

**Proceedings of the
European Society for Aesthetics**

Volume 9, 2017

Edited by Dan-Eugen Ratiu and Connell Vaughan

Published by the European Society for Aesthetics

esa

Proceedings of the European Society for Aesthetics

Founded in 2009 by Fabian Dorsch

Internet: <http://proceedings.eurosa.org>

Email: proceedings@eurosa.org

ISSN: 1664 – 5278

Editors

Dan-Eugen Ratiu (Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca)

Connell Vaughan (Dublin Institute of Technology)

Editorial Board

Zsolt Bátori (Budapest University of Technology and Economics)

Alessandro Bertinetto (University of Udine)

Matilde Carrasco Barranco (University of Murcia)

Daniel Martine Feige (Stuttgart State Academy of Fine Arts)

Francisca Pérez Carreño (University of Murcia)

Kalle Puolakka (University of Helsinki)

Isabelle Rieusset-Lemarié (University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne)

Karen Simecek (University of Warwick)

John Zeimbekis (University of Patras)

Publisher

The European Society for Aesthetics

Department of Philosophy

University of Fribourg

Avenue de l'Europe 20

1700 Fribourg

Switzerland

Internet: <http://www.eurosa.org>

Email: secretary@eurosa.org

Proceedings of the European Society for Aesthetics

Volume 9, 2017

Edited by Dan-Eugen Ratiu and Connell Vaughan

Table of Contents

Claire Anscomb <i>Does a Mechanistic Etiology Reduce Artistic Agency?...</i>	1
Emanuele Arielli <i>Aesthetic Opacity</i>	15
Zsolt Bátori <i>The Ineffability of Musical Content: Is Verbalisation in Principle Impossible?</i>	32
Marta Benenti <i>Expressive Experience and Imagination</i>	46
Pía Cordero <i>Towards an Aesthetics of Misalignment. Notes on Husserl's Structural Model of Aesthetic Consciousness</i>	73
Koray Değirmenci <i>Photographic Indexicality and Referentiality in the Digital Age</i>	89
Stefan Deines <i>On the Plurality of the Arts</i>	116
Laura Di Summa-Knoop <i>Aesthetics and Ethics: On the Power of Aesthetic Features</i>	128
Benjamin Evans <i>Beginning with Boredom: Jean-Baptiste Du Bos's Approach to the Arts</i>	147

Paul Giladi <i>Embodied Meaning and Art as Sense-Making: A Critique of Beiser's Interpretation of the 'End of Art Thesis'</i>	160
Lisa Giombini <i>Conserving the Original: Authenticity in Art Restoration</i>	183
Moran Godess Riccitelli <i>The Aesthetic Dimension of Moral Faith: On the Connection between Aesthetic Experience and the Moral Proof of God in Immanuel Kant's Third Critique</i>	202
Carlo Guareschi <i>Painting and Perception of Nature: Merleau-Ponty's Aesthetical Contribution to the Contemporary Debate on Nature</i>	219
Amelia Hruby <i>A Call to Freedom: Schiller's Aesthetic Dimension and the Objectification of Aesthetics</i>	234
Xiaoyan Hu <i>The Dialectic of Consciousness and Unconsciousness in Spontaneity of Genius: A Comparison between Classical Chinese Aesthetics and Kantian Ideas</i>	246
Einav Katan-Schmid <i>Dancing Metaphors; Creative Thinking within Bodily Movements</i>	275
Lev Kreft <i>All About Janez Janša</i>	291
Efi Kyprianidou <i>Empathy for the Depicted</i>	305
Stefano Marino <i>Ideas Pertaining to a Phenomenological Aesthetics of Fashion and Play : The Contribution of Eugen Fink</i>	333
Miloš Miladinov <i>Relation Between Education and Beauty in Plato's Philosophy</i>	362
Philip Mills <i>Perspectival Poetics: Poetry After Nietzsche and Wittgenstein</i>	375
Alain Patrick Olivier <i>Hegel's Last Lectures on Aesthetics in Berlin 1828/29 and the Contemporary Debates on the End of Art</i>	385

Michaela Ott	<i>'Afropolitanism' as an Example of Contemporary Aesthetics</i>	398
Levno Plato	<i>Kant's Ideal of Beauty: as the Symbol of the Morally Good and as a Source of Aesthetic Normativity</i>	412
Carlos Portales	<i>Dissonance and Subjective Dissent in Leibniz's Aesthetics</i>	438
Isabelle Rieusset-Lemarié	<i>Aesthetics as Politics: Kant's Heuristic Insights Beyond Rancière's Ambivalences</i>	453
Matthew Rowe	<i>The Artwork Process and the Theory Spectrum</i>	479
Salvador Rubio Marco	<i>The Cutting Effect: a Contribution to Moderate Contextualism in Aesthetics</i>	500
Marcello Ruta	<i>Horowitz Does Not Repeat Either! Free Improvisation, Repeatability and Normativity</i>	510
Lisa Katharin Schmalzried	<i>"All Grace is Beautiful, but not all that is Beautiful is Grace." A Critical Look at Schiller's View on Human Beauty</i>	533
Judith Siegmund	<i>Purposiveness and Sociality of Artistic Action in the Writings of John Dewey</i>	555
Janne Vanhanen	<i>An Aesthetics of Noise? On the Definition and Experience of Noise in a Musical Context</i>	566
Carlos Vara Sánchez	<i>The Temporality of Aesthetic Entrainment: an Interdisciplinary Approach to Gadamer's Concept of Tarrying</i>	580
Iris Vidmar	<i>A Portrait of the Artist as a Gifted Man: What Lies in the Mind of a Genius?</i>	591
Alberto Voltolini	<i>Contours, Attention and Illusion</i>	615

Weijia Wang	<i>Kant's Mathematical Sublime and Aesthetic Estimation of Extensive Magnitude</i>	629
Zhuofei Wang	<i>'Atmosphere' as a Core Concept of Weather Aesthetics</i>	654
Franziska Wildt	<i>The Book and its Cover — On the Recognition of Subject and Object in Arthur Danto's Theory of Art and Axel Honneth's Recognition Theory</i>	666
Jens Dam Ziska	<i>Pictorial Understanding</i>	694

Kant's Mathematical Sublime and Aesthetic Estimation of Extensive Magnitude

Weijia Wang¹

University of Leuven

ABSTRACT. A prevailing reading understands Kant's mathematical sublime as a twofold experience, in which we feel both displeasure in encountering sensibility's limitation and pleasure in revealing its supersensible vocation; but this reading cannot explain how, for Kant, all estimations of extensive magnitude are ultimately aesthetic. This paper argues that Kant considers the experience to be threefold: to facilitate an aesthetic estimation in general, the imagination is to reproduce a magnitude's parts successively and unify them simultaneously, such that it undergoes an inevitable tension between two time-conditions. Since the tension both hampers and signifies our partial attainment of an aim set by theoretical reason, we feel both pleasure and displeasure. When the tension becomes so great that it hinders the imagination's further achievement, the feeling is absolutely great, that is, mathematically sublime. Moreover, the imagination's failure to fully attain the cognitive aim reveals its supersensible vocation and strengthens our moral feeling, which is purposive from a practical perspective. Hence, I declare Kant's mathematical sublime to be a threefold aesthetic experience consisting of cognitive displeasure, cognitive pleasure, and practical pleasure. Meanwhile, against Kant, I argue that the judgment of the mathematical sublime is neither universal nor necessary.

1.

In the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, Kant characterizes the mathematical sublime as that which we judge to be absolutely great in an aesthetic estimation of extensive magnitude. For Kant, 'in the end all estimation of the magnitude of objects of nature is aesthetic', namely, only

¹ Email: weijia.wang@student.kuleuven.be

determinable by the feeling of pleasure and displeasure (2000, 5: 251)². When our imagination fails to comprehend certain magnitudes in one intuition, we estimate them as mathematically sublime through what Kant calls 'negative pleasure' (2000, 5: 245), namely, pleasure accompanied with displeasure. On such occasions, Kant maintains, sensibility's inadequacy reveals its 'vocation' for realizing ideas of reason, insofar as 'striving for them is nevertheless a law for us' (2000, 5: 257).

A prevailing reading understands Kant's notion of the experience of the mathematical sublime as *twofold*. For instance, Budd ascribes the displeasure to 'a manifest inability to cope with nature' and the pleasure to 'an aspect of ourselves that is superior to any aspect of nature' (2003, 122). In the same vein, Forsey writes: 'This incommensurability of our imagination with the totalizing demands of reason produces at first a displeasure in our experience of failure and then a subsequent pleasure that is aroused by ... our awareness of the superiority of our powers of reason.' (2007, 384)³

I think these commentators convincingly recognize that, for Kant, in judging the mathematical sublime, the mind feels displeasure in encountering our sensibility's limitation and pleasure in discovering our supersensible vocation. In spite of its merit, however, this approach is only able to explain feelings triggered by the imagination's failure. It cannot account for an aesthetic estimation of extensive magnitude *in general*, which presupposes a form of pleasure and displeasure that does *not* derive from a cognitive inadequacy. Unable to reconcile the two threads in Kant's writings, Recki claims an 'equivocation' (2001, 197)⁴ in Kant's assertion that *all* estimation of magnitude is ultimately aesthetic.

To solve this difficulty, this paper argues that Kant considers the experience of the mathematical sublime to be *threefold* and involving, in

² All references to Kant will provide year of translation, followed by *Akademie Ausgabe* volume (Kant 1902) and page number.

³ Similar remarks are made by Crowther (1989, 99–100; 2010, 178), Pries (1995, 51), Abici (2008, 240), Clewis (2009, 132), Deligiori (2014, 31–32), and Smith (2015, 109).

⁴ Citations from German texts in Recki (2001), Bartuschat (1972), Pries (1995), and Park (2009) are my translation.

addition to the cognitive displeasure and the practical pleasure, a certain kind of *cognitive pleasure*. Most commentators overlook this possibility, and Matthews hastily dismisses it (1996, 172). But as I shall show, although the imagination can never exhaustively fulfill the rational demand of comprehending the infinite, its *partial* attainment, however trivial, is always pleasurable. On the other hand, even when the imagination successfully comprehends a finite magnitude in one intuition, it is still hampered by an inevitable tension between the *successive* reproduction of the magnitude's parts and the *simultaneous* unification of these parts, which is displeasurable. Therefore, I take Kant to hold that in *all* aesthetic estimation of magnitude we feel negative pleasure in relation to a *cognitive aim*.

This remaining of this paper is divided into four sections: Section 2 analyzes Kant's account of the aesthetic estimation of extensive magnitude in general. Section 3 discusses the imagination's aesthetic comprehension and the tension thereof. We experience the sublime when this tension becomes so great that it hinders the imagination's further achievement. Section 4 argues that the imagination's partial attainment of a cognitive aim brings about negative pleasure. Yet, its failure to fully attain this aim reveals our supersensible vocation and strengthens our susceptibility to moral ideas, a susceptibility we are obliged to cultivate. Hence, Kant's notion of the aesthetic experience of the mathematical sublime is threefold and composed of cognitive displeasure, cognitive pleasure, and practical pleasure. Lastly, Section 5 contends that the judgment of the mathematical sublime is neither universal nor necessary.

2.

Immediately following his definition of the mathematical sublime as the '*absolutely great*', Kant distinguishes between 'to be a magnitude [*Größe*] (*quantitas*)' and 'to be great [*groß*] (*magnitudo*)' (2000, 5: 248). The Latin terms indicate his distinction between possessing a certain quantity and being superior in terms of quantity. For instance, both a mansion and a cottage are 'magnitudes' with measurable sizes, while the house is 'greater' in size.

For Kant, we cognize something to be a ‘magnitude [*Größe*]’ from the thing itself, insofar as we regard a magnitude as a ‘unity’ constituted by a ‘multitude of homogeneous elements’ (2000, 5: 248). I understand the magnitude in question as an *extensive* magnitude, in which ‘the representation of the parts makes possible the representation of the whole’ (Kant 1998, A162/B203). In the *Critique of Pure Reason* Kant describes a threefold synthesis that is essential for cognition of objects: firstly, the imagination ‘apprehends’ the impressions of an object’s parts successively in the intuition; secondly, the imagination ‘reproduces’ the multitude of impressions altogether as one unity, which possesses an extensive magnitude; and thirdly, the understanding ‘recognizes’ the unity of the reproduced impressions under a concept (2000, A98–A110). The threefold synthesis grounds the ‘axioms of intuition’, that is, ‘all intuitions are extensive magnitudes’ (Kant 1998, A161/B202).

Kant then distinguishes between two methods for estimating a magnitude ‘to be great’: we can estimate the magnitude *logically* by comparing it with an objective measure, namely, its own part or another magnitude. For instance, we estimate a building as five times higher than each story it contains, while the latter is two times higher than an average human being. But in this way, a greater magnitude is always possible, such that we can never obtain the mathematical sublime. And so, Kant introduces the second kind of estimation as follows:

Now if I simply say that something is great, it seems that I do not have in mind any comparison at all, at least not with any objective measure, since it is not thereby determined at all how great the object is. However, even though the standard for comparison is merely subjective, the judgment nonetheless lays claim to universal assent ... (2000, 5: 248)

A few lines later, Kant specifies the ‘mere subjective’ standard in question as only usable for an ‘aesthetic’ judging of magnitude (2000, 5: 249). In the third *Critique*, the determining ground of an ‘aesthetic’ judgment ‘cannot be other than subjective’ (2000, 5: 203), and this subjective ground ‘lies in a sensation that is immediately connected with the feeling of pleasure and

displeasure' (2000, 20: 224). Hence, by 'simply saying' Kant refers to an *aesthetic* estimation of extensive magnitude through the *feeling* of (dis)pleasure.

To estimate something logically by comparing it with some objective measure, we would determine and cognize how great it is. An objective sensation, such as the representation of something's color or sound in senses, constitutes our knowledge of this object. By contrast, Kant declares the feeling of (dis)pleasure to be 'merely subjective' sensation (2000, 20: 224), which '*cannot become an element of cognition at all*', and which only signifies an object's relation to the subject (2000, 5: 189). For instance, it is one thing that I taste the sweetness of some sugar by tongue, but quite another that I enjoy this sensation; for through the enjoyment I cognize nothing about the sugar itself. It follows Kant's statement that

in a judgment by which something is described simply [*schlechtweg*]⁵ as great it is not merely said that the object has a magnitude, but rather this is attributed to it to a superior extent than to many others of the same kind⁶, yet without this superiority being given determinately ... (2000, 5: 249)

This convoluted sentence might seem bewildering, but Kant is actually being very cautious in his phrasing. On my reading, we take three steps to estimate something simply as great: firstly, we represent the object as having an extensive magnitude (i.e., as a multitude of units) and feel some sort of (dis)pleasure thereof. Secondly, we compare the degree of this *feeling* in representing this object with something else as its measure,

⁵ Pluhar mistranslates the '*schlechtweg*' as 'absolutely'. He probably conflates it with '*schlechthin*' (i.e., 'absolutely') which repeatedly appears in the same section. This misleads Goodreau's reading (Goodreau 1998, 137).

⁶ The original text: '*sondern diese [einen Größe] ihm [dem Gegenstand] zugleich vorzugsweise vor vielen anderen gleicher Art beigelegt wird*'. Pluhar translates '*vorzugsweise*' as 'superior', i.e., 'we also imply that this magnitude is superior to that of many other objects of the same kind'. However, since '*vorzugsweise*' is an adverb rather than an adjective, it obviously modifies the verb 'attribute' rather than the noun 'magnitude'. Guyer and Matthews' translation is correct, i.e., we attribute this (magnitude) to the object *superiorly* or 'to a superior extent'. As I am to discuss, Allison adopts Pluhar's translation (Allison 2001, xiv) and might be misled.

namely the degrees of feelings in representing many other objects of the same kind. Thirdly, we represent the first object *superiorly*, that is, when we represent it as having a magnitude, we ascribe to it a *superior feeling* thereof. However, what we estimate and compare are only degrees of feelings; hence what is superior is indeed the degree of (dis)pleasure in representing the object's magnitude rather than the magnitude itself. It would be a subreption to mistake the superiority in the subject's feeling as a characteristic of the object, even though the former is related to the latter (much as my satisfaction in sugar is related to its sweetness).

The above is the key to understanding Kant's theory of the aesthetic estimation of extensive magnitude. Yet many commentators fail to grasp the subtlety fully. For instance, Allison contends that when characterizing something simply as great, we are implying that 'its magnitude is greater than that of many other objects of the same kind, even though this superiority is not assigned a determinate numerical value' (2001, 312); put differently, we compare the magnitude of the *object* to that of its kindred ones but without mathematical precision. Crowther (1989, 88), Park (2009, 133), and Smith (2015, 102) hold similar readings.

However, as I see it, to follow this approach, we would estimate with objective measures (i.e., magnitudes of other objects) rather than subjective ones (i.e., feelings in representing other magnitudes). As a result, we would effectively determine whether an object's magnitude is superior or inferior to a certain measure, although the extent of this superiority would be vague or indeterminate. By contrast, on my reading, to simply say that something is great, we should not in the last cognize its magnitude.

To illustrate: when we represent the average magnitude of most buildings under normal circumstances, we feel some (dis)pleasure; then, when we represent the magnitude of the Eiffel Tower from an aircraft at high altitude, we also feel some (dis)pleasure, which might be inferior to the former in terms of degree. Now, by comparing these two degrees of feelings, we describe the tower simply (i.e., aesthetically) as small. In other words, we attribute our representation of the tower's magnitude to this magnitude inferiorly, insofar as the representation is accompanied with a feeling of an inferior degree. Yet, even a child can estimate vaguely, without

precise numerical value, that the tower is objectively much higher than most buildings. To simply call something great, we only represent its magnitude with a superior feeling; we do not determine the magnitude itself insofar as we do not directly compare it with another magnitude. The subjective superiority in the aesthetic estimation should be strictly distinguished from the objective superiority in the logical estimation.

On the other hand, I agree with Allison's interpretation of the simply-said great as a kind of 'proto- or quasi-sublime' (2001, 312). As I see it, we estimate a magnitude simply or aesthetically to be great, insofar as the feeling in its representation is superior in degree; and we estimate a magnitude aesthetically to be *absolutely* great or *sublime*, insofar as the feeling is not just superior but indeed *absolutely* superior. It is remarkable that Kant characterizes the feeling in the simply-said great with exactly the same terms when he does the mathematical sublime: 'no interest at all', 'universally communicable', and 'a consciousness of a subjective purposiveness in the use of our cognitive faculties' (2000, 5: 249; cf., 5: 247). As Pries points out, Kant 'already refers this aesthetic estimation to the sublime' and 'hereby speaks of the aesthetic estimation of magnitude *in general*' (1995, 47). The mathematical sublime, namely the simply-said *absolutely* great, is only a special case of the simply-said great in general.

Hence, we must feel some form of (dis)pleasure that facilitates all aesthetic estimation of magnitude in general, where our imagination may or may not fail in representing a magnitude. And so, this feeling cannot be explained by displeasure in encountering sensibility's inadequacy or pleasure in revealing our supersensible vocation; on the contrary, the former grounds the latter. In the next section, I shall explain the mental operation that brings about the former feeling.

3.

According to Kant, a logical estimation of magnitude presupposes an objective measure, but the estimation of the measure requires even another measure, and so on and so forth; it follows that, ultimately, the basic measure must be obtained in an aesthetic representation (2000, 5: 251). Kant

distinguishes between two actions in the aesthetic representation, namely, the imagination's 'apprehension (*apprehensio*)' and its 'comprehension (*comprehensio aesthetica*)' (2000, 5: 251).

The notion of 'comprehension' here, as an action of the imagination, might seem problematic; for Kant also defines comprehension as 'the synthetic unity of the consciousness of this manifold [of intuition] in the concept of an object (*apperceptio comprehensiva*)', which requires not only the imagination but also the 'understanding' (2000, 20: 220). But we should notice that Kant specifies the comprehension in the aesthetic estimation as '*comprehensio aesthetica*', while he claims that the mathematical or logical estimation of magnitude involves '*comprehensio logica*' (2000, 5: 254). As I see it, in apprehension (*Auffassung*) the mind 'seizes on' a multitude of impressions or elements of intuition, and by comprehension (*Zusammenfassung*) it further 'takes' them 'altogether'. Therefore, I interpret comprehension in general as a higher stage of synthesis than apprehension: it is either '*aesthetica*' and corresponds to the imagination's reproduction of apprehended elements⁷, or '*logica*' and corresponds to the understanding's recognition of the reproduced elements under a concept.

Kant claims that, while the imagination's apprehension may advance till infinity, its aesthetic comprehension becomes more and more difficult (2000, 5: 251–252). He elaborates this mental operation in a very dense, yet kernel text:

The measurement of a space (as apprehension) is at the same time the description of it, thus an objective movement in the imagination and a progression; by contrast, the comprehension of multiplicity in the unity not of thought but of intuition, hence the comprehension in one moment of that which is successively apprehended, is a regression, which in turn cancels the time-condition in the progression of the imagination and makes *simultaneity* intuitable. It is thus (since temporal sequence [*Zeitfolge*])⁸ is a condition of inner sense and of an

⁷ Strictly speaking, the imagination's aesthetic comprehension only refers to its reproduction *without schemata*, which I shall detail in this section later.

⁸ With my rendition of '*Zeitfolge*' as 'temporal sequence'. Guyer and Matthews translate this term as 'temporal succession', which is not wrong but might mislead the

intuition) a subjective movement of the imagination, by which it does violence to the inner sense, which must be all the more marked the greater the quantum is which the imagination comprehends in one intuition. (2000, 5: 259)

On my interpretation, Kant's reasoning consists of four steps.

Firstly, apprehension is successive.

For Kant, to apprehend a manifold of intuition, we must 'distinguish the time in the succession of impressions on one another' (1998, A99).⁹ The distinction of time is necessary not because the existence of the impressions are objectively successive, but because, to regard them as individual elements, we must apprehend them one by one in different moments. To illustrate: in observing a house, I may first take notice of the door, then the window, and lastly the roof. Even though I may eventually recognize these elements as objectively coexistent, I must apprehend them successively in the first place; otherwise I would only obtain *one* impression of the whole house rather than a *multitude* of impressions of its parts. The imagination's apprehension always relies on this temporal condition, even though the lapses between successive moments could be minimal (provided that the moments are still distinguishable).

Secondly, comprehension is regressive and successive.

Since the 'comprehension' in question concerns not 'thought' but only 'intuition', I take it as the imagination's aesthetic comprehension (*comprehensio aesthetica*) or its reproduction, which is a 'regression'.

According to the first *Critique*, a 'regressive' synthesis proceeds from the conditioned towards more and more remote conditions, while a

reader to associate it with the 'successively apprehended [*Sukzessiv-Aufgefaßten*]' in the same paragraph.

⁹ Interpretation of this sentence remains controversial. I hereby follow Longuenesse's reading that 'The temporality we are dealing with here is generated by the very act of apprehending the manifold' (1998, 37); in other words, the temporal distinction precedes and facilitates the consciousness of the manifoldness in an intuition. Allison argues differently and states that the mind distinguishes the time because 'impressions, qua modifications of inner sense, are given successively' (2015, 109); accordingly, the manifoldness would precede and condition the temporal distinction. But it is safe to say that both commentators consider the apprehension of manifoldness to be *successive*.

'progressive' synthesis proceeds in the opposite direction (Kant 1998, A411/B438). For Kant, space contains 'no difference between progress and regress', as its parts coexist and constitute an '*aggregate*' rather than a '*series*'; however, since each further spatial part is 'the *condition of the boundaries*' of previous ones, 'the *measurement* of a space is to be regarded as a synthesis of a series of conditions for a given conditioned' (1998, A412/B439). Hence, to apprehend the individual parts of an object is also to apprehend the spaces they occupy and to measure a space, which is a progression from conditions to the conditioned. For example, in measuring the space occupied by the house, our imagination apprehends the door, the window, and then the roof *progressively* in three successive moments.

On this basis, we reproduce the apprehended impressions and their corresponding spatial parts in a *reverse* order, as we always start from the impression we are now apprehending, to the one just apprehended, and then to another one apprehended even earlier, and so on and so forth. In this way, the imagination reproduces the roof, the window, and lastly the door *regressively* in three successive moments. The successiveness applies to both stages of synthesis: the longer the progressive apprehension takes, the longer the regressive reproduction or comprehension.¹⁰

Thirdly, the aesthetic comprehension, *qua* regressive and successive reproduction, is nevertheless simultaneous.

The imagination aims to comprehend the apprehended elements simultaneously as one unity. On my reading, this simultaneity does not conflict with the successive apprehension, for comprehension is a higher stage of synthesis than apprehension. But the simultaneity indeed conflicts with or 'cancels' the successive *time-condition* underlying both the progression and the regression. Put differently, we are to reproduce individual elements regressively *one after another* while comprehending them altogether *in one intuition*, which means a tension between the two time-conditions. Since all our representations ('as the modifications of the mind') belong to inner sense (Kant 1998, A98), the form of which is time (Kant 1998, A33/B49), the tension in the aesthetic comprehension does

¹⁰ Kant mentions of 'successive regress [*sukzessiven Regressus*]' several times in the first *Critique*, e.g., 1998, A486/B514, A501/B529, A506/B534.

‘violence’ to the condition of inner sense.¹¹

One might find such a ‘temporal tension’ counterintuitive, as it seems very natural for us to comprehend several elements simultaneously without perceiving any succession. For example, once we apprehend three colors in a flag, we seem to comprehend them in mind discriminately and instantly without any noticeable tension. This leads to:

Fourthly and lastly, the tension intensifies only gradually when we comprehend more and more units in one intuition.

The tension is ‘all the more marked’ when the quantum is aesthetically ‘greater’. In the flag example, in fact, the imagination must recollect the three colors in three different moments, which means a succession of events in a succession of moments. And yet, we may take them as one moment insofar as the succession is almost undiscernible. Just as we may neglect this tension when it is minimal, we are able to perceive yet tolerate it to some extent, which makes cognition possible in the first place; for otherwise we would be unable to comprehend even two elements. Nevertheless, when the imagination takes a significant time to apprehend progressively (as in apprehending ten colors), it must also take an equally significant time to reproduce regressively, which conflicts with its task of simultaneous comprehension. The analysis sheds light on Kant’s statement that

when apprehension has gone so far that the partial representations of the intuition of the senses that were apprehended first already begin to fade in the imagination as the latter proceeds on to the apprehension of further ones, then it loses on one side as much as it gains on the other, and there is in the comprehension a greatest point beyond which it

¹¹ On Smith’s reading, when the mind fails to take up the intuition ‘simultaneously’, our imagination as ‘temporally progressive’ finds itself to be ‘opened’, such that it will ‘advance towards infinity’ (2015, 114). I consider this interpretation untenable in two respects. Firstly and obviously, Kant explicitly states that there is ‘no difficulty with apprehension, because it can go on to infinity’ (2000, 5: 251–252), so the imagination’s progressive apprehension does not need to be ‘opened’ at all. Secondly, since apprehension and reproduction are two distinct stages in the ‘threefold synthesis’, the imagination’s successive progression is neither canceled nor ‘opened’ by its simultaneous (and yet successive) regression.

cannot go. (2000, 5: 252)

As discussed, the successive time-condition in the imagination's apprehension also applies to its simultaneous comprehension. Therefore, the more representations (i.e., impressions) the progressive apprehension obtains, the greater tension the regressive comprehension undergoes. Suppose the imagination already yields its maximal capacity and becomes incompetent to regress any further or to reproduce any more 'representations of the intuition', the representations 'apprehended first' must remain unreproduced and begin to 'fade'. In the first *Critique*, Kant also writes that 'if I were always to lose the preceding representations ... from thoughts and not reproduce them when I proceed to the following ones, then no whole representation ... could ever arise' (1998, A102). When the imagination reaches a 'greatest point', it comprehends and 'gains' a newly apprehended impression on one side but fails to reproduce and thus 'loses' a previously apprehended impression on the other. In this case, the temporal tension is absolutely great, which presumably brings about an absolutely great feeling and an experience of the mathematical sublime. The exact nature of this feeling and this experience, however, will be discussed in the next section.

For instance, in the aesthetic comprehension of an Egyptian Pyramid, suppose the imagination is only capable of reproducing nine impressions of stone tiers, then, once the mind apprehends the tenth tier in the Pyramid, it can only reproduce regressively from the tenth to the second tier, while the tier apprehended first begins to fade in the intuition; for otherwise the mind would have to reproduce ten impressions *successively* and also *simultaneously* in one intuition, and the tension would be too great. Consequently, the imagination fails to represent the complete form of the Pyramid. Indeed, the mathematical sublime is to be found in the formlessness and 'limitlessness' of things (Kant 2000, 5: 244).¹²

¹² Against Allison (2001, 312), Park argues that the simply great cannot be a prototype of the mathematical sublime, because in judging an object simply as great 'the imagination can apprehend its form, especially its extended shape' (2009, 134). I disagree. In my view, even when the imagination comprehends an object's entire form in one intuition, we still perceive a temporal tension or 'violence to the inner sense', which, as I shall detail, brings about negative pleasure. When the imagination fails to overcome the

On the other hand, Kant considers the tension to be relieved in a *logical* comprehension, where the imagination provides schemata for the understanding's numerical concepts (2000, 5: 253). Kant defines a schema as the 'representation of a general procedure of the imagination for providing a concept with its image' (1998, A140/B179). In accordance with a concept, a schema describes the method or rule for presenting images. The schema of magnitude is number, namely 'a representation that summarizes the successive addition of one (homogeneous) unit to another' (1998, A142/B182). For example, the schema of number ten does not refer to any particular image, such as ten dots on paper or ten people in room; it only describes the method of successive addition of homogeneous elements for ten times. The understanding's concept of ten guides the imagination to produce this schema, regardless of what particular impressions should realize the ten elements in an image.

Therefore, to comprehend the Pyramid logically, the imagination still apprehends the tiers successively but ascribes them to a numerical concept rather than intuitions. In other words, when the imagination counts the tenth tier, it comprehends it along with the *schema* of number nine (which corresponds to the *concept* of nine) and thus brings only two elements (namely the tenth tier and the schema) into a unity, which is then the schema of number ten and referred to the concept of ten. The reproduction of merely two elements is hardly challenging. Relying on schemata and concepts, the imagination is barely enlarged, whatever great number it counts. It follows Kant's claim that the logical comprehension can proceed 'unhindered to infinity' (2000, 5: 254). By contrast, the aesthetic comprehension is 'not of thought but of intuition', in which case the imagination reproduces the tenth tier and the *intuitions* of the previous nine through ten moments, yet also in one moment.

Insofar as 'all intuitions are extensive magnitudes', I propose that the

tension, then, we estimate a magnitude simply or aesthetically as sublime. As Kant puts it, in simply saying that an object is great, we feel satisfaction 'even if it is considered as formless' (2000, 5: 249), which means we do *not necessarily* consider this object as formless. Therefore, the judging of the mathematical sublime (where we are not able to represent an object's form) is a special case of the aesthetic estimation in general (where we may or may not be able to represent a form).

imagination's tension, although not always noticeable, is inevitable in all cognition of objects. Kant implies the two conflicting time-conditions in the Transcendental Deduction in the first *Critique*, as he writes, we add the units to each other 'successively' so they hover before our senses 'now', that is, simultaneously (1998, A103).¹³ The stakes involved in Kant's theory of aesthetic comprehension are high indeed, as they amount to Kant's introduction of a temporal tension into the synthesis of reproduction and his tacit development of the Transcendental Deduction in the first *Critique*.

In the next section, I shall show how a maximal tension brings about a threefold aesthetic experience that is the mathematical sublime.

4.

On the aesthetic comprehension of magnitude, Kant writes:

But now the mind hears in itself the voice of reason, which requires totality for all given magnitudes, even for those that can never be entirely apprehended although they are (in the sensible representation) judged as entirely given, hence comprehension in *one* intuition, and it demands a *presentation* for all members of a progressively increasing numerical series, and does not exempt from this requirement even the infinite (space and past time), but rather makes it unavoidable for us to think of it (in the judgment of common reason) as *given entirely* (in its totality). (2000, 5: 254)

As I see it, Kant's discussion here consists of three steps.

Firstly, reason demands the 'presentation' or aesthetic comprehension of the absolute *totality* of all given magnitudes.

For Kant, reason's ideas give the understanding's concepts 'that unity which they can have in their greatest possible extension, i.e., in relation to the totality of series' (1998, A643/B671). The totality of all

¹³ This disproves Maakreel's reading, which takes the 'violence to inner sense' to be occasioned 'in an unexpected reversal' of the imagination's normal operation (1994, 73). Moreover, Maakreel's approach cannot explain Kant's assertion 'in the end all estimation of the magnitude of objects of nature is aesthetic' (2000, 5: 250).

appearances would have an extensive magnitude that comprises an infinite multitude of units.¹⁴ Since this multitude cannot be entirely given in our intuition, it is only an object of an idea. Nevertheless, Kant ascribes to this idea a 'necessary regulative use' in directing our understanding to a cognitive 'goal' (1998, A644/B672). The mind hears this 'voice of reason' and aims to present the idea, that is, to apprehend and then comprehend all units of this series aesthetically 'in one intuition'.

While Matthews acknowledges the idea's regulative use, she claims that 'the imagination's attempt to illustrate an idea of reason is illegitimate' (1996, 172) and that to 'apply' the idea of an absolute totality of the infinite to appearances is a 'transcendental illusion: natural, but also illegitimate' (1996, 179). In my view, what would be illegitimate is the imagination's pretension to a *complete* illustration or presentation of the infinite. But in the aesthetic comprehension we do not use this idea constitutively or 'apply' it determinatively to appearances; rather, the imagination only *strives* to illustrate the idea and advances as far as possible. Now that the idea effectively guides the imagination's endeavor, the regulation is not illusionary but with indeterminative 'objective reality' (Kant 1998, A665/B693). For Kant, insofar as our cognition is directed to 'the totality of series', the 'vocation' of our imagination consists exactly in its attempt at 'adequately realizing that idea as a law' (2000, 5: 257).

Secondly, reason demands aesthetic comprehension of *any* given magnitude.

Since any finite magnitude is considered as a part of the infinite totality, the imagination's aesthetic comprehension of any given magnitude must be considered as *partial attainment* of its ultimate goal in comprehending the totality. In this endeavor, the imagination undergoes a temporal tension, which hampers its further attainment, but which also signifies how far it does attain the ultimate aim (though always partially). For Kant, 'the attainment of every aim is combined with the feeling of pleasure' (2000, 5: 187); accordingly, the hampering of such attainment

¹⁴ According to Kant's resolution of the First Antinomy in the first *Critique*, whether the world is infinite or bounded is unknowable (1998, A520/B548). But I shall follow Kant's identification of 'absolute totality' with 'infinity' in the third *Critique*.

should be combined with displeasure. Therefore, the tension brings about both *pleasure* and *displeasure* in relation to a goal set by theoretical reason, namely, a form of *cognitive* negative pleasure. The more units the imagination comprehends aesthetically, the closer it approximates the full attainment of the ultimate goal, but the more 'violence' it does to the inner sense, and so, the more negative pleasure we feel. By contrast, in a logical comprehension, whatever great number is at stake, the imagination comprehends in each time merely two units in one intuition (be it '1 + 1 = 2' or '99 + 1 = 100') and achieves barely nothing with regard to reason's demand of the aesthetic comprehension of the infinite.

Matthews contends that since the imagination is inadequate to illustrate the infinite, 'If we were merely attempting to meet a demand of theoretical reason, this state would be simply displeasurable' (1996, 172). Her reasoning seems to be syllogistic: (1) Pleasure presupposes attainment of some aim. (2) The imagination cannot possibly attain the ultimate aim set by theoretical reason. (3) Therefore, no pleasure from the theoretical point of view. But I find the minor premise untenable. For sure, the imagination never attains the cognitive aim to the full extent, but it does so to *some* extent. Even when it fails to entirely comprehend a given magnitude (let alone the infinite), it still *succeeds* in comprehending a significant multitude of units, and this partial achievement brings about noticeable negative pleasure.

My interpretation finds more textual support in Kant's assertion that the aesthetic comprehension, as a 'kind of representation [*Vorstellungsart*]'¹⁵, is 'subjectively considered ... contrapurposive', but 'objectively, for the estimation of magnitudes ... necessary, hence purposive' (2000, 5: 259). For Kant, we call something 'purposive' insofar as we can only conceive its possibility by assuming 'as its ground a causality in accordance with ends, i.e., a will that has arranged it so in accordance with the representation of a certain rule' (2000, 5: 220); for instance, a regular hexagon drawn in the sand in an apparently uninhabited land is purposive (2000, 5: 370). On my reading, we call the aesthetic

¹⁵ With my correction of Guyer and Matthews' erroneous translation of '*Vorstellungsart*' as 'kind of apprehension'.

comprehension of a given magnitude 'purposive' because, to explain why this kind of representation can be so compatible with the cognitive aim, we must conceive it to be 'arranged' or designed according to the concept of this aim. But the aesthetic comprehension is also 'contrapurposive' in terms of how a tension hampers the aim's realization – as if the mental operation is *not* arranged accordingly. In relation to the demand by theoretical reason, the feeling of this purposiveness accompanied with contrapurposiveness (which we may call 'negative purposiveness') is a cognitive kind of negative pleasure. This explains Kant's assertion that, when we judge something simply as great, its 'mere magnitude' brings about a satisfaction 'not ... in the object' but 'rather in the enlargement of the imagination itself' (2000, 5: 249); for what we find negatively purposive is the operation of our own sensibility.

Pries considers Kant's assertion of 'objectively, for the estimation of magnitudes ... purposive' to be 'more than unclear' and argues that this objective purposiveness cannot possibly mean the purposiveness in the sublime, which is 'in any case only subjective' (1995, 49). But I suggest we read Kant's assertion in its context. In the very same paragraph Kant describes the imagination's apprehension of a space as 'an objective movement' (2000, 5: 258), namely, a movement in relation to *objects* in space. Thus the aesthetic comprehension is 'objectively ... purposive' for the aesthetic estimation of the magnitude of *objects*. Meanwhile, the judgment of the mathematical sublime, *qua* aesthetic and *non-conceptual* judgment, represents 'subjective' purposiveness. Therefore, in both the aesthetic comprehension and the judging of the sublime, the purposiveness is 'objective' (in terms of its relation to objects) as well as 'subjective' (in terms of its non-conceptual representation). The aesthetic comprehension gives rise to negative pleasure, which facilitates the aesthetic estimation of extensive magnitude in general and thus of the mathematical sublime.

My interpretation clarifies Kant's statement that 'in the end all estimation of the magnitude of objects of nature is aesthetic (i.e., subjectively and not objectively determined)' (2000, 5: 251). Recki considers it 'unintelligible' that a satisfaction should accompany 'each subjective determination' (2001, 196–197). And so, on Recki's reading,

Kant commits an 'equivocation' by conflating the concept of 'subjective', which refers to intuition and imagination, with the specific concept of 'aesthetic', which refers to a non-conceptual susceptibility (2001, 197). But in my view, a 'subjective' determination is no other than an 'aesthetic' estimation, by which we call something simply great or small according to a mere feeling. As I have shown, an aesthetic comprehension always attains the cognitive aim to some extent and always brings about the feeling of negative pleasure, however trivial it is. Therefore, *all* magnitudes can be estimated aesthetically, *namely*, subjectively; Kant's assertion makes perfect sense and contains no 'equivocation'.

Thirdly and lastly, when our imagination fails to comprehend a certain finite magnitude aesthetically, we 'judge' or 'think of' the infinite as 'given entirely'.

As I see it, on the one hand, we may conceive that, if the *infinite* were given in our sensibility, its aesthetic comprehension would yield a feeling of negative pleasure that is *absolutely great* in degree. On the other hand, in the aesthetic comprehension of a certain *finite* magnitude, our imagination may encounter an inadequacy or 'greatest point' due to the temporal tension, such that it cannot proceed any further; on this occasion, the tension it undergoes must be maximal, and the negative pleasure we feel must be *absolutely great*. Hence, when we compare the feeling in comprehending the finite magnitude with the supposed feeling in comprehending the infinite, we consider them equivalent in degree; and so, in an aesthetic estimation, we describe the finite magnitude to the same 'superior extent' as we would describe the infinite.

In this case, we 'think of' the infinite as entirely given, while what is actually given is only the maximal subjective feeling (i.e., the absolutely great negative pleasure) rather than the maximal objective magnitude (i.e., the infinite). In other words, while the infinite 'can never be entirely apprehended', it is 'in the sensible representation', that is, in the aesthetic comprehension of the finite magnitude, 'judged as entirely given'. Strictly speaking, what is mathematically sublime in the aesthetic comprehension is only the maximal feeling rather than the infinite (which is absolutely great but never given), let alone the finite magnitude (which is given but never

absolutely great in itself).¹⁶

In short, Kant grounds the judgment of the mathematical sublime on the aesthetic estimation of extensive magnitude and the feeling of negative pleasure, which expresses the negative purposiveness in an aesthetic comprehension and in relation to a *cognitive* goal. Nevertheless, Kant also ascribes a kind of *practical* purposiveness to the judgment:

Thus the inner perception of the inadequacy of any sensible standard for the estimation of magnitude by reason corresponds with reason's laws, and is a displeasure that arouses the feeling of our supersensible vocation in us, in accordance with which it is purposive and thus a pleasure to find every standard of sensibility inadequate for the ideas of understanding. (2000, 5: 258)

The 'magnitude by reason' refers to the idea of infinity. In judging the mathematical sublime, we think of the infinite as 'given in sensible representation' and regard the imagination's failure as an unsuccessful attempt to comprehend the infinite. Since 'striving' for ideas of reason is 'a law for us', the imagination's inadequacy for presenting the idea of infinity and by extension ideas *in general* is a mental disposition that 'corresponds with reason's laws'; and so, sensibility's inadequacy reveals its 'supersensible vocation', namely, its determination by reason for 'adequately realizing' ideas (Kant 2000, 5: 257). Now that we also strive to realize practical ideas in the sensible world, Kant describes this disposition as akin or compatible with 'that which the influence of determinate (practical) ideas on feeling would produce' (2000, 5: 256). As Allison points out, the feeling of the superiority of theoretical reason to sensibility 'serves as a reminder' of a similar superiority of practical reason and thus of our moral autonomy (2001, 326).

On my reading, in view of this kinship, the disposition in judging the

¹⁶ Shaper comments: 'Perhaps Kant's struggle to locate the sublime in that which occasions the feeling *and* in the feeling itself can be seen as indicative of a deeper ambiguity.' (1992, 384) This 'ambiguity' is now clarified: Kant locates the sublime only in the feeling, for that which occasions the feeling is a *finite* magnitude; such a magnitude is not absolutely great in itself but only *aesthetically* so, that is, in terms of the absolute great *feeling* in its representation.

sublime indirectly strengthens our susceptibility to practical ideas, a capacity which Kant calls 'moral feeling' or 'the susceptibility to feel pleasure or displeasure merely from being aware that our actions are consistent with or contrary to law of duty' (1996, 6: 399). Moreover, for Kant, it is an 'obligation' to '*cultivate*' and to 'strengthen' the moral feeling (1996, 6: 399–400). Therefore, the disposition is not just suitable but indeed 'purposive' for a practical end. Any achievement with regard to this end, however indirect, must be combined with pleasure.

Here lies an answer to Guyer's question of whether the sublime experience is 'a single but complex feeling which is both displeasurable yet pleasurable', or 'a succession of simple feelings which begins with displeasure but must end in pleasure' (1996, 211).¹⁷ I have shown that there is more to Kant's mathematical sublime than meets the eye: in the aesthetic comprehension, the imagination undergoes a temporal tension that is both displeasurable and pleasurable. This complex feeling *grounds* an aesthetic estimation in general, such that we can judge any extensive magnitude aesthetically (i.e., simply, subjectively) to be small, great, or even sublime. It is only then, another kind of pleasure *results from* a judgment of the mathematical sublime, insofar as the revelation of our supersensible vocation is purposive for the cultivation of the moral feeling, that is, for a practical end.

Hence, I declare Kant's notion of the experience of the mathematical sublime to be *threefold*: it begins with the complex feeling of *cognitive displeasure* and *cognitive pleasure*, and it ends in the simple feeling of *practical pleasure*. Kant indicates the three feelings altogether in a string of characterizations of the judging of the sublime as 'subjectively considered, contrapurposive', but 'objectively, for the estimation of magnitude ... necessary, hence purposive', and then 'purposive *for the whole vocation* of the mind' (2000, 5: 259). It is truly remarkable that we can estimate all extensive magnitudes according to mere feelings, whose degrees range from negligible to absolutely great. Highlighting the cognitive negative pleasure,

¹⁷ Guyer poses a similar question in an earlier paper, where he considers Kant's characterization of the complexity in the negative pleasure to be 'unstable' (1982, 763–764).

my approach elucidates Kant's account of the aesthetic estimation of extensive magnitude in general and fills a lacuna in the prevailing reading of his mathematical sublime.

5.

Thus far I have limited myself to an interpretation of Kant's theory of the mathematical sublime, but in this section I shall discuss a problem thereof. Kant claims that judgments of the mathematical sublime are 'necessary' and 'universally valid' (2000, 5: 247), because we find in them

a purposive relation of the cognitive faculties, which must ground the faculty of ends (the will) *a priori*, and hence is itself purposive *a priori*, which then immediately contains the deduction, i.e., the justification of the claim of such a judgment of universally necessary validity. (2000, 5: 280)¹⁸

A judgment of the mathematical sublime represents the purposiveness in the imagination's inadequacy in relation to the idea of infinity and our faculty of ideas (i.e., reason). This purposive relation, namely reason's superiority over sensibility, grounds the will *a priori*, because the will as such is to determine our power of choice *a priori*. 'Hence', the relation is purposive in an *a priori* manner.

So far so good, until Kant states that the purposive relation 'immediately contains' the deduction of the judgment of the sublime. His reasoning appears to be that insofar as the judgment represents a kind of *a priori* purposiveness, it must be based *a priori* and thus universally necessary. Nevertheless, it is one thing that the purposiveness is universal and necessary; and it is quite another that the representation of this purposiveness is also universal and necessary. A judgment of the mathematical sublime represents the *a priori* purposive relation not in thoughts but through the *feeling* of an absolutely great negative pleasure in

¹⁸ The pronoun 'which [*welches*]' appears twice and refers to the singular neutral noun 'relation [*Verhältnis*]' on both occasions.

the imagination's maximal extension. Therefore, universality and necessity of the judgment would presuppose universality and necessity of the imagination's maximal capacity, which is then problematic.

Cassirer argues that the judgment's deduction consists in its exposition because the latter 'has shown that the human mind, as possessed of imagination and Reason, is capable of relating them to each other, of becoming aware of its supersensible capacity on the presentation of a sensible object' (1938, 249–250).¹⁹ However, the problem is exactly the *aesthetic* 'becoming aware', namely, the subjective awareness of the imagination's inferiority to ideas through the *feeling* of its inadequacy in judging certain finite magnitudes. The occasioning of this feeling remains contingent.

Kant writes that the '[aesthetic] comprehension becomes ever more difficult the further apprehension advances, and soon reaches its maximum' (2000, 5: 252), but he provides no deduction for this maximum. For Kant, 'Every necessity has a transcendental condition as its ground' (1998, A106). I have shown that the aesthetic comprehension involves a tension that is grounded in two *a priori* temporal conditions of the reproductive synthesis, the exposition of which is already contained in the Transcendental Deduction in the first *Critique* and then developed in the third *Critique*. The tension is indeed necessary but can be tolerated in cognition to some extent, for otherwise no comprehension would be ever possible. The imagination reaches a maximum only *if* it is incompetent to overcome a tremendous tension, but why *must* there be a maximum in representing certain sensible objects? Why can the imagination not reproduce in one intuition more and more elements with greater and greater hindrance but still advance towards infinity?

For sure, if the infinite were given in the intuition, we would universally and necessarily fail to comprehend it aesthetically. However, we encounter the mathematical sublime in representing *finite* magnitudes such

¹⁹ Similarly, Bartuschat argues that the judgment of the sublime does not require a deduction because it 'exhibits the judging subject and his faculty which is not limitable by nature, so that the feeling of the sublime is only an expression of the subject's disposition' (1972, 134).

as the Pyramids. While the imagination's inferiority to reason and its inability for presenting ideas are indeed *a priori*, its inadequacy for measuring certain sensible objects is only *a posteriori* and, therefore, neither universal nor necessary.²⁰ Paradoxically, it is exactly by means of a private and contingent experience of the mathematical sublime that one reveals the necessary and universal supersensible vocation in humanity.²¹

References

- Abici, Uygur (2008), 'Kant's Justified Dismissal of Artistic Sublimity'. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 66.3: 237–251.
- Allison, Henry E. (2001), *Kant's Theory of Taste: A Reading of the Critique of Aesthetic Judgment*. Cambridge University Press.
- (2015), *Kant's Transcendental Deduction: An Analytical-Historical Commentary*. Oxford University Press.
- Bartuschat, Wolfgang (1972), *Zum systematischen Ort von Kants Kritik der Urteilskraft*. Vittorio Klostermann.
- Budd, Malcolm (2003), 'The Sublime in Nature', in Paul Guyer ed. *Kant's Critique of the Power of Judgment: Critical Essays*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers. 121–141.
- Cassirer, H. W. (1938), *A Commentary on Kant's Critique of Judgment*. Barnes & Noble, Inc. and Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Clewis, Robert R. (2009), *The Kantian Sublime and the Revelation of Freedom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crowther, Paul (1989), *The Kantian Sublime: From Morality to Art*. Oxford University Press.

²⁰ As De Man points out: 'The [mathematical] sublime cannot be grounded as a philosophical (transcendental or metaphysical) principle, but only as a linguistic principle.' (1984, 130) Meanwhile, I maintain that the negative pleasure in the aesthetic comprehension is necessary as it is conditioned on the transcendental operation of the imagination.

²¹ My particular thanks to Martin Moors for the many long and stimulating discussions over this topic. I also thank Karin de Boer, participants at European Society for Aesthetics Conference (2017) and Leuven Kant Conference (2017) for their comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of the paper.

- (2010), *The Kantian Aesthetic: From Knowledge to the Avant-Garde*. Oxford University Press.
- De Man, Paul (1984), 'Phenomenality and Materiality in Kant', in Gary Shapiro and Alan Sica (eds.), *Hermeneutics: Questions and Prospects*, University of Massachusetts Press, pp. 121–144.
- Deligiorgi, Katerina (2014), 'The Pleasures of Contra-purposiveness: Kant, the Sublime, and Being Human'. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 72.1: 25–35.
- Forsey, Jane (2007), 'Is a Theory of the Sublime Possible?'. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 65.4: 381–389.
- Goodreau, John R. (1998), *The Role of the Sublime in Kant's Moral Metaphysics*. Council for Research in Values & Philosophy.
- Guyer, Paul (1982), 'Kant's Distinction between the Beautiful and the Sublime'. *Review of Metaphysics* 35.4: 753–783.
- (1996), *Kant and the Experience of Freedom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel (1902), *Kants gesammelte Schriften*. Ed. Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Walter de Gruyter.
- (1987), *Critique of Judgment*. Trans. Werner S. Pluhar, Hackett Publishing Company.
- (1996), *Practical Philosophy*. Trans. Mary J. Gregor. Cambridge University Press.
- (1998), *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge University Press.
- (2000), *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Ed. Paul Guyer, trans. Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews. Cambridge University Press.
- Longuenesse, Béatrice (1998), *Kant and the Capacity to Judge: Sensibility and Discursivity in the Transcendental Analytic of the Critique of Pure Reason*. Tran. Charles T. Wolfe. Princeton University Press.
- Makkreel, Rudolf A. (1994), *Imagination and Interpretation in Kant: The Hermeneutical Import of the Critique of Judgment*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Matthews, Patricia M. (1996), 'Kant's Sublime: A Form of Pure Aesthetic Reflective Judgment'. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 54.2:

165–180.

- Park, Kap Hyun (2009), *Kant über das Erhabene: Rekonstruktion und Weiterführung der kritischen Theorie des erhabenen Kants*. Königshausen u. Neumann.
- Pries, Christine (1995), *Übergänge ohne Brücken: Kants Erhabenes zwischen Kritik und Metaphysik*. Akademie Verlag GmbH.
- Recki, Birgit (2001), *Ästhetik der Sitten: Die Affinität von ästhetischem Gefühl und praktischer Vernunft bei Kant*. Vittorio Klostermann.
- Shaper, Eva (1992), 'Taste, Sublimity, and Genius: The Aesthetics of Nature and Art', in Paul Guyer ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*. Cambridge University Press. 367–394.
- Smith, Simon (2015), 'Kant's Mathematical Sublime and the Role of the Infinite: Reply to Crowther'. *Kantian Review*, 20.1