothing to do with formalism. His aim in writing this passage was to make certain that evaluations of the non-aesthetic internal properties of the object – either on the basis of private feelings or on the basis of the principle of subjective purposiveness – do not add anything whatsoever to my evaluation of my main object of appreciation, namely the work as a whole. The appropriate aesthetic appreciation of an artwork or an object in general consists in judging the design that brings all the internal properties of the object together. As my explanation of Kant's account of aesthetic ideas shows, the design or the form that we judge is the expression of an aesthetic idea, which is the organization of the contingent and diverse non-aesthetic properties. In this sense, the allegedly formalist passage is not formalist at all. In fact, instead of contradicting Kant's claims concerning aesthetic ideas, it is supplementary.

One related worry concerning Kant's views on judgments of adherent beauty arises from a consideration of the negative tone Kant uses in discussing the impure combination judgments of sense and taste. Kant thinks that his analysis of how and why the ground of judgments of taste is different and independent from agreeableness can be of help in eliminating possible aesthetic misunderstanding or disagreements (KU, AA 05: 223). He thinks that considerations in that regard can help us to correct our taste. For

instance, one of the obvious mistakes one can make is to take our subjective evaluations of an object for a judgment of taste. However, as we have seen in the cases (a) and (b), there are more subtle mistakes that we can make too. These mistakes are about thinking that the charms taken into consideration in combination judgments of taste and sense can improve or heighten taste. Kant is very explicit in regard to these kinds of mistakes: these mistakes are "very detrimental to genuine, uncorrupted, well-grounded taste" (KU, AA 05: 225). Hence, the message of §13-14 is straightforward: if you want to correct your taste, stay away from combining your satisfaction in the beauty of the object with your subjective satisfaction in its agreeableness. It is not easy to see why Kant uses such a pejorative overtone if we are considering only the cases where the judgment of taste and the judgment of sense are in agreement in either their positive or negative assessment. The possible damage that the combinations can cause for taste becomes apparent, however, when there is a disagreement. When we consider cases where a negative judgment of sense overrides the positive judgment of taste or a positive judgment of sense overrides the negative judgment of taste, it becomes obvious why Kant is not in favour of combination judgments and thinks that they can corrupt taste. The lesson is: even though we can and indeed do make combination judgments of sense and taste, we *ought not* to do that.

Given Kant's derogatory remarks on such impure aesthetic judgments, one might think that he has the same attitude towards judgments of adherent beauty. This would be a gross misunderstanding. First of all, Kant does not use such a disparaging tone when he talks about judgments of adherent beauty. Secondly, the interpretation I presented in the last two chapters runs counter to such a view. All along, I have been trying to

demonstrate that, depending on the work, the appropriate judgment to make can differ. If a work is clearly subsumable under a category either as a good or bad example of its kind, then the appropriate judgment is always a judgment of adherent beauty. If the work displays originality and exemplarity, then an informed pure judgment of taste is the appropriate one to make. Hence, instead of it being a sign of undeveloped taste, to employ judgments of adherent beauty on occasions where a work succeeds or fails to meet the expectations attached to the category it falls under is indicative of having a good taste.

Since my interpretation of Kant's theory of artistic beauty permits us to use categories of criticism in making informed pure and impure aesthetic judgments, it renders moot some worries concerning the status of artistic beauty in relation to natural beauty. Christopher Janaway claims that, for Kant, an artwork's being beautiful is different from a natural object's being beautiful. He argues that the concept requirement in the cases of artistic beauty indicates that there are two separable components of aesthetic value, i.e. being pleasing to our taste and expressing an aesthetic idea (1993, 323). Natural beauty is different from artistic beauty because, in appreciating the former, these components of appreciation are not separable. Janaway argues in this way in order to back up his claim that while the perceptual properties of a natural beauty are the supervenience base of its supervening beauty, we cannot make a similar claim concerning artistic beauty. Any two objects that share subvening properties will share the same supervening properties. For instance, I cannot imagine an identical physical replica of a beautiful butterfly to be ugly. However, he wants to claim that we *can* imagine an identical replica of a beautiful artwork which, while perhaps not ugly, is banal. This is the

case, he thinks, because whether an artwork has certain properties, such as being trite or profound, "depends not solely on its perceptible features, but on the time, place, and culture of its production, the artist's conception of it, the styles or conventions into which it may fit, and so on" (326). On the basis of these claims, he concludes that beauty in art and beauty in nature should be different. My interpretation of Kant shows that his account allows for differences in the supervenience base without committing me to the claim that beauty in art and beauty in nature are different. They are the same in the sense that we can make a pure judgment of taste regarding both of them. However, my interpretation shows that Kant's account permits one to judge a replica of a beautiful artwork as banal because, while the initial judgment of the original and exemplary artwork will be free due to the expansion of the concepts in use, in judging the replica the concepts cannot get expanded and the judgment would not be aesthetic. In judging a replica, the positive judgment of taste I formed of the object is overridden by the negative judgment of perfection.

Perhaps Kantian aesthetic evaluations are not truth-apt; however, some are appropriate and some are inappropriate to employ depending on the artwork. This is one of the indicators that perhaps the Kantian theory of taste can yield a theory of art criticism. But one of the most important pieces of support for the expectation that a non-trivial theory of Kantian art criticism is possible lies in my exposition of the use of categories of criticism in forming appropriate informed pure and impure aesthetic judgments. This falsifies the commonly held belief that expertise in art history and criticism has no role to play in making aesthetic evaluations in the Kantian framework. I am going to explore the implications of my interpretation of the Kantian theory of artistic

beauty in the next chapter and construct an account of Kantian art criticism, which is not only radically different from the ones proposed by his predecessors and contemporaries but which has recognizable advantages over the most influential theories of criticism proposed in the 20th and 21st centuries.

Chapter IV Kantian Art Criticism

Having provided my exposition of Kant's theory of artistic beauty, finally we are in a position to explore the implications of his theory on art criticism. There are two central claims I will argue for in this chapter: (1) Kant was an aesthetic particularist; and (2) Kantian art criticism, despite being essentially particularist, incorporates generalist elements. I argue that Kantian art criticism is best understood as a hybrid theory, one that incorporates Noël Carroll's objective generalist model of art criticism, but puts Carroll-type evaluations of success value of artworks in the service of evaluations of artworks with respect to their reception value. Unlike other generalist accounts, Carroll's account has no bearing on the reception value of artworks, namely the value they possess in virtue of the positive experiences they afford to their audience. Instead, he construes art criticism essentially as the evaluation of a work's success in meeting category-membership expectations and he claims that all art critical practices are implemented to support these types of evaluations. Hence, the function of art criticism becomes that of telling others whether or not the artwork under scrutiny is an achievement or a failure and, furthermore, specifying why it is an achievement or why it is a failure. The grounds

for the possibility of the integration of Carroll's account into the Kantian account lie in the centrality of good-of-its-kind judgments in both Kant's and Carroll's accounts. I argue that the critical practices subsumed under the Kantian model partially involve the ones outlined by Carroll because their functions correlate with judgments of perfection. I suggest that the Kantian art critic, by using what Carroll takes to be central to the critic's evaluations, namely good-of-its-kind judgments, narrows down the common ground of appreciation, which would otherwise be non-articulable. In other words, determinations of success value become pivotal in determining the reception value of artworks. Hence, I will not only show that, contrary to common conception, Kant's theory can indeed yield a fruitful account of art criticism, but also demonstrate that it yields an alternative theory of metacriticism, which has the merit of reinstating the centrality of reception value in art critics' evaluations.

I start by explaining Kant's two constraints on aesthetic appreciation, namely the rejection of aesthetic testimony and the rejection of general principles of taste. These two key features of his theory are also the main tenets of aesthetic particularism and render the Kantian theory essentially particularist. I will discuss the types of problematic outcomes a particularist theory of aesthetic appreciation would have with respect to art criticism if it does not make further theoretical commitments to prevent these unwanted consequences. In connection to this, I will (1) explain the solutions other particularist accounts have provided to overcome these problems and why a Kantian account cannot adopt either of these solutions; and (2) discuss and evaluate two attempts (Crawford's and Zuckert's) to construct an account of Kantian art criticism. Then I will articulate the Kantian solution to these problems and present my own construal of Kantian art criticism.

IV. 1. Two Constraints

The autonomy and no-principles constraints, which involve rejection of ("thin") aesthetic testimony and rejection of general objective principles of taste respectively, are derived from the two peculiarities of judgments of taste, namely their universality and necessity. These peculiarities distinguish judgments of taste not only from other merely subjective aesthetic judgments but also from judgments of understanding and judgments of reason. The claim to universality and necessity embedded in a judgments of taste distinguishes it from a merely subjective judgment of the agreeable because the latter pertains to feeling alone and does not carry these qualities. However, the judgments of understanding and reason lay claim to universality and necessity as well. What distinguishes judgments of taste from them stems from the way in which the claims of judgments of taste are grounded. Due to the grounding principle, namely the principle of subjective purposiveness without a purpose, the universality and necessity of judgments of taste are of a special kind and different from that of judgments of understanding and reason.

The Second and Fourth Moment of the Analytic of the KU involve the exposition of these peculiarities and a description of what makes judgments of taste special in regard to them. Kant revisits them in the Deduction of Pure Aesthetic Judgments. He derives what I call the two constraints from the universality and necessity of judgments of taste in his later treatment of the issue, particularly in §§32-33. Let's look at the first peculiarity first and how the first constraint is derived from it.

The Second Moment is an investigation of judgments of taste in terms of their quantity. Kant tells us that, in terms of *logical* quantity, judgments of taste are singular.

In other words, the judgment of taste is about a singular object and does not involve a claim that can be extended to other objects. However, this is not the main point of the Moment. Kant is mainly interested in the relation between aesthetic satisfaction and the subject, that is, in the question of for whom the judgment of taste holds. This is a question concerning *aesthetic* quantity. In uttering "*Praying Boy* is beautiful," for instance, Kant thinks that due to the special relation between the subject and the satisfaction, the subject claims that the satisfaction he or she experiences in encountering *Praying Boy* is valid for everyone. In making the judgment "my mom's butter cookies are delicious," however, I do not make a claim to universality. I do not expect everyone to find them to be delicious and furthermore, even if they do not, I do not rebuke them for it. When I utter this sentence, I am merely claiming that they are delicious to me or they are agreeable to me (KU, AA 05: 212). So why is it then that in making a judgment of beauty I find myself in a different kind of psychological state? Why not assume that the proposition "*Praying Boy* is beautiful" means "*Praying Boy* is beautiful for me"?

Kant claims that one surmises that she has the grounds for expecting a similar pleasure from everyone regarding beauty through reflecting on herself as the subject of pleasure. Since the Second Moment follows after the characterization of judgments of taste as disinterested, Kant's argument starts from the supposition that the subject already realizes that she has no interest in the existence of the object prior to forming an aesthetic appreciation. After realizing that her judgment cannot be just an expression of her private preference, since she had no interest in the object beforehand, the subject finds herself pondering that there must be something to ground the universal validity of her judgment. If its ground is not the private conditions of the subject, then it must be grounded in

something that can be presupposed in everyone else (KU, AA 05: 211). Indeed, that is the reason why Kant says that it would be absurd to think that the subject, in making a judgment of taste, would only be claiming that the object is beautiful just for her. What she does is not to judge the object for herself but for everyone else (KU, AA 05: 212). The subject feels as though her judgment were a theoretical one, as if she had a concept of beauty like everyone else and all she did in her judgment was to subsume the object under it. Hence she speaks of beauty *as if* beauty were a property of the object (KU, AA 05: 211); she presumes that everyone will agree with her *as if* her judgment were objective (KU, AA 05: 281). In fact, the judgment does not express anything else other than the relation of the reflection on the representation of the object to the feeling of pleasure. Hence, the universal validity does not stem from the subject's ability to subsume the object under the same determinate concept in the same way. Only later on in the Deduction does Kant demonstrate that the subject is in fact right to suspect that her judgment is grounded in subjective conditions that can be presupposed in everyone else. It is quite understandable though that the subject is under the impression that her judgment is objective because she can be conscious of the free play only through the feeling of pleasure and so she mistakenly presumes that the pleasure and the purposiveness she feels are caused by the object even though judging precedes the felt pleasure. The upshot of this discussion is that in contemplating on the relation between the subject and the satisfaction we come to realize that judgments of taste are universally valid in a rather peculiar way. This constitutes the first peculiarity: the judgments of taste lay claim to "universal validity *a priori*, yet not a logical universality in accordance with concepts, but the universality of a singular judgment" (KU, AA 05: 281). The relation

between the subject and the satisfaction reveals the "as if objective" universal validity of judgments of taste.

From this peculiarity Kant derives the first constraint on judgments of taste: everyone is autonomous in judging what is beautiful (KU, AA 05: 282). In uttering "*Praying Boy* is beautiful," I claim that everyone should be able to judge *Praying Boy* to be beautiful. Surely, I would not be able to make such a claim unless I was judging *Praying Boy* for myself in the first place and not imitating someone else's judgment. To illustrate his point, Kant gives the example of a young poet. He writes,

> [A] young poet does not let himself be dissuaded from his conviction that his poem is beautiful by the judgment of the public nor that of his friends, and, if he does give them a hearing, this is not because he now judges it differently, but rather because, even if (at least in his view) the entire public has a false taste, he nevertheless (even against his judgment) finds cause to accommodate himself to the common delusion in his desire for approval. Only later, when his power of judgment has been made more acute by practice, does he depart from his previous judgment of his own free will, just as he does with those of his judgments that rest entirely on reason. Taste makes claim merely to autonomy. To make the judgments of others into the determining ground of one's own would be heteronomy (KU, AA 05: 282).

The poet rejects the opinions of others up to the point when there is an actual improvement in his taste. Only after his taste becomes more acute does he form a judgment that overrides his initial one and he comes to see that his poem is not that great. But this second judgment is still his own; its determining ground is not the judgment of others. This constraint obviously constitutes an obstacle if we want to assign a role to an art critic. This constraint tells us that an art critic could not be someone whose judgment we can make into a determining ground of our own since otherwise that would be

heteronomy. It tells us that appreciation is not something we can imitate. Hence the critic cannot be someone whose judgment we can defer to in this way.

If the judgment of taste did not have the peculiar feature of being "as-if-objective" but instead it was an objective judgment, we would not need to judge the object ourselves but instead we would be able to defer to critics. Think of all the statements where one is predicating a property of an object, such as "the table is round," "the table is blue," "the table has three legs," and so on. When someone tells us that a specific table is round, we do not typically say, "Wait! Hold on a second! I am not so sure. I need to judge for myself whether the table is round." In such types of objective statements, which express that an object has a certain property, we can use someone else's testimony to form a belief about an object. However, in the case of judgments of taste, we cannot form an appreciation on the basis of someone else's testimony. Why is this the case?

The statement "*Praying Boy* is beautiful" does not predicate the property of beauty of *Praying Boy*. Its role is expressive and evaluative rather than descriptive. It is expressing one's experience of a certain mental state, namely the free play between understanding and imagination. In hearing this statement, I can understand and appreciate the following facts: The person who utters this statement feels aesthetic pleasure. However, this is not the type of aesthetic pleasure one can have in what Kant calls the agreeable. So she is not just expressing her merely subjective preference. Since her pleasure is not in the agreeable but in the beautiful, this statement communicates to me that she is convinced that everyone in his or her right mind should agree with her that *Praying Boy* is beautiful. She communicates all these facts through her judgment of taste. However, what is not communicated by the judgment is the pleasure itself. I know that

she feels this universal pleasure, but on the basis of this I myself cannot feel the same pleasure. For aesthetic testimony to work, I should have been able to find myself in this mental state of free play upon hearing someone's testimony that "*Praying Boy* is beautiful." This is, of course, impossible. We cannot just feel pleasure because someone says that she does. The autonomy constraint cannot be reversed. It is grounded in the very conditions of forming a judgment of taste. Hence, the problems it creates concerning art criticism cannot be overcome by rebuking it.

We cannot form an appreciation on the basis of the critic's testimony that "x is beautiful." In this regard we cannot defer to the critic. But does this mean that we cannot defer to the critic regarding his or her descriptions of an artwork? After all, they are empirical statements about non-aesthetic properties of objects. For instance, the critic can describe *Praying Boy* in terms of its being a statue, made out of bronze, belonging to the Hellenistic period, and so on. These types of statements do not differ from the statements used to describe a table in terms of its color, shape, and so on. Since it seems obvious that we can defer to the critic's descriptive statements, the next question becomes what kind of force these statements have. Can a person develop an appreciation of an object on the basis of descriptions provided by a critic? As we have seen, in the rationalist paradigm, the force of these types of descriptive statements lies in the general principles of taste that back them up. The rationalist critic's main job is to provide evaluations that are supported by reasons, which are backed up by general principles. He or she is supposed to provide a logical proof in virtue of which he or she can persuade us about the aesthetic value of an artwork. Kant addresses exactly this issue in his discussion of the second constraint on judgments of taste. The second constraint indicates that there are no general objective

principles of taste and in this regard it involves rejection of the possibility of providing proofs for justifying aesthetic assessments. Just like the first constraint being derived from the first peculiarity of judgments of taste, the second constraint is derived from the exposition of their second peculiarity, namely, their necessity.

In the Fourth Moment, through giving an analysis of judgments of taste in terms of their modality, Kant derives the second peculiarity. The relation under investigation this time is the relation between the feeling of pleasure and the representation of the object being judged. Kant tells us that the relation is necessary. However, this necessity is neither a theoretical objective necessity nor a practical necessity. Since a judgment of taste is not an objective cognitive judgment, the necessity cannot be derived from determinate concepts. The necessity claim implied in the judgment of taste cannot be that everyone *will* feel the same pleasure in the object I declare to be beautiful. The necessity claim also cannot be equivalent to the claim that everyone *ought* to feel satisfaction as a necessary consequence of an objective law. The practical laws surprisingly do not extend their legislation over matters of taste. They tell me that I ought not to lie but not that I ought to have aesthetic pleasure in contemplating, let's say, Marc Chagall's *Double Portrait with Wine Glass*.

Nevertheless, judgments of taste lay claim to necessity. When I say that *Double Portrait with Wine Glass* is beautiful, I simultaneously make a claim that everyone who is in her or his right mind should find it beautiful. What type of necessity is it that is involved in the relation between my representation of this painting and the satisfaction I have in it? Kant says that it is of a special type. He calls it exemplary necessity: "a necessity of the assent of **all** to a universal rule that one cannot produce" (KU, AA 05:

237). The rule I derive from my particular experience of *Double Portrait* is not a rule I can universalize and use to infer what other objects should be judged to be beautiful. This rule is applicable only to the particular object under consideration. The necessity concerns only the relation between the representation of *Double Portrait* and the satisfaction I have. This necessity, Kant says, however, can be derived neither from determinate concepts nor from the universality of the experience (KU, AA 05: 237). From this peculiar necessity of judgments of taste, Kant derives the second constraint: neither *a priori* nor empirical proof can be given to convince others in regard to their judgments of taste (KU, AA 05: 284). First of all, one cannot infer from the universality of the experience, namely from the unanimous agreement that an object is beautiful, that this object is beautiful. Kant states that "[t]he judgment of others, when it is unfavorable to our own, can of course rightly give us reservations about our own, but can never convince us of its incorrectness" (KU, AA 05: 284). Therefore, the second constraint imposes further sanctions on aesthetic testimony. Recall that, according to the first constraint, one cannot form an appreciation of an object on the basis of others' testimony. The second constraint tells us that others' testimony cannot even be used to prove that we are wrong. Perhaps one can think that just because everybody thinks that an artwork is beautiful this agreement constitutes a good enough reason to assume that pleasure is necessarily connected to the form of the work. Kant rejects this kind of reasoning by stating that the shared pleasure cannot serve as a ground to prove that there is such a connection nor to make a favorable judgment of the work. However, he still admits that their testimony can, nonetheless, make us doubt ourselves and perhaps reconsider our judgment.

Secondly, even though the aesthetic pleasure is necessarily connected to the form of the object and this form consists in the unity of all the contingent and heterogeneous non-aesthetic properties of the object, one cannot provide an *a priori* proof that this object is beautiful by listing all these properties of the object and establishing connections between these properties and pleasure *via* determinate rules. One can give such proofs for objective and cognitive judgments such as judgments of perfection. I can list for you all the qualities of an object so as to ground my judgment that this object is a good example of its kind. I can do so because I refer to a determinate concept, namely a kind-concept, which gives the rule for the unification of these properties. However, in the case of judgments of taste, Kant says that such kind of *a priori* proof is impossible. The issue is that the representation we have of the object is its form, namely the organization of heterogeneous and contingent properties. We reflect on them as a whole. The main issue is that this form, namely the aesthetic idea expressed by the work, is nonconceptualizable. We cannot express it by using concepts. It is inarticulable. We find this very organization purposive. The purposive form cannot be analyzed further into its elements. Hence, the descriptions of an artwork seem to lack the logical force to persuade us that an object is beautiful. There cannot be any determinate rules that govern the relationship between descriptive statements concerning the object and the judgment of taste. Hence, Kant suggests that any rule, even the ones that have been agreed upon by art critics, falls short of constituting a proof as to why an artwork is beautiful or not. He writes,

> If someone reads me his poem or takes me to a play that in the end fails to please my taste, then he can adduce **Batteux** or **Lessing**, or even older and more famous critics of taste, and adduce all the rules they established as proofs that his poem is beautiful; certain passages, which are the very ones that displease me, may even agree with rules of beauty (as they have been given there

> and have been universally recognized): I will stop my ears, listen to no reasons and arguments, and would rather believe that those rules of the critics are false or at least that this is not a case for their application than allow that my judgment should be determined by means of *a priori* grounds of proof, since it is supposed to be a judgment of taste and not of the understanding or of reason (KU, AA 05: 284-285).

These rules can come in two forms. They can state specific pleasing properties or can generalize over specific kinds of art. Kant writes,

> [f]or someone may list all the ingredients of a dish for me, and remark about each one that is otherwise agreeable to me, and moreover even rightly praise the healthiness of this food; yet I am deaf to all these ground, I try the dish with **my** tongue and my palate, and on that basis (not on the basis of general principles) do I make my judgment (KU, AA 05: 285).

In a similar vein, I can list all the properties of *Double Portrait* to you, I can tell you that its property x is a property you had appreciated in a different artwork, and make all these connections between all the properties of *Double Portrait* and the very same properties manifested by other works. Furthermore, I can come up with rules that generalize over all these properties just as the rationalists did. I can try to persuade you of the beauty of *Double Portrait* by citing a rule stating that any work which has the properties x, y, z (which happen also to be the properties of *Double Portrait*) are beautiful. Such general principles cannot convince me of the beauty of *Double Portrait* because even though I might have appreciated all these properties in other contexts this does not mean that I will appreciate them in the context of *Double Portrait*. All these properties are unified in a particular manner in the context of this work. When I am making a judgment of taste I am not reflecting on the properties one by one and concatenating the judgments I make about these properties and forming one general judgment on the basis of them. Instead I reflect

on the unity or the organization of all these properties. In this sense, my finding all these properties to be pleasing on their own does not necessitate that I will find this particular organization of them to be pleasing. There cannot be a general rule that can tell me what to appreciate and how to appreciate it. As Kant says, even if such rules exist, they cannot be rules of taste.

Additionally, the possible rules concerning particular art kinds can hardly serve the purpose. A general rule to the effect that all Russian avant-garde paintings are beautiful does not have any binding power over my judgment of *Double Portrait*. This generalization is not a judgment of taste. Kant writes,

> [i]n fact, the judgment of taste is always made as a singular judgment about the object. The understanding can make a universal judgment by comparing how satisfying the object is with the judgments of others, e.g., all tulips are beautiful; but in that case that is not a judgment of taste, but a logical judgment, which makes the relation of an object to taste into a predicate of things of a certain sort in general; but that by means of which I find a single given tulip beautiful, i.e., find my satisfaction in it universally valid, is the judgment of taste alone (KU, AA 05: 285).

The statement that all Russian avant-garde paintings are beautiful is a logical judgment, which is an amalgamation of the singular judgments of taste I make, let's say, of all the Russian avant-garde paintings I have seen from A to M. This general rule I derive on the basis of my experience with paintings A through M cannot have any bearing on my judgment concerning painting N. The necessity between my pleasure and the form of an object is legislative only over this very relation and is not transmittable.

That is why the necessity of a judgment of taste makes it seem *as if* it is merely subjective. The *as if* subjectivity of judgments of taste comes from the fact that one

cannot provide any proof, empirical or *a priori*, as to why the object he or she finds beautiful is beautiful. In §34, titled "No objective principle of taste is possible," Kant clearly states that

> [b]y a principle of taste would be understood a fundamental proposition under the condition of which one could subsume the concept of an object and then by means of an inference conclude that it is beautiful. But that is absolutely impossible. For I must be sensitive of the pleasure immediately in the representation of it, and I cannot be talked into it by means of any proofs. Thus although critics, as Hume says, can reason more plausibly than cooks, they still suffer the same fate as them. They cannot expect a determining ground for their judgment from proofs, but only from the reflection of the subject on his own state (of pleasure and displeasure), rejecting all precepts and rules (KU, AA 05: 285f).

Kant's clear rejection of general principles or rules of taste seems to render one of the operations critics engage in, namely providing reasons in the form of descriptive statements concerning properties of artworks, completely futile. If there are no principles governing the relation between the non-aesthetic properties of objects and aesthetic pleasure, then these reasons critics give are completely arbitrary. Thus, the function of Kantian art criticism could not be the function that is prescribed by the rationalists. It could not amount to providing a certain set of determinate rules we can follow in judging something to be beautiful.

Generally, for Kant scholars, the two constraints, the autonomy and no-principle constraint, imply that since everyone judges for themselves without any regard to others' judgments or to determinate rules, everyone is an art critic, and hence no one is, insofar as there is no role available for an art critic within this democratic aesthetic theory. The theory seems to be too democratic not only in comparison to rationalist theories, but also

in comparison to sentimentalist theories, such as Hume's elitist theory, where we can immediately discern the function of art critics. For rationalists, as we have seen, critics make rational inferences from a set of determinate rules. For Hume, critics have "delicate taste" that sets them above the rest in judging beauty. Hence, their joint judgments constitute the standard of taste that serves as a rule for others to follow. However, for Kant everyone is on an equal footing with respect to judging something as beautiful. If everybody is competent enough, why do we need critics?

One might object to this conclusion by arguing that both the autonomy and no-principle constraints have applicability only if we are making *pure* judgments of taste. Hence, they have legitimacy for us only when we are making judgments of free beauty and this legitimacy does not extend over to our judgments of adherent beauty. If artistic beauty is adherent beauty then the constraints do not apply to our judgments concerning them. However, all the extant accounts that I have discussed in Chapter II allow for at least some kind of free component to be involved in our judgments. Crawford goes even further and suggests that we make pure judgments of taste concerning artistic beauty. The incorporation view takes the judgment of adherent beauty and artistic beauty to be impure but still argues that in the last instance we judge the subjectively purposive form of the object. Hence, even though our judgment of taste is restricted, still the constraints should be in full force. For the conjunctive view, the constraints have no binding power over the judgment of perfection, but they should have power over what the judgment of perfection is combined with, namely the judgment of taste.

Hence, if we want to formulate an account of Kantian art criticism, the functions we assign to art critics should thwart neither the autonomy constraint nor the no-principle

constraint. These constraints are also what make Kant's account peculiar with respect to his predecessors' and contemporaries' accounts. They constitute the principal tenets of a certain movement in aesthetics, namely *particularism*. In this sense, Kant was a forerunner of aesthetic particularism. The constraints did not preclude particularist art criticism from flourishing. It seems to be intuitive to think that perhaps one possible way to construct a Kantian art criticism lies in mapping Kant's account on to one of the existing accounts of particularist art criticism.

IV. 2. Aesthetic Particularism

The term "aesthetic particularism" is a recent coinage influenced by Jonathan Dancy's moral particularism, which has been retroactively attributed to some philosophical positions in aesthetic theory, such as those of Arnold Isenberg, Frank Sibley, and Mary Mothersill. There are also, of course, self-identified particularists, such as Alan Goldman. The common denominator between all these accounts is their rejection of aesthetic testimony and rejection of general principles of taste. These particularist positions are also developed in order to explicate the function of art criticism. So the question is how they have managed to get around the problems generated by the two constraints and whether or not the Kantian account can integrate their solutions.

On the basis of the present literature there are two main schools of particularism. The first one provides a realist solution and the second an anti-realist one. I will show that both positions provide solutions by introducing aesthetic properties as mediators between non-aesthetic properties and value judgments. I argue that a Kantian account of art criticism cannot adopt either of the solutions for this reason. Even though Kant's theory of taste shares the basic theoretical commitments of particularism, both the realist

and the anti-realist camps present aesthetic evaluations as affective responses to aesthetic properties of objects. Furthermore, several of these accounts present beauty as a property and Kant vehemently rules out this view in the KU (KU, AA 5:189, VII; 5:211f, §6; 5:218, §9).

IV. 2. 1. The Realist-Particularist Solution to the Arbitrariness Problem

Arnold Isenberg is the first to explicitly state the dilemma of the arbitrariness of reasons. His aim in doing so is to contest the generalist position and show that obscurantism is not the only alternative to generalism.[60] In other words, Isenberg wants to show that, even if there are no general principles, this does not mean that "critical communication" is impossible. The dilemma problematizes – to use Isenberg's terminology – the relationship between aesthetic judgments or verdicts (V: This film or painting is good) and reasons (R: because it has such-and-such a quality). In particular, Isenberg is interested in specific types of statements, namely descriptive statements concerning non-aesthetic features of artworks, and he asks whether they can support critical verdicts. The dilemma he sets up is this (1949, 355):

[60] Isenberg's motivations for rejecting generalism are very similar to Kant's motivations for challenging the German rationalist paradigm. German rationalist aesthetics, which aimed at establishing aesthetics as a science, was a form of generalism. We have seen in Chapter I that rationalist criticism assumes the existence of general objective principles of taste in accordance with which we can derive rules of criticism. These rules were supposed to establish the logical connection between the critic's judgment, "object O is beautiful" and the critic's reason, "because O has such and such unified properties." Hence, on the basis of these rules the critic makes rational inferences as to why O is beautiful. Rationalists thought that it must be possible to imitate the scientific procedure in aesthetics: Just like in science, where in order to demonstrate the validity of a proposition we make inferences from generalizations, in aesthetics we should be able to demonstrate the validity of our aesthetic responses by giving reasons which are backed up by a set of rules. In this sense, when Kant is challenging the possibility of articulating general objective principles of taste, he is challenging the rationalist account of art criticism according to which one can prove why an artwork is beautiful. He is rejecting the possibility of establishing aesthetics as a science. Isenberg's motivations are very similar to Kant's because generalism in aesthetics, which Isenberg is vehemently criticizing, was an attempt to perpetuate the rationalist conception of aesthetics as science and art criticism as a rule-guided scientific enterprise. Hence, the eighteenth-century debate is in some respect parallel to its twentieth-century counterpart.

(i) A description becomes critically relevant and useful only when it is backed up by a norm (N) or a general principle. Put otherwise, R can support V only if R is backed up by N which states that any work which has the quality stated in R is *pro tanto* good.

(ii) In the absence of N, we must assume that R is perfectly arbitrary (1949, 335).

The obvious problem is that we cannot find such general norms or principle of taste that apply across all artforms and artworks. For instance, it is hard to see what general principle of taste might be applicable to both Marcel Duchamp's *The Bride Stripped Bare by Her Bachelors* and Joss Whedon's *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. In the absence of general principles, are we supposed to accept that critics' reasons are arbitrary and criticism is subjective? The only alternative seems to be obscurantism, namely claiming that critical communication is doomed to fail from the very start. However, Isenberg and other particularists found a resolution of the dilemma by dismissing general principles while at the same time pointing out that this dilemma is actually a false dilemma. Consequently, the defeat of the generalist seemed complete: there are no general principles, but even if there were, rational inferences from these principles would not provide a logical argument to persuade the readers of the aesthetic value of an artwork. Isenberg's point is simple: if I have not experienced the work myself, there is no possibility for me to experience aesthetic pleasure through reading a criticism of the artwork even if the critic magically backs up his or her descriptions with general principles (1949, 339). In this sense, Isenberg's criticism of the use of principles of taste in critical communication is derivative of his rejection of aesthetic testimony. It seems, however, that Isenberg's reasons for rejecting general principles are not only quite

different from Kant's but that he is also working with a different conception of aesthetic testimony than Kant.

Recall from the previous section that Kant's rejection of general principles is grounded in the peculiar necessity of judgments of taste. While Kant's rejection is grounded in the very conditions which make judgments of taste possible, Isenberg's rejection is grounded in his rejection of aesthetic testimony. Furthermore, the restrictions imposed on aesthetic testimony by Isenberg are stricter than Kant's restrictions. For Kant, in order to form a judgment of taste, I should be the person who makes this judgment (KU, AA 05: 282). This does not mean that I am required to have a first-hand experience of the object. For instance, a critic can give me a very good description of an artwork, and using my imagination I can form a representation of this work. I can reflect on this representation and relate this reflection to pleasure or displeasure. Perhaps I do not make an appropriate judgment concerning this work because the concrete work and my imaginative representation differ in important respects. However, the judgment I form is a genuine judgment of taste and I feel genuine pleasure or displeasure.[61] I call Kant's

[61] One of Kant's remarks seems to suggest that first-hand experience of an object is required for its appreciation. He writes as follows: "For someone may list all the ingredients of a dish for me, and remark about each one that is otherwise agreeable to me, and moreover even rightly praise the healthiness of this food; yet I am deaf to all these grounds, I try the dish with **my** tongue and my palate, and on that basis (not on the basis of general principles) do I make my judgment" (KU, AA 05: 285). As we have seen in the last section, in writing this passage Kant's aim is to show that the rules that identify specific properties as pleasing cannot be of help in the task of proving that an object with these specific properties is beautiful. All these properties are unified in a particular manner in the context of this work, so even if in isolation I can like each of these properties, this does not imply that I will find some particular organization of them beautiful. In this sense, there is a certain necessity to having first-hand experience of some objects in order to develop appropriate appreciation of them, such as tasting a dish. However, when I say that Kant's autonomy constraint does not require us to have first-hand experience of an object, what I mean is that this is not a necessary condition for appreciating all artworks. Even if the judgment I can form is not an appropriate judgment, this does not mean that it is not a genuine judgment. Also there can be some conceptual artworks, such as John Cage's 4'33'' or Walter De Maria's *Vertical Earth Kilometer*, appreciation of which perhaps does not require a first-hand experience of the piece. A realist-particularist needs to endorse the first-hand experience requirement even in these types of cases; but I do not think that

conception of aesthetic testimony "thin" aesthetic testimony in order to contrast it with a stricter version I call "thick" aesthetic testimony, the conception Isenberg and other particularists alike are working with. Isenberg works with the thick notion instead of the thin one because his rejection of aesthetic testimony is grounded in his acceptance of what Wollheim later on called the "acquaintance principle." Wollheim states that according to the acquaintance principle "judgments of aesthetic value, unlike judgments of moral knowledge, must be based on first-hand experience of their objects and are not, except within very narrow limits, transmissible from one person to another" (1980, 233). Due to his acceptance of the acquaintance principle, Isenberg claims that existence of general principles of taste would not have changed anything and they cannot function in the desired capacity in critical communication. Isenberg is inflexible with respect to the conditions for aesthetic judgment. For him, one cannot form an appreciation on the basis of a description. Description cannot play this role not just because the language of criticism lacks precision and perfect vocabulary to provide us a perfect description. He states

> Imagine, then, that the painting should be projected onto a graph with intersecting co-ordinates. It would then be possible to write complicated mathematical expressions which would enable another person who knew the system to construct for himself a close an approximation to the exact outlines of the El Greco as we might desire. Would this be an advance toward precision in criticism? Could we say that we had devised a more specific terminology for drawing and painting? I think not, for the most refined concept remains a concept; there is no vanishing point at which it becomes a percept. It is the idea *of* a quality, it is not the quality itself. To render a critical verdict we should still have to perceive the quality… (1949, 339).

Kant has such a requirement. As long as I reflect on my imaginative representation of the work as a whole, the judgment I form should be a genuine judgment.

From Isenberg's perspective, even if we come up with a perfect description, which will allow us to reconstruct the painting in our minds, this is not going to do the job it because we cannot perceive the necessary quality without having a first-hand experience of the object. To repeat Isenberg's claim: "To render a critical verdict we should still have to perceive the quality." First-hand experience is central to aesthetic appreciation because Isenberg implicitly endorses that the verdict V results from a perception of a quality in an artwork. The immediate question that this raises is what this quality is.

In order to explicate the peculiar role of R in aesthetic evaluation, Isenberg gives the example of Goldscheider's criticism of El Greco's *The Burial of Count Orgaz*. Isenberg examines the following passage from Goldscheider:

> Like the contour of a violently rising and falling wave is the outline of the four illuminated figures in the foreground: steeply upwards and downwards about the grey monk on the left, in mutually inclined curves about the yellow of the two saints, and again steeply upwards and downwards about… the priest on the right. The depth of the wave indicates the optical center; the double curve of the saints' yellow garments is carried by the greyish white of the shroud down still farther; in this lowest depth rests the bluish-grey armor of the knight (as cited in Isenberg, 335).

Isenberg states that Goldscheider's description is aimed at communicating an idea of a certain quality which we should expect to perceive in this painting. He claims, "this quality is… a wavelike contour; but it is not the quality designated by the expression 'wavelike contour'" (336). The issue is that it cannot be the critic's intention to alert us to the presence of a quality that is as banal and obvious as a wavelike contour. This quality, which can be perceived even in a few lines I can draw on a piece of paper, cannot be what the critic wants us to see. According to Isenberg, by providing descriptions,

> the critic… gives us directions for perceiving, and does this *by means* of the idea he imparts to us, which narrows down the field of possible visual orientations and guides us in the discrimination of details, the organization of parts, the grouping discrete objects into patterns (336).

However, the critic can do so only if we have first-hand experience of the painting. By providing descriptions, telling us what to focus on, where to look at, the critic facilitates our perception and guides us in the process of perceiving a certain quality. Hence, "the critic's meaning is 'filled in,' 'rounded out' or 'completed' by the act of perception, which is performed not to judge the truth of his description but in a certain sense to *understand* it" (336). As Mary Mothersill puts it, the critics do not "mean" what they "say" (1961, 77) and that is why, in Goldscheider's criticism, the quality of wavelike contour does not exactly refer to what it is.

According to Isenberg, the semantic relation between the critic's description and the quality the critic or the reader experience in contemplating the work is not one of designation or denotation. The quality the critic experiences and tries to help us experience is not a quality he or she can pinpoint. Isenberg says that the only positive characterization he can give of this relation is that, if there were a designation of this quality, this designation would be something similar to Morris' analytic implicate of that designation. For instance, "blue" is an analytic implicate of an expression "$H_3B_5S_2$." If the critic's description picked out a quality as if it had designation, this designation would be an analytic implicate of the expression "wavelike contour." It is hard to see exactly what Isenberg is trying to get at. I think that this quality he has in mind that the critic is helping us to perceive is an aesthetic quality, which is particular to the work. In this sense, we are not talking about any wavelike contour but the specific wavelike contour in

El Greco's painting. It is not even this very specific wavelike contour but the aesthetic quality of this specific work, which we come to perceive while our attention is directed at discovering the wavelike contour Goldscheider is talking about. That is why Isenberg says that "[i]t is as if we found both an oyster and a pearl when we have been looking for a seashell because we had been told it was valuable. It is valuable, but not because it is a seashell" (335). The quality of wavelike contour is not valuable because it is a wavelike contour but rather it is valuable because we perceive the particular aesthetic quality the work has while looking for the wavelike contour. Isenberg tells us that this abstract quality can be perceived and appreciated by following the directions given by the critic. In this sense, the critic acts in the capacity of a teacher: by following the critic, we come to perceive the quality he or she perceives and perhaps we were already seeing it but unable to understand it, and once we follow the critic we might say "yes, that is it exactly. How come I was not able to pinpoint it in that way to begin with?" Therefore, the function of criticism is "to bring about communication at the level of the senses, that is, to induce a sameness of vision, of experienced content" (336).

To solve the problem of arbitrariness of reasons, Isenberg tries to introduce a mediator alternative to a general principle N. The particular aesthetic quality of an artwork is the mediator between R and V. If the criticism is successful, it is supposed to induce the sameness of vision, namely directing us to perceive the quality that the critic perceives in the work. In this sense, Isenberg seems to take a realist stance towards aesthetic qualities or properties. The aesthetic quality particular to each work depends on non-aesthetic properties of these works. However, they are not reducible to the non-aesthetic properties, otherwise the quality the critic speaks of would denote or designate a

property of the work. Aesthetic pleasure and displeasure are affective reactions we can have towards aesthetic qualities. Within this framework, R has a new role to play in critical communication.[62] R is not a premise in a logical argument devised to persuade us how good or bad an artwork is. R is not arbitrary either. R has an ostensive function and serves as a guide to perceiving the aesthetic quality of an artwork.

One question to ask is whether or not there is a guarantee that recognition of the aesthetic quality of an artwork would create the same type of reactions. Isenberg is ambivalent about this issue. However, helping the reader to experience the same pleasure or displeasure through the "retrial" of the experienced content with the guidance provided by the critic seems to be one of the main aims of critical communication.[63] After all, Isenberg states that if the critic is able to create the sameness of vision – make us perceive the aesthetic quality he or she perceives –, "it may or may not be followed by agreement, what he calls "communion" – a community of feeling which expresses itself in identical value judgments" (336). As it can be seen, there does not need to be a guarantee in criticism. But is this something undesirable? If we want to get a proof from a critic that will allow us to experience aesthetic pleasure or displeasure, then this outcome is not desirable. Isenberg's whole point is that we do not need to construe the aim of

[62] My interpretation is in complete contrast with the ones provided by Oliver Conolly and Bashshar Haydar (2003) and Daniel Kaufman (2003). Conolly and Haydar use the term "illusionism" to define the position according to which R is arbitrary and has no use in critical communication. They wrongly attribute it to Isenberg because they did not realized that Isenberg was a realist about aesthetic properties and provided an alternative role for R. Kauffman also accuses Isenberg in a similar unjustified way. Interestingly enough, they are not the only ones who assumed that Isenberg was an advocate of a similar position. Years before Conolly and Haydar, Dorothy Walsh (1960) made a similar claim. Mothersill responded in his defense (1961). My interpretation is more in line with Zeccardi's (2010) and Shelly's (2007) interpretations. Although they do not exactly acknowledge that Isenberg was an aesthetic realist, they appreciated that he provided an alternative role to R and thereby an alternative function to art criticism.

[63] See Zeccardi 2010, 374-376.

critical communication in these terms. Nevertheless, there seems to be a tension in Isenberg's account.

The adequacy of my characterization of Isenberg's account is perhaps contestable. Nevertheless, there seems to be at least one other person who reads Isenberg along the lines I have described and who tries to alleviate the tension I diagnosed. It is Mary Mothersill and we can interpret her account as an expansion of Isenberg's. She takes more clear-cut stances towards issues Isenberg seems to be more ambivalent about. From the outset, Mothersill rejects the existence of general principles of taste and "thick" aesthetic testimony. The puzzle she proposes to solve is more general and is a clear indicator of her explicit commitment to aesthetic realism. In her *Beauty Restored*, she formulates the puzzle as follows: How is it possible for genuine aesthetic judgments to exist even though there are no general principles of taste? She aims to show that, despite the lack of general principles governing the relationship between value judgments and non-aesthetic properties of objects, the value judgments are truth apt. Her solution to this puzzle of taste has important implications for the problem of arbitrariness of reasons. In a nutshell, her solution involves endorsing realism concerning aesthetic properties.

Mothersill argues that this solution is what Isenberg had in mind. She claims, however, that Isenberg's account is incomplete and she wants to make amendments to it. She writes,

> Isenberg's term, 'aesthetic qualities', gives us a way of recognizing properties that are picked out only by indexical predicates that figure in a critic's explanation of what it is in a particular work that pleases him. But Isenberg's account, although correct, is incomplete: what is needed is an explication that displays aesthetic properties as having the generality required of properties

> (as in indefinite description), allows them to figure in a subject's account of why an individual pleases him, and yet does not sanction the conception of serious laws of taste (1984, 364).

Isenberg has an ambivalent attitude to two main issues and this attitude renders his account incomplete. These two issues are the following: (1) The supervenience relation between "aesthetic qualities" (or what Mothersill calls "aesthetic properties") and non-aesthetic properties is not clearly articulated; and (2) Isenberg does not want to say that recognizing an aesthetic property will necessarily be followed by pleasure. As to the first issue, Mothersill adopts Sue Larson's definition of aesthetic properties, which she thinks satisfies all the three requirements she lists in the above quote.[64] According to Larson's definition,

> the aesthetic properties of an individual O are those that define the class of items which, for a particular subject, S, under standard conditions etc., are indistinguishable from O. Various tests are possible: if a subject claims that O is beautiful but O^1 not, and is unable to distinguish O from O^1, then he is inconsistent and shows that features other than aesthetic properties have affected his response; in Kant's terms, his judgment is 'impure'. If a subject can distinguish O from O^1 and takes both to be beautiful, he must (supposing he wants to defend his judgment) offer two different explanations: no item that are distinguishable have the same aesthetic properties (364).

In this sense, aesthetic properties supervene on non-aesthetic properties. Unless O^1 shares every non-aesthetic property of O, they cannot share the same aesthetic property. However, there are no necessary and sufficient conditions for possessing aesthetic properties. Each aesthetic property is instantiated in a particular way. For Isenberg, it seems as though each work instantiates a particular aesthetic quality. Mothersill modifies

[64] As far as I know Larson did not publish her account. Mothersill uses Larson's lecture notes and her conversations with Larson as references.

Isenberg's account by claiming that some works can have different aesthetic properties (354). Furthermore, there can be visual, audible or intelligible aesthetic properties (354). One of the questions we can ask is: how does Mothersill individuate aesthetic properties? She argues,

> [i]t seems to me that the question – how do you individuate aesthetic properties? – is itself the result of confusion. We slip into thinking of an aesthetic property as something *recherché* or mysterious, perhaps not really a property but more like an 'abstract particular'. But aesthetic properties are not arcane; they are properties of an individual disclosed to us only through acquaintance with that individual (352).

The individuation of aesthetic properties is not something mysterious. According to Mothersill, we perceive – or, to put it more appropriately, we grasp – aesthetic properties. They are like Gestalt properties. As it sometimes takes time for us to see the rabbit instead of the duck, it can take time to grasp the aesthetic property of an object. However, their being Gestalt properties does not change the fact that, for Mothersill, they are real and they are in the object.

As to (2), Mothersill argues that aesthetic pleasure is intimately connected to the aesthetic properties, which are "grasped in *apprehensio* of an individual" (342). Retrofitting Aquinas' definition of beauty, namely "*Pulchrum dicatur id cujus apprehensio ipsa placet* – 'Let us call that beautiful of which the apprehension in itself pleases,'" with the particularity of the aesthetic experience, Mothersill claims that *apprehensio* is not mere acquaintance with an object but instead involves grasping the object in its particularity and indicates success on the part of the subject (323). The cause of our pleasure in an object O involves *apprehensio* of O's aesthetic property and having such a grasp of the property is a success. It is a success because we are finally able to see

the rabbit instead of the duck. You and I can have the same pleasure in an object if we both grasp the object in the same manner, namely if we both grasp its aesthetic properties.

It sounds as though Mothersill does not only introduce aesthetic properties as mediators between aesthetic evaluations and non-aesthetic properties of objects but also gets rid of the evaluative component of judgments of taste. On this reading, Mothersill's judgment of taste seems to reduce to a truth-apt cognitive judgment. Her account seems to have some similarities with the rationalist accounts we have seen in Chapter I: Beauty seems to be reduced to aesthetic properties instead of perfection and an object either has or does not have these properties. Although the aesthetic judgment is not a report on the perception of perfection but a report on *apprehensio* of an individual *via* aesthetic properties, it is in the last instance a cognitive judgment. This reading is partially true, but we also need to acknowledge a central difference between rationalist accounts and Mothersill's account: Rationalists were generalists who believed that we can make generalizations over what perfection, and hence beauty, consists in while Mothersill is a particularist who rejects outright the possibility of formulating such generalizations. Even acknowledging this disparity is not enough because equating Mothersill's judgment of taste merely with a cognitive judgment does not do justice to her account. For her, a judgment of taste ('O is beautiful') has two components: (1) 'O is beautiful' (speech act) which "implicates an avowal on the part of the speaker," and (2) 'O is beautiful' (sentence) which "stands on its own feet as claiming for O a specific causal power, namely the power to please in virtue of O's aesthetic properties" (371). Insofar as judgments of taste involve a speech act, they have an evaluative component. But, at the

same time, given that a judgment of taste can stand on its own feet, there are genuine judgments of taste that are either true or false. A judgment of taste about O is true if and only if O is the cause of pleasure in virtue of its aesthetic properties (347). The judgment of taste also implicates an avowal, namely "in pronouncing O beautiful, I implicate that O pleases me, where 'O pleases me' is understood as equivalent to 'I take O to be the cause of my pleasure'" (311). Perhaps an avowal does not require a justification in the way that a verdict does, yet it requires an explanation (91). Mothersill states that avowals are true when sincere (91). However, I can be sincere in reporting that I take an object to be beautiful even though in reality it is not. The subjectivity of the avowal seems to relativize the import of a judgment of taste. In order to avoid relativism, Mothersill claims that an avowal can acquire an objective status, namely we can transform "I take O to be the cause of my pleasure" into "I find O to be the cause of my pleasure" when my belief that O pleases me in virtue of its aesthetic properties is true (347). Its truth can be explained only by reference to aesthetic properties of the object. For instance, if I cannot provide you with an explanation as to why O is beautiful and O^1 is not, namely if I cannot spell out the aesthetic properties of each object, then this means that my pleasure is not grounded in *apprehensio* of O and O^1 and my judgments of taste are not genuine. In this framework, "there *is* a generic, standing concept, - which is to say that Alcibiades, a good *haiku*, a successful poem, and so forth, have an interesting common feature – and… that the term 'beauty', as it is commonly understood picks out that concept" (249). When we make a judgment of taste, we do not subsume the object under the concept of beauty in virtue of its non-aesthetic properties. Beauty is not a kind concept. However, it is an

aggregate concept, which subsumes objects that share one common feature, namely causing aesthetic pleasure in virtue of its aesthetic property or properties.

Mothersill's amendments to Isenberg's account, by developing a theory of aesthetic properties and fleshing out their role in aesthetic assessments, also directly translate into her solution to the problem of the arbitrariness of reasons. Following the Isenbergian line, she claims

> Critical description has an ostensive and the same time pedagogical function. It is necessary to present my cactus to you but not enough to cry, 'Behold!' The serious cactus critic will want to distinguish, say, between the color (pleasing) and the shape (grotesque), and this he cannot do by pointing unless at the same time he narrows the field of attention by producing the appropriate concept (354).

Critical description is employed to direct our attention so as to assist us in grasping aesthetic properties of an object. Art criticism, according to Mothersill, is an empty project if it is a project of justifying one's aesthetic responses in reference to general rules (425). Nevertheless, she states that if her account of aesthetic experience is correct then

> there is a critical talent or skill which… consists in the capacity to discriminate through reflective analysis the various aspects of an individual which one takes to be beautiful and through the use of creative imagination to find words that will convey one's findings to others (425).

The critical skill involves being able to grasp the aesthetic properties of an object and to give an account of the beauty of the object by reference to its aesthetic properties. If one cannot give an account, then it does not matter whether or not he or she claims that object O is beautiful whereas O^1 is not. By arguing that criticism requires such a skill Mothersill construes criticism as a kind of fine art and specifically a kind of fine art that involves

modifying readers' feelings and redirecting their attention instead of imparting information to them (425f).

One might wonder whether Mothersill's amendments to Isenberg's account do justice to Isenberg. I will not here question whether or not Mothersill's realism can be integrated into Isenberg's account. As I mentioned, I also read Isenberg as a realist. However, it is rather curious why Isenberg was hesitant to claim that communion of feeling will necessarily follow the perception of the same aesthetic quality in an object. Due to her Kantian leanings, Mothersill claims that the universality of pleasure will follow from grasping aesthetic properties of an object. I think the reason why Isenberg did not want to commit to such a democratic view was because of his Humean leanings and his noncognitivism.[65] The underlying assumption in Isenberg's dismissal is that our affective responses to the same aesthetic quality can differ because of discrepancies between people's tastes. Some people, like the Humean critics, have better taste and they can discern aesthetic qualities and associate them with pleasure.

A certain type of Humean move can also be discerned in another realist-particularist position, one advocated by Sibley. Sibley wrote under the influence of ordinary language philosophy and thought that the clue to understanding problems in aesthetics and their possible solutions lay in the careful investigation of aesthetic terms. Through a detailed analysis of aesthetic terms (such as 'garish', 'graceful', 'balanced', etc.) used in various works of criticism, Sibley tries to understand the relation between non-aesthetic properties of objects and their aesthetic properties. Similar to Isenberg and Mothersill, Sibley presents aesthetic properties as mediators and claims that the question

[65] See Zeccardi 2010, 367-377.

of the relationship between non-aesthetic properties and aesthetic evaluations should be divided into two (1959, 435): (1) What is the relation of non-aesthetic properties to aesthetic properties? (2) What is the relation of aesthetic properties to aesthetic evaluations? His answer to (1) is that aesthetic properties are emergent properties, which depend on but are irreducible to non-aesthetic properties (1965, 137f). They are real, perceptual properties of objects.[66] Even though they depend on non-aesthetic properties, there are no necessary or sufficient conditions for how to apply them, except negatively (1959, 430). For instance, Sibley writes,

> [i]f I am told that a painting in the next room consists solely of one or two bars of very pale blue and very pale grey set at right angles on a pale fawn ground, I can be sure that it cannot be fiery or garish or gaudy or flamboyant (427).

However, I cannot be sure of any positive attribution. I cannot say, "Oh! If that is the case, it cannot be anything but dull or somber, or so forth." The aesthetic properties instantiate in a particular manner and hence our assessments of aesthetic properties of objects require first-hand experience. This is the main feature of Sibley's aesthetics that renders it particularist. He states that

> …the features which make something delicate or graceful, and so on, are combined in a peculiar and unique way; that the aesthetic quality depends upon exactly this individual or unique combination of just these specific colors and shapes so that even a slight change might make all the difference. Nothing is to be achieved by trying to single out or separate features and generalizing about them (434).[67]

[66] See Levinson, 2001, 61-66.

[67] Sibley makes a similar point in (1965, 138).

The recognition of non-aesthetic properties of an object does not require the exercise of taste; however, the recognition of its aesthetic properties, which supervene on non-aesthetic properties, requires an exercise of taste (421). Sibley, by following the Humean thread, argues that taste is the ability to notice and discern aesthetic properties and some people are more sensitive or perceptive. The critic, supposedly one of these more perceptive people, can aid our perception of aesthetic properties of an object. The critic's guidance can also result in aiding our aesthetic appreciation of this object because the object's aesthetic value depends on its aesthetic properties. By challenging the descriptive-evaluative dichotomy, Sibley states that the terms that denote aesthetic properties can be grouped under three headings: (1) "*intrinsically* or *solely* evaluative" terms (e.g. 'good,' 'bad,' 'mediocre,' 'nasty,' 'effective,' 'worthless') which indicate the object has some value (1974, 5); (2) "*descriptive merit terms*" (e.g. 'sharp' for razors, 'spherical' for tennis balls) that assign a property to an object without ascribing any value to it (1974, 6); and (3) "*evaluation-added*" terms (e.g. 'tasty,' 'insipid,' 'grace,' 'elegance') that have both an evaluative and a descriptive component (1974, 6). Due to the partial evaluative component they possess, the terms grouped under (3) exhibit an inherent polarity similar to the ones in group (1). Sibley writes,

> [t]he attribution to an art-work of dramatic intensity, *tout court*, like the attribution of grace or elegance, is the attribution to it of a property that inherently possesses aesthetic merit. I would say that there are a whole host of properties that inherently possess a positive aesthetic polarity when applied to works of art, not just those I have mentioned, which seem to me aesthetic *par excellence*, but many, like witty, balanced, and joyous, that have applications of another kind entirely outside the arts. Similarly there are a host of inherently negative properties, like garish, sentimental, bombastic, and ugly (2001, 105).

These properties have inherent merit or demerit *in vacuo*. Sibley states that "[t]he general qualities that, when mentioned *tout court* or *in vacuo*, I have called inherent merit qualities are, in the context of a particular work, prima-facie merits, but not necessarily *actual* merits" (2001, 109). For instance, without further qualification, if you tell me that a work W is humorous, I will think that you consider W to have merit in virtue of being humorous. From Sibley's point of view, your statement that "W is humorous" is a fully adequate and sufficient reason for attributing aesthetic merit to W (2001, 101). However, the inherent polarity of the term 'humorous' can be reversed in the context of a particular work. For instance, if W is a tragic comedy and its humorous components weaken its tragic intensity, then its humorousness will count as a defect in the work. Each work should be assessed in its particular context and we can give reasons as to why it has aesthetic value or disvalue because the aesthetic properties it possesses can count as good-making properties or bad-making properties. In this sense, our positive or negative aesthetic evaluations depend on a work's aesthetic properties, which in turn depend on its non-aesthetic properties. Given this general picture of aesthetic appreciation, it only makes sense that Sibley's solution to the arbitrariness problem is to introduce aesthetic properties as mediators.

One can still ask whether or not Sibley's account is indeed particularist since some aesthetic properties do have inherent merit or demerit *in vacuo*. There are a few reasons why Sibley cannot be considered a generalist even though his account incorporates some generalist elements.[68] First of all, even though there are *prima facie*

[68] There is a debate whether or not Sibley was a particularist. See Anna Bergqvist (2010) and Claire Kirwin (2011). I side with Bergqvist and I think that the textual evidence I provide for why Sibley is a particularist should suffice to persuade the readers.

generalizations concerning the inherent polarity of some aesthetic properties, our aesthetic assessments are always particular to the work and we cannot come up with rules or principles in the form of generalizations concerning the *in situ* relation between aesthetic evaluations and aesthetic properties, nor can we formulate generalizations regarding the relation between non-aesthetic and aesthetic properties. Sibley clearly states that

> [t]here are no sure-fire rules by which, referring to the neutral and non-aesthetic qualities of things, one can infer that something is balanced, tragic, comic, joyous, and so on. One has to look and see. […] [T]here are no sure-fire mechanical rules of procedure for deciding which qualities are actual defects in the work; one has to judge for oneself (2001, 107f).

Second, unlike generalists, as can be discerned in the above quote, Sibley rejects thick aesthetic testimony. His rejection, similar to Isenberg's and Mothersill's, is grounded in the fact that aesthetics is a perceptual matter and aesthetic evaluations are responses to perceptual properties in objects. Third, contrary to generalists' contention, the critic, by using descriptions to support his or her assignment of aesthetic properties to a work and in turn to support his or her positive or negative evaluation of a work, is not giving us a justification of his or her evaluation. Similar to Isenberg and Mothersill, Sibley advocates that the support is explanatory instead of justificatory.

Within this realist-particularist framework, reasons in the form of descriptive statements do not function as justificatory reasons but instead as explanatory reasons. The critic's job is not to provide us with a proof as to why an artwork has value or disvalue but instead provide what Sibley calls "perceptual proof" (1965, 143). Similar to Hume, Sibley thinks that not all of us can easily discern aesthetic properties of artworks. The

critic can assist us in this endeavour by providing a perceptual proof. He or she can make us see or hear what he or she sees or hears. Sibley lists various ways in which the critic can do so and some of these activities the critic engages in include providing descriptions concerning non-aesthetic properties of artworks.[69] While describing the work the critic can make us see its aesthetic properties, thereby informing our aesthetic assessments. Of course, the critic can do so only if we are acquainted with the work.

It is easy to see that Isenberg, Mothersill and Sibley solve the problem of the arbitrariness of reasons by providing an alternative theory of aesthetic experience and introducing aesthetic properties as real properties of objects and as mediators between aesthetic evaluations and non-aesthetic properties of objects. The aesthetic properties turn out to be perceptual properties of objects, which depend on but are irreducible to their non-aesthetic properties. In this sense, they are real and they are in the objects. Our aesthetic evaluations are affective responses to these properties. The realist outlook these accounts adopt not only entails that we cannot aesthetically appreciate on the basis of others' testimony but also has a further consequence, namely that aesthetic knowledge (e.g. Francis Bacon's 1987 Triptych on bull fight is a masterpiece) is non-transmissible.[70] Such knowledge is not transmissible from one person to another because these accounts construe aesthetic knowledge as based on grasping aesthetic properties of artworks, since a work's value depends on its aesthetic properties. Aesthetic properties are instantiated in

[69] See Sibley (1959, 442-444).

[70] Wollheim already indicates in his definition of the acquaintance principle that acceptance of such a principle by realists involves rejecting that aesthetic knowledge is "transmissible from one person to another" (1980, 233). See also Pettit (1983, 17-38). Budd rejects that there is a necessary connection between the acquaintance principle and non-transmissibility of aesthetic properties. For his detailed argument, see Budd (2003, 386-392). He is partially right and partially wrong. Being a realist necessitates the acceptance of the acquaintance principle but not the acceptance of non-transmissibility of aesthetic knowledge. Being a realist and a particularist at the same time requires the rejection of both.

a particular manner in each artwork and therefore one can grasp aesthetic properties of works only through a first-hand experience. Especially for Isenberg and Mothersill, since each work, assuming that they are not identical, has a particular aesthetic property, one cannot communicate their aesthetic knowledge concerning a work W to another person. Even for Sibley, although we can say of two works W and W^1 that they are, let's say, graceful, they instantiate gracefulness in a particular manner. Due to the particularity of instantiation, one cannot communicate any nontrivial aesthetic knowledge concerning W and W^1. One can say they are graceful but unless we have first-hand experience of the object we have no clue about what their gracefulness consists in. This is a problematic outcome given that it implies that all the body of work written by critics and art historians is gibberish to me if I have not seen the works they talk about for myself, however at least these accounts seem to solve one of the main problems concerning particularist art criticism, namely the problem of arbitrariness of reasons, and give an account of art criticism, which is not a matter of deference or justification.

Within the Kantian framework too, art criticism is not a matter of deference or justification. Kantian aesthetic judgments are always particular to the work in question and it is impossible to provide objective principles of taste. Kant is clearly a forerunner of aesthetic particularists like Isenberg, Mothersill, and Sibley. However, Kant's account cannot incorporate their solution to the problem of the arbitrariness of reasons. As we have seen, Kant motivates his two constraints on judgments of taste in a different way from Isenberg, Mothersill, and Sibley. Their rejection of objective principles of taste and rejection of thick aesthetic testimony are grounded in their endorsement of aesthetic realism concerning aesthetic properties. But the Kantian framework cannot be altered to

integrate aesthetic realism. Kantian judgments of taste are not reactions to properties of works, aesthetic or otherwise. Judgments of taste result from reflection on the work as a whole. We reflect on the aesthetic idea expressed by the work and this reflection arouses a multitude of feelings and sensations which remind us of the feelings and sensations we have on reflecting on whatever the work aims to present, a rational idea, an empirical concept, or an affect. During this process of reflection, our cognitive faculties are expanded and it is in this expansion that we find pleasure. In this sense, a property of the work cannot be the direct cause of this pleasure. The judgment of taste is not a judgment of perception.

One might object that Kant only rejects the notion of *non-aesthetic* properties being causes of pleasure. Aesthetic properties are considered to be Gestalt properties; what bears the strongest resemblance to them in the Kantian framework is purposiveness, since finding an object to be beautiful means finding it to be purposive. However, Kant straightforwardly rejects this possibility in the introduction of KU. He writes,

> the purposiveness of a thing, insofar as it is represented in perception, is also not a property of the object itself (for such a thing cannot be perceived), although it can be derived from a cognition of things. Thus the purposiveness that precedes the cognition of an object, which is immediately connected with it even without wanting to use the representation of it for a cognition, is the subjective aspect of it that cannot become an element of cognition at all (KU, AA 05: 189).

Subjective purposiveness is not something that we perceive or cognize. The mental state we find ourselves in, namely the free play, is the reason for our regarding an object as purposive. In this sense, purposiveness cannot be equated with the aesthetic properties of

realist-particularist paradigm. The Kantian account of art criticism cannot integrate the realist-particularist framework due to his commitment to expressivism.

IV. 2. 2. The Antirealist-Particularist Solution to the Arbitrariness Problem

The realist solution is not the only particularist solution that has been provided to the problem of the arbitrariness of reasons. Alan Goldman provides an antirealist solution. Can this perhaps be the solution that a Kantian account can adopt? After a brief explanation of Goldman's account, I will argue that this account too fails to qualify as providing a solution that is acceptable from the Kantian perspective.

Goldman's solution also involves introducing aesthetic properties as mediators between non-aesthetic properties (which he calls phenomenal properties) and aesthetic evaluations. Similar to the realists, Goldman argues that aesthetic properties supervene on phenomenal properties of artworks but are irreducible to them (1990, 26). Similar to Sibley, Goldman argues that aesthetic properties such as graceful, powerful, original, and so on, are partly evaluative (24). However, he rejects that they are perceptual properties of objects. Instead, he endorses antirealism about aesthetic properties and states that they are relational properties. There are good motivations for adopting antirealism. Goldman discusses two problems with realist-particularist accounts.

The first problem is the problem of indiscernibles (27). Arthur Danto famously argued that perceptually indiscernible objects could have different aesthetic value.[71] For instance, Warhol's *Brillo Boxes* are perceptually identical to Brillo boxes. Nonetheless, they merit different aesthetic descriptions and evaluations (27). Furthermore, while the

[71] See Danto (1964; 1981).

latter is not an artwork, the former is. If aesthetic properties are perceptual, then the problem is that we cannot account for the differences between these objects. Indeed, this seems to be an implication of Mothersill's account since she clearly states that if two objects share the same non-aesthetic properties, they share the same aesthetic property or properties (1984, 364). The problem of indiscernibles indicates that aesthetic merit cannot be solely grounded in perceptual or phenomenal properties of objects (Goldman 1990, 27). The second problem concerns the non-phenomenal or non-perceptual nature of representational and expressive functions of artworks (27). For instance, to fully appreciate the critical stance Yılmaz Guney's film *Yol* takes one needs to have knowledge of Turkish history and the effects of coup d'états in Turkish social and political life. If aesthetic qualities are purely perceptual, then we seem to be at a loss to explain some of the representational or emotional import of artworks.

Goldman states that his account of aesthetic properties is geared to overcome such problems by construing aesthetic properties as relational. They consist not only in phenomenal properties but also in relations among them and these relations are not always perceptual (27). The non-aesthetic properties of artworks are transformed into evaluative aesthetic properties by entering into structural, expressive, representational, or historical relations. Structural relations comprise contrasts, variations, repetitions, similarities, tensions, and so on (28). By entering into structural relations a work can gain the aesthetic properties of being dynamic, balanced, etc. Expressive and/or representational relations, Goldman says, are not themselves perceivable (28). For instance, we can consider a musical piece to be joyous, not because it is literally joyous, but because it reminds us of our joyous experiences, and so on (29). Historical relations

include originality, innovativeness, being reactionary, etc. (30). By entering into historical relations, the phenomenal properties can be transformed into aesthetic properties, such as being original, daring, and so on.

The structural, expressive, representational, and historical relations through which aesthetic properties emerge are the sources of artistic value. For Goldman, beauty and artistic merit are aesthetic properties of objects but they are *purely* evaluative. Beauty and artistic merit supervene on partly evaluative aesthetic properties, which in turn supervene on phenomenal or non-aesthetic properties of artworks. Similar to Sibley, Goldman also argues that these partly evaluative aesthetic properties have *prima facie* polarity (24). For instance, if a work is powerful we expect it to be artistically good. Hence, relational aesthetic properties ground positive or negative judgments of value. Value emerges when phenomenal properties enter into various relations. In this regard, "form, representation, expressiveness, and… originality must impregnate our experience of the sensible properties of artworks in order to be of aesthetic value" (33). However, the connection between these relations and the positive value judgments they elicit cannot be captured by a set of principles.

Goldman rejects aesthetic principles on two grounds. First, the connections just mentioned arise in a particular manner in our experience of particular works. He states that his account cannot generate principles because "entire works in all their relations are never repeated" (34). Second, according to Goldman, there are genuine aesthetic disagreements which result from differences in personal taste and preference (35). These disagreements do not result from one of the parties failing to notice or discern certain phenomenal properties of a work or from differences between these parties' knowledge

of art history and criticism. The type of relations that transform or alter the phenomenal properties of artworks can be various and can affect different judges in different ways depending on their personal taste and preferences (1993, 31). To use an example from Goldman, the "disagreement between one music critic who finds Tchaikovsky's 6th Symphony powerfully poignant and another who finds it self-indulgently maudlin… [is a result of] irreconcilably different musical tastes or reactions to the ultra-Romantic idiom" (1993, 31). For Goldman, the explanation for such irreconcilable aesthetic disagreements is that even though evaluative properties supervene on nonevaluative properties, they are not necessitated by them (1990, 35). The impossibility of providing a necessity relation between these properties makes it impossible to formulate principles.

What is the function of descriptive statements in the absence of general principles within this antirealist-particularist framework? Given that structural, representational, expressive, historical relations are sources of artistic value, the critic can use descriptive statements to trace the relations into which phenomenal properties enter and the manner in which they are transformed or altered to give a general picture of where an artwork's aesthetic value lies. However, since Goldman's theory allows for "disagreements without error or even insensitivity," critics can speak to you only if you share the same sensibility or taste (35). Goldman's account seems to provide a solution to the arbitrariness problem at the expense of accepting that there are radical, irresolvable aesthetic disagreements. In fact, Goldman himself does not see this as a problem since he believes that there are such disagreements and that one of the main weaknesses of aesthetic realism is that they cannot give an account of such disagreements.

I am not sure whether everyone is as willing as Goldman to accept that there are such irresolvable disagreements.[72] Putting this worry aside, I think that there is something much bigger at stake. On Goldman's antirealist-particularist picture, an art critic can speak to you only if you share the same type of sensibilities, but there seems to be nothing that can ensure that this level of communication is even possible. There can be as many different evaluations as there are evaluators. If there is no way to draw the line with respect to which experiences are relevant to determining the outcome of evaluation, then any and all experiential differences may be relevant and we end up with the possibility of an artwork eliciting different, but equally appropriate and incomparable evaluations. Goldman seems to find the way out by reviving the old construct of the "ideal" critic. So it seems as though for Goldman the only genuine disagreements are between the art critics. However, it is rather questionable how persuasive this move is, today.[73]

A Kantian account of art criticism cannot adopt Goldman's antirealist solution for several reasons. First of all, Kant rejects genuine aesthetic disagreements. Remember that, for him, judgments of taste are universal and necessary. Aesthetic disagreements can arise for various reasons but they can all be resolved. The disagreement between parties results from making different aesthetic judgments. These judgments include pure judgment of taste, single judgment of sense, combination judgment of taste and sense, combination judgment of taste and perfection, incorporation judgment of taste and perfection, combination judgment of taste, perfection, and sense, etc. It could even be the case that two parties can disagree because they are incorporating and combining different

[72] For instance, Levinson (2001) presents a realist account of aesthetic properties and with some reservations and half-willingly shows how this account can accommodate genuine disagreements. One of Goldman's realist interlocutors, Eddy Zemach (1991) rejects that there are genuine disagreements.

[73] For a recent criticism of the ideal critic view, see Lopes (2015).

judgments of perfection or judgments of sense with a judgment of taste. The important issue for Kant is that we can trace and eliminate all aesthetic disagreements (at least in theory). Furthermore, to allow personal tastes or preferences to have effects on one's aesthetic evaluations is to allow a judgment of sense to interfere with a judgment of taste. From the Kantian perspective the reasons why Goldman says that there are irresolvable, radical aesthetic differences require one to accept that what Kant calls charms and emotions can have an effect on aesthetic judgment, which cannot be eliminated and which are also welcome. For Kant, as I have laid out in the previous chapter, charms and emotions are always detrimental to taste and their effects fade away through the development of one's taste. In this sense, Kant does not accept that there can be radical irresolvable aesthetic disagreements.

The second reason why the Kantian account of art criticism cannot incorporate Goldman's solution is that Goldman presents beauty as a property. Perhaps it is not a perceptual property of artworks, nevertheless in the last instance it is a property. Kant rules out this view in the KU (KU AA 5:189, VII; 5:211f, §6; 5:218, §9).

Another overarching reason for resisting the possibility of constructing a Kantian account of art criticism by mapping it onto one of the realist or antirealist particularist accounts is that we lack good motivations to do so. The only motivation seems to be the fact that Kant is a particularist. The high-stake metaphysical commitments of realist or antirealist particularist accounts and the respective prices one needs to pay to make these accounts work (namely, realist accounts necessitating the rejection of thick aesthetic testimony and antirealist accounts requiring the acceptance of irresolvable aesthetic disagreements and ideal critics) already take away from the attractiveness of such a

prospect. Furthermore, all these accounts solve the problems attached to any particularist account by introducing aesthetic properties as mediators. As we have seen, Kant already has a mediator between non-aesthetic properties of objects and aesthetic evaluations, namely judgments of perfection. In this sense, we seem to lack the necessary motivation for introducing yet another mediator between them simply to solve the arbitrariness problem. In the next sections, I will articulate how the Kantian account solves the problem and we are also going to see that the Kantian particularist account of art criticism is superior to all these other particularist accounts in its metaphysical simplicity and its elimination of the unattractive consequences of the other particularist accounts.

IV. 3. Kantian Art Criticism: Round I

Before moving to my exposition of the Kantian answer to the arbitrariness problem and the Kantian theory of art criticism, I want to acknowledge two attempts at exploring the function of art criticism within Kant's aesthetic theory because I believe that there are important lessons to be drawn from both accounts. One of these attempts is by Crawford and the other is by Zuckert, thirty-nine years later. Both speculate on the issue by drawing on the implications of their interpretations of Kant's free-adherent beauty distinction and what they take to be appropriate aesthetic judgments concerning artistic beauty. They also acknowledge Kant's constraints and the limitations they impose on art criticism.

IV. 3. 1. Crawford's Kantian Art Criticism

At the end of his book, *Kant's Aesthetic Theory*, Crawford devotes a short section on Kantian art criticism where he speculates on the issue by drawing on the implications of his interpretation of free-adherent beauty distinction. Crawford states that one of his

aims is "to explore the nature and function of reason-giving in support of judgments of taste as entailed by or consistent with Kant's aesthetic theory" (1974, 166). According to this reading, which also acknowledges the binding role of Kant's constraints on theorizing about art criticism, the function of the art critic is defined as giving either positive or negative reasons in resolving certain cases of aesthetic disagreement.

The negative reasons resolve the disagreements between the parties where one is making a pure judgment of taste while the other is making an impure judgment concerning the same object. Crawford says,

> the judgment can be impure if it is based on sense pleasure, charm, emotion, or on a preconceived idea (a concept) of what the object should be, rather than on the pleasure or displeasure felt in the act of judging its formal purposiveness (166).

Exposition of the impurity of judgments of taste informs the negative reasons that can be given in resolving disagreements. Crawford adds,

> [i]n judging the beauty of an object, one must abstract from any concept of what it ought to be and from its mere sensuous or emotional appeal. Insofar as one can become conscious of the grounds on which his judgment is being made, one can know whether his judgment is pure (167).

This passage reflects Crawford's commitment to the view that appropriate judgments of artistic beauty should be pure. I have already laid out the problematic aspects of Crawford's view in Chapter II and will not repeat them here. Leaving this problem aside, Crawford thinks that "the discovery of a given judgment of taste being impure results from becoming aware of (what one would give as) reasons for the judgment" (167). These reasons are purely negative in the sense that the critic adduces them just in order to

show that one party involved in the disagreement is making an aesthetic mistake. One wonders, though, if Crawford's critic needs to go through an intensive training in art history and criticism and acquire expert knowledge on the related fields as we expect art critics to do in order to resolve disagreements of this sort. In fact, since everyone can make pure judgments of taste and figure out at some point or another whether the judgment in question is pure or not – like Kant's young poet did – everyone is capable of resolving such disagreements without having any expert knowledge. In this sense, this function of the art critic does not render art criticism a profession, but some exercise that everyone can engage in.

Providing positive reasons in order to solve the other kind of disagreements seems to have more potential. This second type of disagreements Crawford discusses is between a party making a pure judgment of taste and another party making a judgment based on "inadequate material resulting from an incomplete or inadequate experience" (168). Crawford thinks that the resolution of this second type of disagreement depends on providing positive reasons for one's judgment of taste. He writes "[r]esolution… depends on being able to become conscious of and point to the grounds of the pure judgment of taste, to delineate precisely what one has judged and to be able to establish a common basis of judgment" (169). Hence, the function of an art critic is to form this common basis by describing the formal features of the object on which her judgment is based. Crawford states that

> [i]n Kant's aesthetic theory, the major task of the critic is to make objects of beauty accessible to us, thereby helping us in our critical development, and aiding in the delineation of a common object for our experience which enables us to share our responses with others (170).

However, after this rather promising description of the function of the art critic Crawford tunes down his enthusiasm and admits that even though this diagnosis gives a nice structure to what a Kantian art critic can do, it lacks content. He concludes that Kant's

> … central concept for a theory of criticism is purposiveness of form, but this is inadequate for two reasons. (1) Kant's assumptions surrounding the form-matter or form-content distinction are confused (for example, in holding that we can only communicate the form of our experience and never the content, and in identifying formal properties with the traditional philosophical category of primary qualities). (2) Kant provides us little direction for determining how, in a given case, such purposiveness or the lack of it is to be discovered or discussed. The form is there, but the content of a Kantian theory of criticism remains to be given (171).

The problem is rooted in the very way Kant describes aesthetic experience. The pure judgment of taste consists of the free play of the faculties of understanding and imagination, of which we can become aware through the feeling of pleasure alone. In other words, we become aware of the object's purposive form that puts our faculties into free play only through feeling. Thus the problem is how the art critic can serve her purpose of delineating the common ground of appreciation if this common ground is non-conceptual and hence non-articulable.

The results of Crawford's attempt summarize why scholars, for the most part, did not really want to get involved in the apparently futile attempt of theorizing about Kantian art criticism. If artistic beauty is free beauty, then it is almost pointless to talk about what a Kantian art critic can do. Either the function of an art critic is to provide negative reasons and this is something that everyone can do; or she can in principle provide positive reasons to form a common basis of judgment, but then we do not know what those reasons are.

But Crawford is wrong to assume that appropriate judgments are always pure judgment of taste. As we have seen in Chapters II and III, sometimes judgments of adherent beauty and sometimes pure judgments of taste that result from expansion of concepts are appropriate judgments to employ, depending on the artwork. However, he is right in claiming that critic can be the person who can assist us in understanding which judgment is appropriate to employ. Furthermore, I think that another important lesson we can draw from Crawford's account is that the main role of Kantian art criticism is to delineate the common ground of appreciation. Due to his interpretation of Kant's free-adherent beauty distinction and theory of artistic beauty, Crawford ends on a negative note by saying that we do not have the tools to delineate this non-conceptual ground. However, I will argue that the critic has the tools to do so. It is judgments of perfection that allow the critic to delineate this ground, sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly.

IV. 3. 1. Zuckert's Kantian Art Criticism

In her brief article, "Is There Kantian Art Criticism?," Zuckert starts with a discussion of the problems about theorizing about art criticism similar to the way that I did. She acknowledges the double constraints on judgments of taste but still, she thinks, it is possible to give a positive account of what a Kantian art critic can do. If you recall from the Chapter II, Zuckert thinks that, on Kant's view, the appropriate judgments for assessing artistic merit of artworks are judgments of adherent beauty. According to the incorporation view she develops, these judgments of adherent beauty "incorporate further values" (2013, 348). Additionally, Zuckert points out that the constraints do not rule out every possible aesthetic discussion. Similar to realist-particularists, she claims that some

aesthetic discussions "need not entail either proof or deference, and Kant's theory leaves open, indeed might be said to aim to establish, the possibility of fruitful discussion with others, including critics" (348). Accordingly, for Zuckert art critics remind us that such kinds of aesthetic discussion are possible. That is the main aim of criticism.

In this picture, we have two roles being assigned to the critic. First of all, the critic communicates her experience of the artwork in question. She communicates her experience through empirical conceptual descriptions which demonstrate what other kinds of values should be incorporated in our judgments. Zuckert claims "[n]oticing aspects of the work under empirical conceptual descriptions, as salient in light of knowledge of medium or historical tradition, is then *part of* aesthetic appreciation, of the harmony of imagination and understanding in representing the work" (352). This type of descriptions that are informed by practice and knowledge draws our attention to the features of the work that make it beautiful. By acknowledging them we find ourselves to be in a better position to engage in the free play (352-353). Secondly, the critic "exhibits the exercise of aesthetic judging" (355). Zuckert claims "[i]n providing concrete, evocative descriptions, the critic models aesthetic judging itself, the playful, informed, inventive cognitive aliveness to empirical particularities and resonances of this object" (355). Zuckert does not mean to suggest that the critic exhibits a model that we can imitate. Rather she claims that we only emulate the critic and go through the process of judging ourselves instead of merely adopting the critic's views. She says, "Kantian critics thus are exemplary not in the sense that we should defer to them – they, like us, judge on the basis of pleasure, not expertise – but in the sense that they remind us that aesthetic debate is possible" (356). In this sense, the general aim of criticism is to demonstrate that

reasonable aesthetic debate is possible and that the matters of taste are not merely subjective.

Doubtlessly, Zuckert's construction of Kantian art criticism has more flesh than Crawford's. She does not share Crawford's pessimism. Furthermore, she compares the incorporation view to the conjunctive view in an attempt to demonstrate the comparative fruitfulness of the former in assigning roles for art critics. She correctly points out that the conjunctive view "makes the critic's expertise *so* irrelevant to judgments of taste" (351). The conjunctive view can give a privileged role to the art critics only with respect to the formation of judgments of perfection. However, because appreciation and evaluation of the object's perfection are divorced from one another, the Kantian critic would not share anything in common with the rationalist art critic either. Zuckert claims that the

> …critics would be something like the empirical scholars of religion Kant discusses in *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone* and the *Conflict of the Faculties*, who empirically investigate religious documents, traditions, or rituals, to establish the character of actual religions. So too would art critics, or perhaps art historians, inform us concerning the empirical character of actual art works (351).

With respect to the judgment of taste that gets combined with the judgment of perfection, the art critic holds no privileged position.[74] Therefore, the result that Crawford reaches applies to the account of art criticism entailed by the conjunctive view: everybody is an art critic but only in a Pickwickian sense. Everybody has the capacity to be an art critic but nobody seems to be able to provide reasons for justifying their judgments.

[74] Zuckert does not mention this; however, the account of art criticism we can construct by pertaining to the conjunctive view resonates with Jerome Stolnitz's theory of criticism. Aesthetic and critical attitudes are different.

I agree with Zuckert that some of the judgments of artistic beauty are judgments of adherent beauty, which incorporate other values in the assessments of an object's subjectively purposive form. Within this framework, the expertise of the critic can put her in a privileged position in matters of taste. However, there seems to be a tension between the way Zuckert sets up what is involved in the communication of both critic's expertise and her experience to others and the main aim of criticism. How can the art critic stimulate aesthetic discussion that is neither proof-based nor deferential if the only elements that Zuckert thinks are admissible are descriptive claims, which led themselves to proofs, or evaluative claims, which can only be used deferentially? The realist-particularist answer to this problem, as we have seen, is through aesthetic properties. However, as we have also seen, Kant cannot adopt this answer.

I also partially agree with Zuckert's assessment of the implications of conjunctive view for art criticism. The critic does not hold a privileged position when it comes to making positive assessments of artworks. However, I do not agree that this applies to the negative judgments. As I have discussed in Chapter II, what Zuckert thinks that are negative judgments of incorporation view are actually the negative judgments of conjunctive view and as we have seen they are informed by negative judgments of perfection. Hence, expertise matters for making such judgments.

Zuckert claims that her incorporation view supports that "the Kantian theory of taste does allow for a special role for the art critic, though not for the determinate role that critics in the artworld may claim to have" (343). In fact, the Kantian art criticism which I will construct partly on the basis of Zuckert's account, can do more than just show us that we can reasonably argue about art. The main functions of Kantian art

criticism, I will show, are to aid our appreciation of artworks and contribute to the formation of good taste within a society. The Kantian art critic can do so by delineating the common ground of appreciation in virtue of providing an evaluation of a certain type of value artworks do realize, namely success value. In a nutshell, I will show that the Kantian account of art criticism is a hybrid account that incorporates generalist elements.

IV. 4. Kantian Art Criticism: Round II

In this section I develop a Kantian account of criticism that integrates a version of generalism, viz., Noël Carroll's. This integration, I will argue, is mutually beneficial. Carroll states that his aim in writing *On Criticism* is to reconstruct art criticism so as to render it objective (2009, 3).[75] He presents a plausible *generalist* account of objective art criticism that is essentially evaluation supported by good reasons. However, this approach comes at a price: art criticism no longer involves exercising one's taste, and thereby a good art critic does not need to have taste. For Carroll, reasoned evaluation consists in informing readers what is of value and disvalue in an artwork, and why (50). What is of value in an artwork, Carroll argues, is its success value, which is defined as the achievement or the failure of the artist (52). Hence, the function of art criticism becomes that of telling others whether or not the artwork under scrutiny is an achievement or a failure and, furthermore, specifying why it is an achievement or why it is a failure. What drops out of this picture of art criticism is the reception value of the work. Carroll's art critic does not evaluate the effects of artworks. What is valuable in an artwork has nothing to do with the positive aesthetic experiences the work affords to its audience. Assigning success value is merely a matter of determining whether the work is

[75] The majority of what follows until the end of Chapter IV is a reprint of the material that will be found in Tuna (forthcoming a).

a good instance of its kind; this determination, Carroll argues, is objective and taste-free (9 and 180). For instance, an evaluation of Joan Mitchell's *Hemlock* on the basis of interpreting it as opening up new directions for abstract expressionism does not require taste, just as an evaluation of a vacuum cleaner with respect to its capacity to clean carpets would not require taste.

I agree with Carroll that evaluation of success value does not require taste. However, I do not agree that the critic's job is limited to evaluating a work's success value. Critical evaluation should explore the reception value of the work in question and I develop a Kantian account of art criticism (which is informed by my interpretation of Kant's theory of artistic beauty) that is suited for this task because it is a hybrid account that incorporates Carroll's objective model, but puts Carroll-type evaluations in the service of evaluations of artworks with respect to their reception value.

The grounds for the possibility of this integration lie in the centrality of good-of-its-kind judgments in both Kant's and Carroll's accounts. I argue that the critical practices subsumed under the Kantian model partially involve the ones outlined by Carroll because these functions correlate with the judgments of perfection that are involved in judging artworks. These judgments report on whether a work is good of its kind and thereby evaluate the success value of the artwork. In Chapters II and III, I have demonstrated that the main function of judgments of perfection lies in making informed *impure* and *pure* judgments of taste. Corresponding to this function, I suggest that the Kantian art critic, by using what Carroll takes to be central to the critic's evaluations, namely good-of-its-kind judgments, narrows down the common ground of appreciation, which would otherwise be non-articulable. In other words, determinations of success

value become pivotal in determining the reception value of artworks.[76] Hence, I will not only make a case for Kantian art criticism, but will also suggest an alternative theory of *metacriticism*, which has the merit of reinstating the centrality of reception value in art critics' evaluations. My construction of the Kantian hybrid account of art criticism demonstrates that, contrary to common conception, Kant's theory can indeed yield a fruitful account of art criticism, one that might prove to be useful in reconstructing the enterprise of art criticism today. The benefit of this hybrid Kantian account is that, despite being essentially particularist, it should be appealing even to generalists, including Carroll.

IV. 4. 1. Art Criticism and Success Value

Throughout *On Criticism*, Carroll reduces the main critical question of what is of value in an artwork to the question of what its success value is, which in turn comes down to the question of whether or not the artwork is a good example of its kind. The critic's job is to determine the purpose of the work, which in turn supplies him or her with a set of expectations, and then reporting whether or not the work meets these expectations (2009, 93-94). If it meets these expectations, then it is marked as an achievement. If it does not, it is marked as a failure.

Classification—namely determining the category-membership of an artwork, that is, determining which artform, genre, sub-genre, style, oeuvre, movement, lineage, tradition, and so on, the work belongs to—becomes the principal means for determining the purpose of a work. In fact, classification, while initially characterized at the beginning

[76] Carroll's account is amenable to such integration. Even though he does not elaborate on it, he acknowledges that success value of artworks can help to determine their reception value (2009, 62-64). Hence, what I will do is to show how this is possible.

of *On Criticism* as one of the critical sub-operations, gains a central place in reasoned evaluation as the book unfolds. Classification is not only the basis on which the critic assigns value, but is also the main wherewithal for choosing which other sub-operations of criticism, such as description, contextualization, elucidation, interpretation, and analysis, are appropriate to engage in, and what they should involve, in order to explain why an artwork has value and/or disvalue. To use Carroll's own example (168-169), Joan Acocella's criticism of Mark Morris's *Mozart Dances* places the work in the category of modern-dance abstraction, thereby identifying its problematic, which is to make abstract movement accessible. *Mozart Dances* gets a favorable evaluation because it meets this challenge. The success value of the work gets grounded in reasons, which are yet again formed and shaped by this classification. Acocella maintains that the Morris piece becomes accessible due to the underlying vague but discernible narrative running through the abstract movements. By describing, interpreting, and contextualizing, she allows the reader to see the narrative. For instance, she describes the repetitive sharp movements of the women dancers in the opening section, then the way the male soloist looks upwards with his fisted hands against his chest in the second dance, and then from the final section she chooses to describe how some of the dancers hold their hands over their hearts while others hold out their arms in a questioning gesture. These descriptions are supplemented with corresponding interpretations of these movements to form the narrative: the first is interpreted as premonition of trouble, the second as a sign of desperation and abandonment, and the last as a nagging, even unsetting, state of irresolution. We see that the sub-operations provide support to the evaluation of success value only insofar as they themselves receive support from sound and objective classifications. Objective criticism,

that is, objective reasoned evaluation, becomes a possibility on the basis of objective classification.

Carroll identifies three main lines of thought that hinder the possibility of objective criticism and he rejects them one by one: (1) criticism is an exercise in taste, hence it is highly personal and idiosyncratic; (2) there are no objective general principles governing the relation between non-aesthetic properties and aesthetic evaluations, hence the reasons the critic provides in the form of descriptive statements to support his or her evaluations are completely arbitrary; (3) criticism is subjective because the process through which the critic chooses to classify an artwork is subjective.

Carroll argues that because critical taste has been theorized by analogy to gustatory or sensory taste and taken to be an internal capacity for experiencing beauty and/or artistic merit, art criticism is considered to be highly personal and idiosyncratic. In order to reject the claim that criticism is subjective, Carroll rejects that criticism is an exercise in taste. His initial move involves claiming that "beauty is too limited a concept to supply us with the critical vocabulary we need to estimate the value of artworks" (160). He writes, "for much of the value critics discover in artworks has to do with the kind of intellectual achievements in the work that are hardly comprehensible on the model of our basic operating perceptual system" (161). After all, it seems impossible to say for works such as Goya's *Saturn Devouring His Son* or *Wicked Woman* that they have artistic value because they are beautiful (160). According to Carroll we do not even experience aesthetic pleasure in contemplating such works. What we are, or more precisely should be, interested in are the intellectual achievements in the work; these intellectual achievements are tantamount to being good of a kind. It might look as though

this argument at most establishes that only some type of criticism is objective since criticism of works deemed beautiful should still be concerned with determination of reception value, which necessarily involves taste and thereby invites the charge of subjectivism. However, what Carroll is actually doing is getting rid of criticism that talks about the artistic value of the work in relation to the experiences it affords. So the type of criticism he supports is indeed completely objective—it is a type of criticism that is not an exercise in taste because it is a purely intellectual endeavor that consists in determining a work to be good of its kind.

Carroll's second argument addresses one of the central dilemmas of metacriticism, namely the dilemma of the arbitrariness of reasons. Recall that the dilemma, formulated by Arnold Isenberg, questions the role of descriptive statements in supporting aesthetic judgments or verdicts. As we have seen, the issue is either there are objective principles of taste or all the reasons we can given in the form of descriptive statements to support our aesthetic judgments are completely arbitrary. Isenberg's aim in formulating this dilemma was not only to show that it is a false dilemma and that there is a third alternative but also to bury generalism, which endorses the existence of such principles. He told us that (1) we cannot find any principles that apply across all artforms and artworks; and (2) even if we were to find them, without a first-hand experience of the artwork, it would not matter whether the critic magically backs up his or her descriptions with general principles.

Carroll accepts Isenberg's main points against generalism. However, in the spirit of reviving generalism from its ashes, he develops an alternative solution and argues as follows:

(i) There are no general principles a critic can appeal to in making rational inferences as to the reception value or success value of an artwork.

(ii) There are, however, general-enough *pro tanto* principles that critics use in grounding their assessments of the success value of artworks (166-167).

The general-enough principles are "about what counts as success in the pertinent artforms, genres, and so forth… [and] are sufficient to ground… [the critics'] evaluations" (167-168). Critics get access to them "by adverting to categories of art and their purposes" (167). In this sense, these principles are category-relative. For instance, Acocella grounds her criticism of *Mozart Dances* in the general-enough principle that a suggested narrative is a good-making feature. However, it is not a good-making feature for all artworks *per se*, but rather only for modern abstract choreography. Hence, even finding general-enough principles depends on classification of artworks and the purposes assigned to them in relation to their category membership. Acocella's criticism is grounded in this general-enough principle because initially she classifies *Mozart Dances* as a modern-dance abstraction, which then allows her to identify the purposes and expectations attached to this category, namely to solve the problematic of making abstract movement accessible. Carroll states that this principle is a *pro tanto* principle because it admits that in some cases either a suggested narrative could be regarded not as a positive feature of the work, or the work could lack the suggested narrative because it solves the problematic in virtue of some other feature (169).[77]

[77] I think that this demonstration of general-enough principles cannot be used to overcome the Isenbergian critical dilemma. These general-enough principles establish a connection between non-aesthetic features and good-of-its-kind judgments, not a connection between non-aesthetic features and Isenbergian verdicts, which are reports on the positive or negative aesthetic

Carroll tackles the final obstruction to the vindication of objective criticism by demonstrating how classification can be objective. He argues that there are three objective reasons that support critics' classifications, namely structural, historico-contextual, and intentional reasons (2009, 172). For instance, if the artwork has salient features that are standard to a category, the critic has strong structural reasons to classify it under that category. Furthermore, the critic's determination of the category-membership of a work more often than not is informed by art-historical context. Situating the work in its institutional or cultural context supports the classifications the critic makes. For instance, classifying a tribal artwork under the category of primitivism just because it has features that are standard to primitivism is disregarding the historico-contextual reasons and confusing the order of influence. Lastly, we have objective means other than classification to indirectly access the artist's intentions (2009, 76). Therefore, the structural, contextual, and intentional considerations, particularly when combined together, provide an objective basis on which to ground classification and render it objective.

These three arguments, as I have illustrated, show that a certain kind of art criticism, namely reasoned evaluation, is an objective enterprise. Carroll establishes this objectivity at the expense of rendering taste irrelevant to criticism. As Carroll mentions at one point, the critic judges whether the artwork is good of its kind as one judges a steak knife to be good of its kind (2009, 179). The processes are similar; they involve classifying, finding a purpose, setting up expectations, telling whether the object meets

---

experiences artworks afford. In this sense, Carroll's argument does not really help him to overcome the dilemma. Carroll's account is immune to particularist worries because he changes what 'verdict' means: For Carroll, 'verdict' does not refer to an aesthetic judgment but rather to a good-of-its-kind judgment.

these expectations, and then finally pronouncing whether it is a good example of its kind. The critic's processes do not involve exercising taste or making aesthetic judgments about the work he or she is criticizing.

IV. 4. 2. Art Criticism and Reception Value

Now I turn to the main topic at hand, namely delineating a Kantian hybrid account of art criticism that is essentially particularist, while also accommodating Carroll's generalist model. We have seen that as a forerunner of aesthetic particularism, Kant formulated its principal tenets in his own peculiar way in the KU. They are what I called Kant's autonomy and no-principle constraints. There are two key features shared by all particularist accounts and these features, unless supplemented by some other premise, seem to undercut the possibility of art criticism: rejection of aesthetic testimony and rejection of general principles of reception value. If art criticism is an enterprise of providing evaluations of artworks supported by reasons, then it is hard to see what the Kantian art critic can do for us. First, Kant says that we cannot defer to the critic's aesthetic judgment, so it is hard to see whether it matters at all that an art critic communicates to us his or her evaluation of an artwork on the basis of its reception value. Second, as Isenberg states, it is not clear whether it matters at all that the critic provides reasons in the form of descriptive statements if these reasons are completely arbitrary given the absence of general objective principles governing the relation between non-aesthetic properties and aesthetic evaluations.

It is standardly assumed that Kant's theory does not provide any supplementary theoretical leeway to suppress these worries and hence a theory of criticism flies in the

face of Kant's rejection of aesthetic testimony and of general principles.[78] We have also seen that Kant cannot adopt any of the particularist solutions to the dilemma, which in general involved introducing a theory of aesthetic properties to overcome these worries. He presents a thoroughly expressivist account, according to which the judgment expresses the state of mind one has in reflecting on an object, namely the free play of cognitive faculties. His expressivism has the advantage of obviating any need for a theory of aesthetic properties. Unfortunately, the combination of his expressivism with his particularism strengthens the impression that any activity engaged in by the Kantian art critic is trivial. This is the reading I challenge by showing that Kant introduced a mediating process between aesthetic evaluations of reception value of artworks and reasons provided in the form of descriptive statements. This mediating process is nothing other than the evaluation of success value. The possibility of Kantian art criticism lies in the fact that the Kantian framework provides a particularist model that incorporates generalist elements. In this section, I want to show that the Kantian account can adopt Carroll's solution to the arbitrariness problem and his theory of art criticism with ease. It can even supplement the shortcomings of Carroll's account. In this section, using Carroll's account of art criticism as a foil, I want to derive implications for art criticism from my exposition of Kant's theory of artistic beauty.

Let us first see how the Kantian account can incorporate Carroll's model. I argue that the critical practices subsumed under the Kantian model partially involve the ones outlined by Carroll because these functions correlate with one of the judgments Kant identifies as involved in judging artworks, namely, judgments of perfection that report on

[78] See Crawford (1974, 160-171), Wollheim (1980, 194).

whether a work is good of its kind. This is, for Carroll, the basis of the critic's evaluation. Here is a brief summary of the points of convergence between their accounts of these judgments:

(i) The judgment requires the concept of what the object ought to be, namely a kind concept. In the case of artworks, kind concepts involve categories of art criticism, namely artforms, genres, subgenres, movements, schools, lineages, styles, and so on.

(ii) By classifying a work under a category, we get access to the purpose of the work.

(iii) In relation to this purpose, we set up expectations.

(iv) The judgment of perfection or the good-of-its-kind judgment involves reporting whether or not the artwork meets our expectations.

There are three other issues to note here. First, the good-of-its-kind judgment involves comparing the representation by which an object is given to us with other representations associated with the same kind concept. Put otherwise, using Carroll's example (2009, 166-168), the judgment "Harold Lloyd's *Safety Last* is a good example of slapstick comedy" involves comparing our representation of *Safety Last* with what a slapstick comedy ought to be. The rule or the general-enough *pro tanto* principle provided by slapstick comedy, namely "slapstick comedies contain many successful pratfalls," regulates our judgment. Given that *Safety Last* contains many successful pratfalls, all else being equal, it is a good example of a slapstick comedy. Second, according to both Carroll's and Kant's accounts, there is not only one fixed kind concept we can appeal to in making a judgment of perfection about an object. Depending on the object, several

different categories can be relevant and we can assign different purposes to the same object. For instance, we can assign different purposes to Nuri Bilge Ceylan's *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* in accordance with the kind concept or the category we place it under, such as crime-thriller, drama, slow-cinema, neo-realism, and so on. Third, according to both accounts, good-of-its-kind judgments do not involve exercising taste. These judgments are not reports on one's aesthetic pleasure. However, according to both accounts, there is an element of pleasure involved in making judgments of perfection, namely intellectual pleasure. A positive judgment of perfection involves determining an artwork to be good of its kind and evaluating it as an intellectual achievement. For Kant, as we have seen in Chapter II, such evaluation can result in an intellectual enjoyment similar to the enjoyment one takes in sciences or one that can come in the form of esteem, approval, or admiration. In this regard we see that there is yet another correlation between Carroll's and Kant's accounts. They both think that good-of-its-kind judgments involve assessing intellectual achievements of artworks and lead to developing intellectual satisfaction in contemplating them. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that, similar to Carroll, Kant neither classifies intellectual pleasure under aesthetic pleasures nor does he think that taste is required to make judgments of perfection. In the same vein, Carroll also thinks that intellectual pleasure is at stake when making good-of-its-kind judgments. It is clear, then, that Carroll's good-of-its-kind judgments and Kant's judgments of perfection are interchangeable and we can see how the two accounts align. Recall that for Kant judgments of perfection are attributive good judgments and therefore are a type of value judgment. Now by using Carroll's account we can see what type of value is in question

when it comes to artworks. It is success value. Therefore, Kant's judgments of perfection express evaluations of success value of artworks.

There is a twist: for Kant evaluations of artworks are not based solely on judgments of perfection since aesthetic judgments express our evaluations of the reception value of artworks. As we have seen in Chapters II and III, the main function of judgments of perfection that determine the success value of a work lie in making *informed impure* and *pure* judgments of taste. In the former case, the judgments of perfection express the degree to which artworks meet our expectations. There are two main judgments available to make informed impure judgments of taste. The first involves the incorporation of a positive judgment of perfection into a judgment of taste. In this instance, the positive good-of-its-kind judgment directly contributes to the reception value of an art. The second leads to a nullification of a positive judgment of taste or can be used to explain a work's failure to evoke one due to a negative judgment of perfection. In Chapter II, I used the example of *Broadway Boogie-Woogie* to illustrate the first. Now I want to go through the example one more time and show how Carroll's account along with some additions from Walton's theory of categories of art – as I did in Chapter II – helps us to get a better grasp of informed appreciation.

Classifying an artwork under an appropriate category allows us to identify general-enough *pro tanto* principles, but additionally these principles are intimately connected to the determination of standard and variable properties of the work in relation to its category-membership. For instance, one of the main challenges for De Stijl paintings is to produce a non-representational, yet nonetheless expressive, composition that consists of straight lines and rectangular grids in a two-dimensional space by using a

color palette involving primary colors, black, and white. This *pro tanto* principle already sets up what properties can count as standard and as variable. Once we classify *Broadway Boogie-Woogie* under the category of De Stijl paintings, we determine its purpose and set up expectations. Determining its purpose and comparing it to other works in this category allows us to appreciate its variable and standard properties and on this basis we appreciate the fact that it presents the affect of being energetic. We would not be able to realize that the work is meant to present the affect of being energetic unless we classify it under De Stijl paintings. After all these determinations, a judgment of perfection can takes place: one can judge *Broadway Boogie-Woogie* to be a good example of its kind given that it meets the expectations one has of a De Stijl painting, namely an expressive, yet non-representational, composition using a very restricted number of elements. However, this value judgment is not a judgment of reception value, but a success value judgment. It informs our reception value judgment insofar as it *directly* tells us the relevant qualities of the painting we should attend to. We make a reception value judgment—a judgment of taste—by reflecting on the organization of the relevant properties of the painting, which are picked out with respect to the judgment of perfection, and how it presents the affect of being energetic. If we did not go through the steps of classification in non-aesthetic evaluation, we would not be able to form this aesthetic judgment. We would not be able even to pinpoint what the work presents. In this regard, the work's success value contributes to its reception value.

In the same way, evaluations of success value inform our negative aesthetic assessments. Assume that we are aesthetically appreciating a work because we use a wrong category or no category at all. By classifying a work under an appropriate

category, we can determine if it fails to meet the category expectations. The *pro tanto* principle of this category will *directly* single out which standard properties the work lacks and thereby grounds our negative assessment of the work's success value. We make an informed impure judgment of taste regarding the work once we place the work under appropriate categories and allow our positive judgment of taste to be overridden by a negative judgment of perfection. Put otherwise, an informed aesthetic assessment of the work is formed once we let our judgment of reception value be overridden by a negative judgment of success value. We can then either greet the work with indifference or we can find it unpleasant. There will also be scenarios in which a work does not initially trigger any aesthetic engagement, or might in fact elicit displeasure. The explanation for this initial response can be given again by appealing to a negative judgment of success value.

The judgment of success value, both from Kant's and Carroll's perspective, is about checking whether or not an artwork meets the expectations attached to the categories under which we subsume it. This process *directly* informs one's positive or negative assessments of reception value of an artwork. What is more noteworthy, I think, is what happens in the cases of artworks that *exceed* our expectations. The idea of radically new artworks is not successfully handled in Carroll's account. He talks about artworks that do not seem to fit under preexisting categories or that belong to nascent artforms (2009, 94-96) and argues that even in these cases classification is still possible. Even if we suppose, for the sake of argument, that there is an artwork that is radically new, no one would be able to understand such a work and acknowledge that it is art (95). Furthermore, he argues that artworks that are aimed to bring about a perceptual revolution in art fit under the tradition of the new, which encompasses movements such

as Cubism, Dadaism, Pop Art, Minimalism, and so on (95-96). To classify the new, critics create new categories by hybridization, category-splicing, and so forth. The new is always understood relationally. Sometimes it is a result of amplification, inventing new solutions to an earlier problematic, just as Jackson Pollock's drip painting advanced the problematic of modern painting to a new level (103). Sometimes it is a result of repudiation, just as impressionism developed out of rejection of academic and romantic art, or as Jenny Saville rejected beauty-obsessed art by celebrating the sublate in her depictions of distorted, fleshy, and disquieting naked female bodies.[79] All in all, according to Carroll, the critic is able to find a category and thereby a purpose to every work, and set up expectations so that he or she can determine its artistic value in relation to the work's success in meeting those expectations.

I see two main problems with Carroll's position. The first is that classification of a transgressive work under the category of new or avant-garde cannot function in the specific capacity Carroll wants it to, namely to help the critic set up general-enough *pro tanto* principles to judge its success value. The category of avant-garde is too broad and vague. For instance, there is no *pro tanto* principle that can be derived from the category of avant-garde prior to Duchamp's ready-mades to specify expectations that Duchamp's *Fountain* is set to meet. Did we have the expectation that an artwork can be anaesthetic and ready-made prior to Duchamp? Did we presuppose that what is expressed by an artwork can be independent of what we see, hear, or watch? It is true that we make use of different categories, but it is not true that these categories help us to set up expectations.

[79] See Michelle Meagher (2003) and Carolyn Korsmeyer (2011, 103-105) for analyses of Jenny Saville's work along these lines.

Instead they assist us to understand how the work under scrutiny exceeds our expectations.

This connects to the second problem with Carroll's account: These works do not meet expectations; they exceed our expectations. If they were to meet our expectations then the critic would be able to subsume these works under existing categories and determine their standard and variable properties and discern *pro tanto* principles applicable to them accordingly. To use Walton's account again, these works exhibit contra-standard properties that resist ordinary subsumption. In order to subsume these works the critic amplifies existing categories or creates new categories to subsume these works. Carroll suggests that the expectations are set in reference to these new or modified categories and the critic's evaluation consists in determining the success of these works in meeting these expectations. He seems to forget that the new expectations did not exist prior to the work itself. These works create new rules instead of conforming to old rules. Therefore, their merit lies in their respective success in exceeding expectations and setting up a new set of expectations attached to the new or amplified categories. Carroll does not seem to acknowledge this kind of value, which does not count as value under the judgment of perfection. However, Kant takes it to be central in understanding art appreciation. It is in these instances exemplified by what Kant calls works of genius, as I argued in Chapter III, that judgments of perfection play a crucial role in making informed judgments of taste that yield positive reception value.

Products of genius, due to their originality and exemplarity, exceed our expectations as to what can be presented and how it can be presented. As we have seen, originality consists in breaking with existing rules while exemplarity lies in creating a

new rule. Correspondingly, I argued that Kant's claims about exemplary originality denote a twofold approach to works of genius: We do not judge the work only with respect to its antecedents or precedents (since otherwise we cannot determine its originality), but also with respect to its successors (since otherwise its exemplary influence cannot be articulated). This two-fold characteristic of works of genius, I argue, is grounded in their success in exceeding our expectations.

They exceed our expectations concerning aesthetic ideas due to the fact that, in creating them, genius not only breaks with the laws of association and the rules of aesthetic convention, but also establishes new associations and new conventions. This in turn opens up the possibility for a rational idea, an empirical concept, or an emotion to be presented in unexpected ways and leads to an aesthetic expansion of this presented material. Kant asserts that in judging such works as beautiful, the aesthetic idea is added to the determinate or indeterminate concept that it aims to present and aesthetically expands it. The expression of the aesthetic idea, which is the work itself, arouses certain feelings, which recall to the mind the feelings stemming from reflection on a concept. This concept turns out to be what the aesthetic idea aims to present. It also makes us realize that there are several other representations that arouse the same feelings in us, which can now be seen as different attributes of the same concept. Through these new associations the concept gets expanded aesthetically and we find further pleasure in this expansion. It is this felt expansion that results in declaring the object beautiful.

We can determine whether or not a work exceeds our expectations *only relationally*. For Kant, as for Carroll, the new is always understood relationally. In this sense we need to appeal to some categories in order to appreciate the way in which the

work exceeds our expectations. The judgment of taste cannot, however, be the judgment by which we determine that a work exceeds our expectations. After all, the judgment of taste is not based on a determinate concept. At this point the judgment of perfection becomes central as a mediator. Our reflection on the given intuition (that is, the aesthetic idea) is occasioned or triggered by the relevant categories. Recall that the function of a judgment of perfection on the basis of objective classification is to *directly* single out the properties constitutive of the aesthetic idea expressed by the object. A judgment of perfection cannot function in such capacity for judging original and exemplary works, which resist classification and are not good examples of any extant artistic kind. In these cases, the relevant categories, namely the existing categories that will be amplified in order to subsume the work or the categories that are repudiated by the work, *indirectly* single out the contra-standard properties of the work. These contra-standard properties, which will become standard with respect to the amplified category or the new category, are constitutive of the aesthetic idea expressed by the work. Hence, we determine whether or not the work exceeds our expectations with respect to what the work presents (the indeterminate or determinate concept or emotion) and how it is presented (the aesthetic idea) *only relationally* via frustrated attempts at making judgments of perfection. The initial categories, which trigger the process of judging by contradistinguishing the properties of the work, cease to determine our judgment. This indeterminacy allows for free play to take place without interruption. It is free because our imagination is being entertained and is not restricted by our understanding since the category, in getting expanded or discarded, ceases to determine our judgment. What happens in these situations is that our initial attempt at making a judgment of perfection

is cancelled out and, reflecting on the work, with our cognitive faculties in free play, we evaluate an artwork on the basis of its reception value in the judgment of taste.

IV. 4. 3. Examples of Kantian Art Criticism

What does the Kantian model of art appreciation tell us? First of all, it tells us that although originality and exemplarity are not directly experienced, they inform our determination of reception value, our judgments of taste. We recognize the originality and exemplarity of a work relationally, through the fact that our initial attempt at making a judgment of perfection is frustrated. These works do not meet our expectations, contrary to what Carroll assumes. Their artistic merit lies in the fact that they are exceeding our expectations and in doing so affording a distinctive type of aesthetic experience to us. In this sense, all the activities Carroll's critic engages in become part of delineating a common ground of appreciation. If the appreciation process did not proceed as depicted, and we were making a sole judgment of taste, then, as Crawford says, the critic would not be able to delineate this ground because it would be completely non-conceptual and hence non-articulable. However, the Kantian critic has the tools for narrowing down the common ground of appreciation by telling us what the work is not and how the work is not that.

For instance, Karen R. Achberger, in her criticism of Ingeborg Bachmann's poem "Mortgaged Time" (1957, 16), provides an evaluation of its success value in exceeding our expectations and thereby assists us in the process of discovering its reception value.[80] She starts with a classification of the work under post-World War II literature. Through contextualizing the work within this genre and within Bachmann's oeuvre, she backs up

[80] See Achberger (1995, 12-14).

her interpretation of the work, namely, that it presents the post-World War II psyche that is marked by a historical age coming to end and is shaped by the urgency for modern women and men to take action. Achberger traces this poetical imaginary to the attributes used in the poem and elucidates, for instance, how aesthetic attributes of coldness of fish entrails symbolize nearing of an end and how the urgency of the situation is expressed through the aesthetic attributes of running out of time and using loaned or mortgaged time that will be due soon. The most crucial part of her criticism comprises her comparison of Bachmann's "Mortgaged Time" to Bertolt Brecht's opening poem from the collection *Aus dem Lesebuch für Städtebewohner* ("Ten Poems from a Reader for Those who Live in Cities"). Here the category of Brechtian style is evoked not in order to set up the literary context within which "Mortgaged Time" is to be understood, but rather against which its uniqueness is to be appreciated. Achberger cites the instructions given by both poets in the form of imperatives in order to highlight the contra-standard properties of "Mortgaged Time." She says, "Brecht's instructions express the experience of general alienation in capitalist society and the need for survival tactics, Bachmann's, on the other hand, are connected to an irretrievable historical moment and as such are an unmistakable expression of the concrete postwar circumstances" (1995, 14). She further elaborates on Bachmann's ingenuity in capturing the present moment in contrast to Brecht's description of a situation after the fact by pointing to her use of adverbs "still," "no longer," "already." She says, "while cold and dark dominate Brecht, Bachmann treats the historical process of *becoming* cold and dark" (1995, 14). Furthermore, she uses contextualization to elucidate Bachmann's aim to capture the present moment, by stating

that this is a recurring theme in Bachmann's work and by pointing out the influence of Heidegger and Wittgenstein on her development of this aim.

While exploring the originality of Bachmann's poem through the use of the category of Brechtian style, Achberger makes us see that indeed Bachmann's work also exceeds our expectations concerning the category of post-World War II literature and expands this category. We see the critic engaging in several sub-operations, such as classification, description, interpretation, contextualization, and elucidation, in order to back up her evaluation of the success value of the work. She appeals to different categories to show how Bachmann's work exceeds our expectation by using Brechtian style for inspiration and further distinguishing her voice and style from Brecht. In reading Achberger, we become informed about the properties of the work we should pay attention to (the specific words used to animate sensations of end and urgency, the set of aesthetic attributes she uses to establishing various associations, and so on), and this guides our reflection on the aesthetic idea, which is partially constituted by these properties. Furthermore, the critic's descriptions of these new types of associations also guide us in the process in which our reflection on the aesthetic idea directs us to reflect on the empirical concept it aims to present. As elements of the aesthetic idea that arouse a multitude of sensations and representations, these new associations get added to our concept of the post-World War II psyche and expand it in an unbounded way. If we go through this process in reading the poem and experience this expansion, we experience aesthetic pleasure. Hence, by describing the work's success value, which is measured in virtue of its success in exceeding expectations, the critic narrows down the common ground of appreciation. However, if the critic fails to develop a novel classification when

the work exceeds expectations, the judgment of success value may be mistaken and may mislead a judgment of reception value. Criticism of original and exemplary works involves an attempt at classifying the work, exploring why the work resists this classification, spelling out how and why the work exceeds our expectations, and finally pronouncing the work not merely to be a good example of its kind, but an exceptional art piece. The critic engages in all these activities to aid our appreciation of the work and to make us see why it has the reception value she thinks that it has.

However, not all works exceed our expectation. Here again determination of success value is pivotal in approximating the reception value. Since there are various incorporation or combination judgments that can be used depending on the work itself, one main function of the Kantian art critic is to direct us to make what she or he takes to be the appropriate judgment. The judgment of perfection functions in different capacities but each time it *directly* singles out the properties one should pay attention to: sometimes it uncovers different salient features of a work depending on the different categories we subsume the object under and this directly contributes to our pleasure in the object. Category-membership of the work informs our selection of the properties of the work we would reflect on, that is, the constituents of the aesthetic idea expressed by the work, and in doing so allows us to form an appreciation that would not otherwise arise. Sometimes it prevents aesthetic engagement to occur, sometimes it results in experience of displeasure, sometimes it revokes the aesthetic judgment, and so on. The critic's job is to highlight the specific role the judgment of perfection plays in what she or he takes to be an appropriate evaluation and to emphasize how it influences the overall aesthetic assessment. In doing so, the critic engages in the typical operations I have been

delineating. Again, his or her job is one of classification, spelling out what are the salient features of the work we should pay attention to, and so on. However, this time the critic does all these things in order to explain how the work meets, or fails to meet, expectations, and thereby she or he manages to restrict the common ground of appreciation.

Acocella's review of *Mozart Dances* does exactly what a Kantian critic does in narrowing down the common ground of appreciation. Her descriptions of how *Mozart Dances* makes abstract movement accessible are prefaced with her claim that Mark Morris does something that his counterparts cannot, and that it is a perfect example of its kind. She starts by informing the readers that when *Mozart Dances* had its premiere and played for the three consequent nights the tickets were sold out. She tells us that this is also expected for its upcoming reprise in New York. She writes, "some ballets do that kind of box-office, but modern dance almost never does, not to speak of a show that, like 'Mozart Dances,' has no ostensible story but is just a choreographic setting of three Mozart piano pieces" (2007). And she adds, "you would have to be Mark Morris to sell out such a program" (2007). What she is trying to communicate in her review is not primarily why *Mozart Dances* is an intellectual achievement but why it is an aesthetic achievement. In other words, she is trying to explain the inexplicable, namely the aesthetic pleasure it evokes by narrowing down the common ground of appreciation. That is exactly why we get the following introduction in her review: "Why is he [Mark Morris] so popular? One reason, I think, is that he gives people the modern pleasure of seeing abstract work without leaving them scratching their heads over what it was about" (2007). Then she explains how a story gets formed throughout the work. Acocella's

explanation of the success value of the work directs the audience to understand why it has the reception value it does. To frame it in the Kantian lexicon, she engages in several different sub-operations such as classification, description, interpretation, and so on, which directly support her judgment of perfection. Since this judgment of perfection informs our judgment of taste by being incorporated into it, Acocella's descriptions of *Mozart Dances* also directly pick out some of the properties constituting the aesthetic idea expressed by the work, namely the choreography. She establishes correlations between these properties—the movements of the dancers, the music, the staging, and so on—and the emotions indirectly presented by them and identifies how they contribute to the formation of a narrative. Her interpretation is meant to guide our aesthetic engagement: for instance, she tells us that in the opening scene our reflection on the repetitive sharp movements of the women dancer is going to make us reflect on premonition of trouble. It is important to note that the aesthetic idea is too rich to be exhausted by these descriptions. Reading Acocella, we cannot experience the sequence of emotions that constitutes the narrative informing the work. Such experience is brought about by our reflections on the aesthetic idea expressed by the work. The Kantian art critic can only facilitate our engagement with the work; to experience pleasure one needs to engage with the work itself.

To summarize, this Kantian hybrid account of art criticism incorporates Carroll's model and puts Carroll-type evaluations in the service of evaluations of artworks with respect to their reception value. On this account reception value is central in critics' evaluations. One might ask what makes this hybrid account particularist. First, the appropriate judgment of taste is always decided in relation to the particular work itself

and there is no possibility of generalizing from this decision to the success value of other works. Second, even though there are general-enough principles, they can never be principles of taste and their applicability and usefulness is always decided within the context of engaging with the work itself. Another reason is that, according to Kant, simply reading the critic or imitating the critic does not produce an aesthetic experience of the work. We can defer to the critic's evaluation of success value but not to his or her evaluation of reception value.[81] This is one of the principal tenets of particularism, namely, rejecting the notion that the critic can give a logical proof to persuade the audience of the reception value of a work. The Kantian art critic, in delineating a common ground of appreciation, tells us how to approach the work. The critic provides guidance but it is up to us to undergo the process of seeing, listening to, or watching the work. Depending on the work, the Kantian art critic engages in several different operations, such as evaluation, classification, description, contextualization, interpretation, analysis, and elucidation, in order to set up a common ground of appreciation. He or she does this with the primary aim of explaining why it makes sense to have the response the critic deems appropriate and, in so doing, aids our appreciation. The obvious merit of this account is that even though it is essentially particularist, it incorporates the sort of judgment that Carroll considers to be central to criticism. Furthermore, through the incorporation of Carroll's account, we solve the problem of arbitrariness of reasons, namely the problem concerning how descriptive statements about non-aesthetic properties of artworks can support our aesthetic appraisals, without introducing a metaphysically loaded theory of aesthetic properties. The problem is

[81] See KU AA 5: 284-285.

resolved by introducing a mediator between those descriptions and the judgment of taste. The evaluation of success value works as a mediator because it gets direct support from descriptive statements and contributes to the determination of reception value in aesthetic judgments.

Conclusion

The Kantian theory of art criticism I present has the advantage of reinstating the centrality of reception value in art critics' evaluations. Most importantly, we now have an expressivist and particularist theory that provides a satisfactory explanation of the relation between non-aesthetic properties of artworks and aesthetic evaluations of these works. There are a few related issues I want to address in conclusion in order to highlight one more time the advantages of the Kantian theory of art criticism I presented.

One might claim that perhaps another hybrid theory, which merges Carroll's account with any of the 20th or 21st century particularist accounts I have discussed, could yield a more compelling theory. I turn to Kant, rather than other particularists, to create a hybrid account of art criticism because the hybrid theory is already implicit in his theory of artistic beauty and therefore the need for the artificial construction of a hybrid theory by merging Carroll's account with some other particularist account is obviated. Furthermore, other particularist positions are not easily amenable to such an

incorporation of Carroll's view. We have seen that there are two main particularist schools, namely realist particularism and antirealist particularism. What is common to both is that they introduce aesthetic properties in order to resolve the problem of the arbitrariness of reasons. Hitching Carroll's theory of success value to either variety of particularism defeats the purpose, since the whole point of advocating a theory of success value is to minimize metaphysical commitments. More to the point, concocting a hybrid by the brute addition of a Carroll-style success-value-based generalist account to a particularist model of art appreciation would be *ad hoc*. For one thing, the merger would not be internally motivated from either the particularist or the generalist theoretical standpoint. Such a hybrid would hence bear at a minimum the following further explanatory burdens. From the generalist angle, one would have to explain why the metaphysically loaded commitment to aesthetic properties is needed, given that parsimony considerations cut the other way. From the particularist angle, success value would have to earn its keep. Kant's theory of taste presents a framework that can incorporate Carroll's account with ease, without incurring further theoretical commitments. Furthermore, Kant's account amends Carroll's short-sightedness about works of genius, which exceed expectations, and overcomes the limitations Carroll imposes on criticism due to his dismissal of reception value.

The Kantian theory of art criticism has various advantages over the other particularist accounts. First of all, his expressivism has the advantage of obviating any need for a theory of aesthetic properties. Secondly, given that aesthetic realism requires the acceptance of the acquaintance principle, by rejecting any type of property talk the Kantian account does not entail that first-hand experience of the object is always

necessary for aesthetic appreciation. Kant's rejection of thin aesthetic testimony opens up the possibility that even though it is not possible in every instance to develop an appropriate appreciation of an object on the basis of description, there can be rare instances where one can develop such appreciation. Most importantly, the main merit of the Kantian theory over its realist-particularist alternatives is that it allows aesthetic knowledge to be transmissible because it construes aesthetic knowledge as a summation of attributive good judgments, which do not necessarily involve exercise of taste.

Unlike its antirealist-particularist alternatives, the Kantian model allows us to track down the causes of aesthetic disagreements and potentially eliminate them. For Goldman, recall, a genuine disagreement between two critics on the aesthetic value of Tchaikovsky's 6th Symphony might be due to the irreconcilable differences in their reactions to the ultra-Romantic idiom. On the Kantian model, such differences cannot have any bearing on these critic's assessment of the success value of Tchaikovsky's 6th. In that regard, if they have the same background knowledge with respect to ultra-Romantic idiom, their judgments as to whether it is a good example of the ultra-Romantic idiom should be in agreement. Once the critics determine the success value of Tchaikovsky's 6th, they can reevaluate their initial aesthetic responses. Perhaps one of them had made a negative judgment of taste not because Tchaikovsky's 6th was a bad example of its kind but because of his or her prejudices about the ultra-Romantic idiom. Another important advantage of Kant's account over Goldman's is that, within the democratic Kantian account, there is no place for ideal critics.

All in all, the Kantian theory displays its contemporary relevance by providing a framework that allows us to navigate between particularism and generalism while evading the shortcomings of each of these theories.

Bibliography

Achberger, Karen R. *Understanding Ingeborg Bachmann*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

Acocella, Joan. "Mozart Moves," Rev. of *Mozart Dances*, by Mark Morris. *The New Yorker* 20 Aug 2007: 84-85: http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2007/08/20/mozart-moves.

Allison, Henry. *Kant's Theory of Taste: A Reading of the Critique of Aesthetic Judgment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Bachmann, Ingeborg. "Die Gestundete Zeit," in *Die Gestundete Zeit*. München: R. Piper & Co. Verlag, 1957.

Baeumler, Alfred. *Kant's Kritik der Urteilskraft: Ihre Geschichte und Systematik*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1923.

Baumgarten Alexander Gottleib. *Metaphysics: A Critical Translation with Kant's Elucidations, Selected Notes, and Related Materials,* eds. and tr. Courtney D. Fugate and John Hymers. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

---. *Reflections on Poetry*, tr. Karl Aschenbrenner and William B. Holther. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1954.

Beardsley, Monroe C. "On the Generality of Critical Reasons." *The Journal of Philosophy* 59:18 (1962), 477-486.

Beiser, Frederick C. *Diotima's Children: German Aesthetic Rationalism from Leibniz to Lessing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Bergqvist, Anna. "Why Sibley is Not a Generalist After All." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 50:1 (2010), 1-14.

Buchenau, Stefanie. *The Founding of Aesthetics in the German Enlightenment: The Art of Invention and the Invention of Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Budd, Malcolm. "The Acquaintance Principle." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 43:4 (2003), 386-392.

Carroll, Noël. *On Criticism*. New York and London: Routledge, 2009.

Cassirer, Ernst. *Freiheit und Form: Studien zur deutschen Geistesgeschichte*. Berlin: Cassirer, 1916.

---. *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951.

Cohen, Alix. "Kant on the Possibility of Ugliness." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 53:2 (2013), 199-209.

Cohen, Ted. "An Emendation in Kant's Theory of Taste." *Noûs* 24:1 (1990), 137-145.

Conolly, Oliver and Bashshar Haydar. "Aesthetic Principles." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 43:2 (2003), 114-125.

Crawford, Donald. *Kant's Aesthetic Theory*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974.

Danto, Arthur C. *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace: A Philosophy of Art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

---. " Mitchell Paints a Picture." *The Nation* 29 Aug 2002: http://www.thenation.com/article/mitchell-paints-picture/.

Danto, Arthur. "The Artworld." *The Journal of Philosophy* 61:19 (1964), 571-584.

Dutton, Denis. *The Art Instinct: Beauty, Pleasure, and Human Evolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Dyck, Corey W. "A Wolff in Kant's Clothing: Christian Wolff's Influence on Kant's Accounts of Consciousness, Self-Consciousness, and Psychology." *Philosophy Compass* 6:1 (2011), 44-53.

Gammon, Martin. "'Exemplary Originality': Kant on Genius and Imitation." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 35:4 (1997), 563-592.

---. "Parerga and Pulchritudo adhaerens: A Reading of the Third Moment of the 'Analytic of the Beautiful.'" *Kant-Studien* 90 (1999), 148–67.

Geach, Peter T. "Good and Evil." *Analysis* 17:2 (1956), 33-42.

Goldman, Alan H. "Aesthetic Qualities and Aesthetic Value." *The Journal of Philosophy* 87:1 (1990): 23-37.

Goldman, Alan. "Realism about Aesthetic Properties." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 51:1 (1993), 31-37.

Gombrich, Ernst Hans. *Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, vol. 5. 7th edition. London: Phaidon Press, 1984.

Goubet, Jean-François. "La Discussion entre Meier et Mendelssohn sur les beaux-arts et les belles-lettres." *Revue Germanique Internationale* [Online], 4 (2006): http://rgi.revues.org/147.

Gould, Timothy. "The Audience of Originality: Kant and Wordsworth on the Reception of Genius," in Ted Cohen and Paul Guyer, eds., *Essays in Kant's Aesthetics*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Gracyk, Theodore A. "Sublimity, Ugliness, and Formlessness in Kant's Aesthetic Theory." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 45:1 (1986), 49-56.

Guyer, Paul. "Free and Adherent Beauty: A Modest Proposal." *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 42 (2002), 357–66.

---. "Kant's Conception of Fine Art." *The Journal of Aesthetic and Art Criticism* 52:3 (1994), 275-285.

---. *A History of Modern Aesthetics*, vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

---. *Kant and Experience of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

---. *Kant and the Claims of Taste*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

---. *Values of Beauty: Historical Essays in Aesthetics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hammermeister, Kai. *The German Aesthetic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Hudson, Hud. "The Significance of an Analytic of the Ugly in Kant's Deduction of Pure Judgments of Taste," in Ralf Meerbote and Hud Hudson, eds., *Kant's Aesthetics*, North American Kant Society Studies in Philosophy, vol. 1. Atascadero: Ridgeview Publishing Co., 1991, 87-103.

Hume, David. "Of the Standard of Taste," in Eugene F Miller, ed., *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary*, Revised edition. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1987, 226-249.

Isenberg, Arnold. "Critical Communication." *The Philosophical Review* 58:4 (1949): 330-344.

Janaway, Christopher. "Beauty in Nature, Beauty in Art." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 33:4 (1993), 321-332.

Kant, Immanuel: *Gesammelte Schriften* Hrsg.: Bd. 1-22 Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Bd. 23 Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, ab Bd. 24 Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Berlin 1900ff.

---. *Anthropology, History, and Education*, eds. Gunter Zoller and Robert B. Louden, tr. Mary Gregor, Paul Guyer, Robert B. Louden, Holly Wilson, Allen W. Wood, Gunter Zoller and Arnulf Zweig. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

---. *Critique of Pure Reason*, eds. and tr. Paul Guyer and Allen Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

---. *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, ed. Paul Guyer, tr. Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

---. *Lectures on Anthropology*, eds. Allen W. Wood and Robert B. Louden, tr. Robert R. Clewis, Robert B. Louden, G. Felicitas Munzel, and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

---. *Lectures on Logic*, ed. and tr. J. Michael Young. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

---. *Lectures on Metaphysics*, ed. and tr. Karl Ameriks and Steve Naragon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

---. *Notes and Fragments*, ed. Paul Guyer, tr. Curtis Bowman, Paul Guyer and Frederick Rauscher. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

---. *Practical Philosophy*, ed. and tr. Mary Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Kaufman, Daniel. "Critical Justification and Critical Laws." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 43 (2003), 393-400.

Kirwin, Claire. "Why Sibley is (Probably) not a Particularist After All." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 51:2 (2011), 201-12.

Koller, Aaron M. "The Flower of Human Perfection: Moses Mendelssohn's Defense of Rationalist Aesthetics." Order No. 3478138 Syracuse University, 2011. Ann Arbor: *ProQuest*. Web. 1 Apr. 2014.

Korsmeyer, Carolyn. *Savoring Disgust: The Foul and the Fair in Aesthetics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. "The Modern System of the Arts: A Study in the History of Aesthetics (I)." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 12:4 (1951), 496-527.

---. "The Modern System of the Arts: A Study in the History of Aesthetics (II)." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 13:1 (1952), 17-46.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Philosophical Papers and Letters*, ed. and tr. Leroy E. Loemker. 2nd edition. Dordrecht-Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1969.

Levinson, Jerrold. "Aesthetic Properties, Evaluative Force, and Differences of Sensibility," in Emily Brandy and Jerrold Levinson, eds., *Aesthetic Concepts: Essays After Sibley*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Lopes, Dominic McIver. "Aesthetic Experts, Guides to Value." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 73:3 (2015), 235-246.

Lorand, Ruth. "Free and Dependent Beauty." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 29:1 (1989), 32-40.

Malaband, Philip. "Understanding Kant's Distinction between Free and Dependent Beauty." *Philosophical Quarterly* 52 (2002), 66-81.

Matherne, Samantha. "The Inclusive Interpretation of Kant's Aesthetic Ideas." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 53:1 (2013), 21-39.

McConnell, Sean. "How Kant might Explain Ugliness." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 48:2 (2008), 205-28.

Meagher, Michelle. "Jenny Saville and a Feminist Aesthetics of Disgust." *Hypatia* 18:4 (2003), 23-41.

Mendelssohn, Moses. *Philosophical Writings*, ed. and tr. Daniel O. Dahlstrom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Menke, Christoph. *Force: A Fundamental Concept of Aesthetic Anthropology*, tr. Gerrit Jackson. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012.

Mothersill, Mary. "Critical Reasons." *The Philosophical Quarterly* 11:42 (1961): 74-78.

---. *Beauty Restored*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Pettit, Philip. "The Possibility of Aesthetic Realism," in Eva Schaper, ed., *Pleasure, Preference and Value: Studies in Philosophical Aesthetics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, 17-38.

Rueger, Alexander. "Beautiful Surfaces: Kant on Free and Adherent Beauty in Nature and Art." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 16:3 (2008), 535-557.

---. "Enjoying the Unbeautiful: From Mendelssohn's Theory of 'Mixed Sentiments' to Kant's Aesthetic Judgments of Reflection." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 67:2 (2009), 181-189.

Savile, Anthony. *Kantian Aesthetics Pursued*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University, 1993.

Schaper, Eva. "Free and Dependent Beauty," originally published in *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses,* Teil 1: Kant-Studien-Sonderheft. Symposien, eds. Gerhard Funke and Joachim Kopper. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974, 247-262, and reprinted in *Studies in Kant's Aesthetics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1979, 78-98.

Schweizer, Hans Rudolf, and Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten. *Ästhetik als Philosophie der sinnlichen Erkenntnis: Eine Interpretation der <Aesthetica> A.G. Baumgartens mit teilweiser Wiedergabe des lateinischen Textes und deutscher Übersetzung*. Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe & Co, 1973.

Shapiro, Lisa (ed. and tr.). *The Correspondence between Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia and René Descartes*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Shelly, James. "Critical Compatibilism," in Matthew Kieran and Dominic McIver Lopes, eds., *Knowing Art: Essays in Aesthetics and Epistemology*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2007, 125-136.

Sibley, Frank. "Aesthetic and Nonaesthetic." *Philosophical Review* 74:2 (1965), 135-159.

---. "Aesthetic Concepts." *The Philosophical Review* 68:4 (1959), 421-450.

---. "General Criteria and Reasons in Aesthetics," in *Approach to Aesthetics: Collected Papers on Philosophical Aesthetics*, eds. John Benson, Betty Redfer and Jeremy Roxbee Cox. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001, 104-118.

---. "Inaugural Address: Particularity, Art and Evaluation." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume* 48 (1974), 1-21.

Tuna, Emine Hande. "A Kantian Hybrid Theory of Art Criticism: A Particularist Appeal to the Generalists." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* (forthcoming a).

---. "Why didn't Kant Think Highly of Music?," in *Natur und Freiheit: Akten des XII. Internationalen Kant-Kongresses 2015*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, forthcoming b.

Walsh, Dorothy. "Critical Reasons." *The Philosophical Review* 69:3 (1960), 386-393.

Walton, Kendall L. "Categories of Art." *The Philosophical Review* 79:3 (1970), 334-367.

Wenzel, Christian. "Kant Finds Nothing Ugly?" *British Journal of Aesthetics* 39:4 (1999), 416-22.

Wicks, Robert. "Dependent Beauty as the Appreciation of Teleological Style." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55 (1997), 387–400.

Wolff, Christian. "Von Geschichten der Baukunst: Vorrede von den Säulen-ordnungen zur gründlichen Anweisung zu der Civil-Baukunst nach den besten Römischen Antiquitäten," in *Kleine Schriften. Gesammelte Werke*, I, vol. 22, Halle, 1755. Reprint: Hildesheim, 1995.

---. *Entdeckung der wahren Ursache von der wunderbaren Vermehrung des Getreydes (1725) und Erläuterung der Entdeckung der wahren Ursache von der wunderbaren Vermehrung des Getreydes*. 2nd edition. Halle, 1725. Reprint in *Id*., *Gesammelte Werke,* I, vol. 24. Hildesheim, 2001.

---. *Philosophia prima sive ontologia methodo scientifica pertractata qua omnis cognitionis humanae principia continentur* [*Ontologia*]. Verona: Typis Dionysii Ramanzini Bibliopolae Apud S. Thomam, 1736.

---. *Preliminary Discourse on Philosophy in General* [*Preliminary Discourse*], tr. Richard J. Blackwell. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

---. *Psychologia empirica, methodo scientifica pertracta, qua ea, quae de anima humana indubia experientiae fide constant, continentur et ad solidam universae philosophiae practicae ac theologiae naturalis tractationem sternitur* [*Psychologia empirica*]. Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1738.

---. *Vernünftige Gedancken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt* [*German Metaphysics*]. Halle im Magdeburgischen: Renger, 1751.

Wollheim, Richard. *Art and Its Objects*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Zeccardi, Joe. "Rethinking Critical Communication." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 68:4 (2010), 367-377.

Zemach, Eddy. "Real Beauty." *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 16 (1991), 249-265.

Zuckert, Rachel. "Boring Beauty and Universal Morality: Kant on the Ideal of Beauty." *Inquiry* 48:2 (2005), 107-130.

---. "Is There Kantian Art Criticism?," in Stefano Bacin, Alfredo Ferrarin, Claudio La Rocca, and Margit Ruffing, eds., *Kant und die Philosophie in weltbürgerlicher Absicht. Akten des XI. Kant-Kongresses 2010*. Band 4. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2013, 343-356.

---. "Kant's Rationalist Aesthetics." *Kant Studien* 98:4 (2007a), 443-463.

---. *Kant on Beauty and Biology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007b.