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ANALYTIC OF THE BEAUTIFUL

FIRST MOMENT
OF THE JUDGEMENT OF TASTE:¹ MOMENT OF QUALITY

§ 1
The judgement of taste is aesthetic

If we wish to discern whether anything is beautiful or not, we do not refer the representation of it to the object by means of the understanding with a view to cognition, but by means of the imagination (acting perhaps in conjunction with the understanding) we refer the representation to the subject and its feeling of pleasure or displeasure. The judgement of taste, therefore, is not a cognitive judgement, and so not logical, but is aesthetic—which means that it is one whose determining ground cannot be other than subjective.

Every reference of representations is capable of being objective, even that of sensations (in which case it signifies the real in an empirical representation). The one exception to this is the feeling of pleasure or displeasure. This denotes nothing in the object, but is a feeling which the subject has of itself and of the manner in which it is affected by the representation.

To apprehend a regular and appropriate building with one’s cognitive faculties, whether the mode of representation be clear or confused, is quite a different thing from being conscious of this

¹ The definition of taste here relied upon is that it is the faculty of judging the beautiful. But the discovery of what is required for calling an object beautiful must be reserved for the analysis of judgements of taste. In my search for the moments* to which attention is paid by this judgement in its reflection, I have followed the guidance of the logical functions of judging (for a judgement of taste always involves a reference to understanding). I have brought the moment of quality first under review, because this is what the aesthetic judgement on the beautiful looks to in the first instance.
representation with an accompanying sensation of delight.* Here the representation is referred wholly to the subject, and what is more to its feeling of life—under the name of the feeling of pleasure or displeasure—and this forms the basis of a quite separate faculty of discriminating and judging, that contributes nothing to knowledge. All it does is to compare the given representation in the subject with the entire faculty of representations of which the mind is conscious in the feeling of its state. Given representations in a judgement may be empirical, and so aesthetic; but the judgement which is pronounced by their means is logical, provided it refers them to the object. Conversely, even if the given representations be rational, but are referred in a judgement solely to the subject (to its feeling), they are always to that extent aesthetic.

§ 2

The delight which determines the judgement of taste is independent of all interest

The delight which we connect with the representation of the existence of an object is called interest. Such a delight, therefore, always involves a reference to the faculty of desire, either as its determining ground, or else as necessarily implicated with its determining ground. Now, where the question is whether something is beautiful, we do not want to know, whether we, or anyone else, are, or even could be, concerned with the existence of the thing, but rather how we judge it on the basis of mere contemplation (intuition or reflection). If anyone asks me whether I consider that the palace I see before me is beautiful, I may, perhaps, reply that I do not care for things of that sort that are merely made to be gaped at. Or I may reply in the same strain as that Iroquois sachem* who said that nothing in Paris pleased him better than the eating-houses. I may even go a step further and inveigh with the vigour of a Rousseau* against the vanity of the great who spend the sweat of the people on such superfluous things. Or, in fine, I may quite easily persuade myself that if I found myself on an uninhabited island, without hope of ever again encountering human beings, and could conjure such a splendid edifice into existence by a mere wish, I should still not trouble to do so, so long as I had a hut there that was comfortable enough for me. All this may be admitted and approved; only it is not the point now at issue.
All one wants to know is whether the mere representation of the object is to my liking, no matter how indifferent I may be to the existence of the object of this representation. It is quite plain that in order to say that the object is beautiful, and to show that I have taste, everything turns on what I make of this representation within myself, and not on any factor which makes me dependent on the existence of the object. Everyone must allow that a judgement on the beautiful which is tinged with the slightest interest, is very partial and not a pure judgement of taste. One must not be in the least prepossessed in favour of the existence of the thing, but must preserve complete indifference in this respect, in order to play the part of judge in matters of taste.

This proposition, which is of the utmost importance, cannot be better explained than by contrasting the pure disinterested delight which appears in the judgement of taste with that which is allied to an interest—especially if we can also assure ourselves that there are no other kinds of interest beyond those presently to be mentioned.

§ 3

Delight in the agreeable is coupled with interest

That is agreeable which the senses find pleasing in sensation. This at once affords a convenient opportunity for condemning and directing particular attention to a prevalent confusion of the double meaning of which the word ‘sensation’ is capable. All delight (so it is said or thought) is itself sensation (of a pleasure). Consequently everything that pleases, and for the very reason that it pleases, is agreeable—and according to its different degrees, or its relations to other agreeable sensations, is attractive, charming, delicious, enjoyable, etc. But if this is conceded, then impressions of the senses, which determine inclination, or principles of reason, which determine the will, or mere contemplated forms of intuition, which determine judgement, are all on a par in everything relevant to their effect upon the feeling of pleasure, for this would be agreeableness in the sensation of one’s state; and since,

2 A judgement upon an object of our delight may be wholly disinterested but nonetheless very interesting, i.e. it relies on no interest, but it produces one. Of this kind are all pure moral judgements. But, of themselves, judgements of taste do not even set up any interest whatsoever. Only in society is it interesting to have taste—a point which will be explained in the sequel.
in the last resort, all the elaborate work of our faculties must issue in and unite in the practical as its goal, we could credit our faculties with no other appreciation of things and the worth of things, than that consisting in the gratification which they promise. How this is attained is in the end immaterial; and, as the choice of the means is here the only thing that can make a difference, people might indeed blame one another for folly or imprudence, but never for baseness or wickedness; for they are all, each according to his own way of looking at things, pursuing one goal, which for each is the gratification in question.

When a modification of the feeling of pleasure or displeasure is termed sensation, this expression is given quite a different meaning to that which it bears when I call the representation of a thing (through the senses as a receptivity pertaining to the faculty of knowledge) sensation. For in the latter case the representation is referred to the object, but in the former it is referred solely to the subject and is not available for any cognition, not even for that by which the subject cognizes itself.

Now in the above definition the word sensation is used to denote an objective representation of the senses; and, to avoid continually running the risk of misinterpretation, we shall call that which must always remain purely subjective, and is absolutely incapable of forming a representation of an object, by the familiar name of feeling. The green colour of the meadows belongs to objective sensation, as the perception of an object of the senses; but its agreeableness belongs to subjective sensation, by which no object is represented: i.e. to feeling, through which the object is regarded as an object of delight (which involves no cognition of the object).

Now, that a judgement on an object by which its agreeableness is affirmed, expresses an interest in it, is evident from the fact that through sensation it provokes a desire for similar objects, consequently the delight presupposes, not the simple judgement about it, but the bearing its existence has upon my state so far as it is affected by such an object. Hence we do not merely say of the agreeable that it pleases, but that it gratifies. I do not accord it a simple approval, but inclination is aroused by it, and where agreeableness is of the liveliest type a judgement on the character of the object is so entirely out of place, that those who are always intent only on enjoyment (for that is the word used to denote intensity of gratification) would gladly dispense with all judgement.
§ 4

*Delight in the Good is coupled with interest*

That is *good* which by means of reason commends itself by its mere concept. We call that *good for something* (useful) which only pleases as a means; but that which pleases on its own account we call *good in itself*. In both cases the concept of an end is implied, and consequently the relation of reason to (at least possible) willing, and thus a delight in the *existence* of an object or action, i.e. some interest or other.

To deem something good, I must always know what sort of a thing the object is intended to be, i.e. I must have a concept of it. That is not necessary to enable me to see beauty in something. Flowers, free patterns, lines aimlessly intertwining—technically termed foliage,—have no signification, depend upon no determinate concept, and yet please. Delight in the beautiful must depend upon the reflection on an object leading towards some concept or other (whatever it may be). It is thus also differentiated from the agreeable, which rests entirely upon sensation.

In many cases, no doubt, the agreeable and the good seem convertible terms. Thus it is commonly said that all (especially lasting) gratification is of itself good; which is almost equivalent to saying that to be permanently agreeable and to be good are identical. But it is readily apparent that this is merely a mistaken confusion of words, for the concepts appropriate to these expressions are far from interchangeable. The agreeable, which, as such, represents the object solely in relation to the senses, must first be brought under principles of reason through the concept of an end, to be, as an object of will, called good. But that the reference to delight is wholly different where what gratifies is at the same time called *good*, is evident from the fact that with the good the question always is whether it is mediately or immediately good, i.e. useful or good in itself; whereas with the agreeable this point can never arise, since the word always means what pleases immediately—and it is just the same with what I call beautiful.

Even in everyday speech a distinction is drawn between the agreeable and the good. We do not scruple to say of a dish that stimulates the sense of taste with spices and other condiments that it is
agreeable—confessing all the while that it is not good: because, while it immediately satisfies the senses, it is mediately displeasing, i.e. to reason that looks ahead to the consequences. Even in our judgement of health this same distinction may be traced. To all that possess it, it is immediately agreeable—at least negatively, i.e. as absence of all bodily pains. But, if we are to say that it is good, we must further apply to reason to direct it to ends, that is, we must regard it as a state that puts us in a congenial mood for all we have to do. Finally, in respect of happiness everyone believes that the greatest aggregate of the pleasures of life, taking duration as well as number into account, merits the name of a true, indeed even of the highest, good. But reason sets its face against this too. Agreeableness is enjoyment. But if this is all that we are bent on, it would be foolish to be scrupulous about the means that procure it for us—whether it be obtained passively by the bounty of nature or actively and by our own efforts. But that there is any intrinsic worth in the existence of one who merely lives for enjoyment, however busy he may be in this respect, even when in so doing he serves others—all equally with himself intent only on enjoyment—as an excellent means to that one end, and does so, moreover, because through sympathy he shares all their gratifications,—this is a view to which reason will never let itself be brought round. Only by what one does heedless of enjoyment, in complete freedom and independently of what nature could passively procure for him, does he give to his life, as the existence of a person, an absolute worth. Happiness, with all its plethora of pleasures, is far from being an unconditioned good.3

But, despite all this difference between the agreeable and the good, they both agree in being invariably coupled with an interest in their object. This is true, not only of the agreeable, § 3, and of the mediately good, i.e. the useful, which pleases as a means to some pleasure, but also of that which is good absolutely and from every point of view, namely the moral good which carries with it the highest interest. For the good is the object of will, i.e. of a rationally determined faculty of desire). But to will something, and to take a delight in its existence, i.e. to take an interest in it, are identical.

3 An obligation to enjoyment is a patent absurdity. And the same, then, must also be said of a supposed obligation to actions that have merely enjoyment for their aim, no matter how spiritually this enjoyment may be refined in thought (or embellished), and even if it be a mystical, so-called heavenly, enjoyment.
§ 5

Comparison of the three specifically different kinds of delight

Both the agreeable and the good involve a reference to the faculty of desire, and are thus attended, the former with a delight pathologically conditioned (by stimuli), the latter with a pure practical delight. Such delight is determined not merely by the representation of the object, but also by the represented bond of connexion between the subject and the existence of the object. It is not merely the object, but also its existence, that pleases. On the other hand the judgement of taste is simply contemplative, i.e. it is a judgement which is indifferent as to the existence of an object, and only decides how its character stands with the feeling of pleasure and displeasure. But not even is this contemplation itself directed to concepts; for the judgement of taste is not a cognitive judgement (neither a theoretical one nor a practical), and hence, also, is not grounded on concepts, nor yet intentionally directed to them.

The agreeable, the beautiful, and the good thus denote three different relations of representations to the feeling of pleasure and displeasure, as a feeling in respect of which we distinguish different objects or modes of representation. Also, the corresponding expressions which indicate our satisfaction in them are different. The agreeable is what gratifies us; the beautiful what simply pleases us; the good what is esteemed (approved), i.e. that on which we set an objective worth. Agreeableness is a significant factor even with animals devoid of reason; beauty has purport and significance only for human beings, i.e. for beings at once animal and rational (but not merely for them as rational beings—as spirits for example—but only for them as both animal and rational); whereas the good is good for every rational being in general;—a proposition which can only receive its complete justification and explanation in what follows. Of all these three kinds of delight, that of taste in the beautiful may be said to be the one and only disinterested and free delight; for, with it, no interest, whether of sense or reason, extorts approval. And so we may say that delight, in the three cases mentioned, is related to inclination, to favour, or to respect. For favour is the only free liking. An object of inclination, and one which a law of reason imposes upon our desire, leaves us no freedom to turn anything into an object of pleasure.
All interest presupposes a need, or calls one forth; and, being a ground determining approval, deprives the judgement on the object of its freedom.

So far as the interest of inclination in the case of the agreeable goes, everyone says: Hunger is the best sauce; and people with a healthy appetite relish everything, so long as it is something they can eat. Such delight, consequently, gives no indication of taste having anything to do with choice. Only when people’s needs have been satisfied can we tell who among the crowd has taste or not. Similarly there may be correct habits (conduct) without virtue, politeness without good-will, propriety without honour, etc. For where the moral law speaks, there is, objectively, no room left for free choice as to what one has to do; and to show taste in the way one carries out its dictates, or in judging the way others do so, is a totally different matter from displaying the moral frame of one’s mind. For the latter involves a command and produces a need of something, whereas moral taste only plays with the objects of delight without committing itself to any.

DEFINITION OF THE BEAUTIFUL DERIVED FROM THE FIRST MOMENT

Taste is the faculty of judging an object or a mode of representation by means of a delight or aversion apart from any interest. The object of such a delight is called beautiful.

SECOND MOMENT

OF THE JUDGEMENT OF TASTE: MOMENT OF QUANTITY

§ 6

The beautiful is that which, apart from concepts, is represented as the object of a universal delight

This definition of the beautiful is derivable from the foregoing definition of it as an object of delight apart from any interest. For where anyone is conscious that his delight in an object is with him independent of interest, it is inevitable that he should judge the object as one containing a ground of delight for all human beings. For, since
the delight is not based on any inclination of the subject (or on any other deliberate interest), but the judging subject feels himself completely free in respect of the liking which he accords to the object, he can find as reason for his delight no personal conditions to which his own subjective self might alone be party. Hence he must regard it as resting on what he may also presuppose in every other person; and therefore he must believe that he has reason for expecting a similar delight from everyone. Accordingly he will speak of the beautiful as if beauty were a feature of the object and the judgement were logical (forming a cognition of the object by concepts of it); although it is only aesthetic, and contains merely a reference of the representation of the object to the subject;—because it still bears this resemblance to the logical judgement, that it may be presupposed to be valid for everyone. But this universality cannot spring from concepts. For from concepts there is no transition to the feeling of pleasure or displeasure (save in the case of pure practical laws, which, however, carry an interest with them; and such an interest does not attach to the pure judgement of taste). The result is that the judgement of taste, with its attendant consciousness of detachment from all interest, must involve a claim to validity for everyone, and must do so apart from a universality directed to objects, i.e. there must be coupled with it a claim to subjective universality.

§ 7

Comparison of the beautiful with the agreeable and the good by means of the above characteristic

As regards the agreeable everyone concedes that his judgement, which he bases on a private feeling, and in which he declares that an object pleases him, is restricted merely to himself personally. Thus he does not take it amiss if, when he says that Canary-wine is agreeable, another corrects the expression and reminds him that he ought to say: It is agreeable to me. This applies not only to the taste of the tongue, the palate, and the throat, but to what may with anyone be agreeable to eye or ear. A violet colour is to one soft and lovely, but to another dull and faded. One person likes the tone of wind instruments, another prefers that of string instruments. To quarrel over such points with the idea of condemning another’s judgement as incorrect when it differs from our own, as if the opposition between
the two judgements were logical, would be folly. With the agreeable, therefore, the principle holds good: *Everyone has his own taste* (that of the senses).

The beautiful stands on quite a different footing. It would, on the contrary, be ridiculous if anyone who plumed himself on his taste were to think of justifying himself by saying: This object (the building we see, the dress that person has on, the concert we hear, the poem submitted to our judgement) is beautiful *for me*. For if it merely pleases him, he must not call it beautiful. Many things may for him possess charm and agreeableness—no one cares about that; but when he declares something to be beautiful, he expects the same delight from others. He judges not merely for himself, but for everyone, and then speaks of beauty as if it were a property of things. Thus he says the thing is beautiful; and it is not as if he counted on others agreeing in his judgement of liking owing to his having found them in such agreement on a number of occasions, but he *demands* this agreement of them. He blames them if they judge differently, and denies them taste, which he still requires of them as something they ought to have; and to this extent it is not open to us to say: Everyone has his own taste. This would be equivalent to saying that there is no such thing at all as taste, i.e. no aesthetic judgement capable of making a rightful claim upon the assent of everyone.

Yet even in the case of the agreeable we find that the judgements people form do betray a prevalent agreement among them, which leads to our crediting some with taste and denying it to others, and that, too, not as an organic sense but as a faculty of judging in respect of the agreeable generally. So of one who knows how to entertain his guests with pleasures (of enjoyment through all the senses) in such a way that one and all are pleased, we say that he has taste. But the universality here is only understood in a comparative sense; and the rules that apply are, like all empirical rules, *general* only, not *universal*,—the latter being what the judgement of taste upon the beautiful deals or claims to deal in. It is a judgement in respect of sociability in so far as it rests on empirical rules. In respect of the good it is true that judgements also rightly assert a claim to validity for everyone; but the good is only represented as an object of universal delight by means of a concept, which is the case neither with the agreeable nor the beautiful.
In a judgement of taste the universality of delight is only represented as subjective.

This particular form of the universality of an aesthetic judgement, which is to be met with in a judgement of taste, is a remarkable feature, not for the logician certainly, but for the transcendental philosopher. It calls for no small effort on his part to discover its origin, but in return it brings to light a property of our cognitive faculty which, without this analysis, would have remained unknown.

First, one must get firmly into one's mind that by the judgement of taste (upon the beautiful) the delight in an object is imputed to everyone, yet without being grounded on a concept (for then it would be the good), and that this claim to universality is such an essential factor of a judgement by which we describe anything as beautiful, that were it not for its being present to the mind it would never enter into anyone's head to use this expression, but everything that pleased without a concept would be ranked as agreeable. For in respect of the agreeable everyone is allowed to have his own opinion, and no one insists upon others agreeing with his judgement of taste, which is what is invariably done in the judgement of taste about beauty. The first of these I may call the taste of the senses, the second, the taste of reflection: the first laying down judgements merely private, the second, on the other hand, judgements ostensibly of general (public) validity, but both alike being aesthetic (not practical) judgements about an object merely in respect of the bearings of its representation on the feeling of pleasure or displeasure. Now it does seem strange that while with the taste of the senses experience not only shows that its judgement (of pleasure or displeasure in something) is not universally valid, but everyone willingly refrains from imputing this agreement to others (despite the frequent actual prevalence of a considerable consensus of general opinion even in these judgements), the taste of reflection, which, as experience teaches, has often enough to put up with a dismissal of its claims to the universal validity of its judgement (upon the beautiful), can (as it actually does) find it possible for all that, to formulate judgements capable of demanding this agreement in its universality. Such agreement it does in fact
require from everyone for each of its judgements of taste—the persons
who pass these judgements not quarrelling over the possibility of
such a claim, but only failing in particular cases to come to terms as
to the correct application of this faculty.

First of all we have here to note that a universality which does not
rest upon concepts of the object (even though these are only empirical)
is in no way logical, but aesthetic, i.e. does not involve any objective
quantity of the judgement, but only one that is subjective. For this
universality I use the expression *universal validity*, which denotes the
validity of the reference of a representation, not to the cognitive fac-
ulties, but to the feeling of pleasure or displeasure for every subject.
(The same expression, however, may also be employed for the logical
quantity of the judgement, provided we add *objective* universal validity,
to distinguish it from the merely subjective universal validity which
is always aesthetic.)

Now a judgement that has *objective universal validity* has always
got the subjective also, i.e. if the judgement is valid for everything
which is contained under a given concept, it is valid also for all who
represent an object by means of this concept. But from a *subjective
universal validity*, i.e. the aesthetic, that does not rest on any concept,
no conclusion can be drawn to the logical; because judgements of
that kind have no bearing upon the object. But for this very reason
the aesthetic universality attributed to a judgement must also be of a
special kind, seeing that it does not join the predicate of beauty to the
concept of the object taken in its entire logical sphere, and yet does
extend this predicate over the whole sphere of *judging subjects*.

In their logical quantity all judgements of taste are *singular* judge-
ments. For, since I must present the object immediately to my feeling
of pleasure or displeasure, and that, too, without the aid of concepts,
such judgements cannot have the quantity of judgements with
objective universal validity. Yet by taking the singular representation
of the object of the judgement of taste, and by comparison converting
it into a concept according to the conditions determining that judg-
ment, we can arrive at a logically universal judgement. For instance,
by a judgement of taste I describe the rose at which I am looking
as beautiful. The judgement, on the other hand, resulting from
the comparison of a number of singular representations: Roses in
general are beautiful, is no longer pronounced as a purely aesthetic
judgement, but as a logical judgement grounded on one that is aesthetic.
Now the judgement, ‘The rose is agreeable’ (to smell) is also, no doubt, an aesthetic and singular judgement, but then it is not one of taste but of the senses. For it has this point of difference from a judgement of taste, that the latter imports an aesthetic quantity of universality, i.e. of validity for everyone which is not to be met with in a judgement upon the agreeable. It is only judgements upon the good which, while they also determine the delight in an object, possess logical and not mere aesthetic universality; for it is as involving a cognition of the object that they are valid of it, and on that account valid for everyone.

When we judge objects merely on the basis of concepts, all representation of beauty goes by the board. There can, therefore, be no rule according to which anyone is to be compelled to recognize anything as beautiful. Whether a dress, a house, or a flower is beautiful is a matter upon which one declines to allow one’s judgement to be swayed by any reasons or principles. We want to get a look at the object with our own eyes, just as if our delight depended on sensation. And yet, if upon so doing, we call the object beautiful, we believe ourselves to be speaking with a universal voice, and lay claim to the concurrence of everyone, whereas no private sensation would be decisive except for the observer alone and his own liking.

Here, now, we may perceive that nothing is postulated in the judgement of taste but such a universal voice in respect of delight that is not mediated by concepts; consequently, only the possibility of an aesthetic judgement capable of being at the same time deemed valid for everyone. The judgement of taste itself does not postulate the agreement of everyone (for it is only competent for a logically universal judgement to do this, in that it is able to bring forward reasons); it only imputes this agreement to everyone, as an instance of the rule in respect of which it looks for confirmation, not from concepts, but from the concurrence of others. The universal voice is, therefore, only an idea—resting upon grounds the investigation of which is here postponed. It may be a matter of uncertainty whether a person who thinks he is laying down a judgement of taste is, in fact, judging in conformity with that idea; but that this idea is what is contemplated in his judgement, and that, consequently, it is meant to be a judgement of taste, is proclaimed by his use of the expression ‘beauty’. For himself he can be certain on the point from his mere consciousness of the separation of everything belonging to the agreeable and the
good from the delight remaining to him; and this is all for which he promises himself the agreement of everyone—a claim which, under these conditions, he would also be warranted in making, were it not that he frequently violated them, and thus passed an erroneous judgement of taste.

§ 9

Investigation of the question of whether in a judgement of taste the feeling of pleasure precedes the judging of the object or the latter precedes the former

The solution of this problem is the key to the critique of taste, and so is worthy of all attention.

If the pleasure in a given object came first and if the universal communicability of this pleasure were all that the judgement of taste is meant to allow to the representation of the object, this approach would be self-contradictory. For a pleasure of that kind would be nothing but the feeling of mere agreeableness to the senses, and so, from its very nature, would possess no more than private validity, seeing that it would be immediately dependent on the representation through which the object is given.

Hence it is the universal capacity for being communicated incident to the state of the mind in the given representation which, as the subjective condition of the judgement of taste, must underlie the latter, with the pleasure in the object as its consequence. Nothing, however, is capable of being universally communicated but cognition and representation in so far as it pertains to cognition. For it is only as thus pertaining that the representation is objective, and it is this alone that gives it a universal point of reference with which the power of representation of everyone is obliged to harmonize. If, then, the determining ground of the judgement as to this universal communicability of the representation is to be merely subjective, that is to say, is to be conceived independently of any concept of the object, it can be nothing else than the state of the mind that presents itself in the mutual relation of the powers of representation so far as they refer a given representation to cognition in general.

The cognitive powers brought into play by this representation are here engaged in a free play, since no determinate concept restricts them to a particular rule of cognition. Hence the state of the mind in
this representation must be one of a feeling of the free play of the
powers of representation in a given representation for a cognition in
general. Now a representation, whereby an object is given, involves,
in order that it may become a source of cognition at all, imagination
for bringing together the manifold of intuition, and understanding for
the unity of the concept uniting the representations. This state of free
play of the cognitive faculties attending a representation by which an
object is given must admit of universal communication: because
cognition, as a definition of the object with which given representa-
tions (in any subject whatever) are to accord, is the one and only
representation which is valid for everyone.

As the subjective universal communicability of the mode of
representation in a judgement of taste is to obtain apart from the
presupposition of any determinate concept, it can be nothing else
than the state of the mind involved in the free play of imagination
and understanding (so far as these are in mutual accord, as is requis-
ite for cognition in general): for we are conscious that this subjective
relation suitable for a cognition in general must be just as valid for
everyone, and consequently as universally communicable, as is any
determinate cognition, which always rests upon that relation as its
subjective condition.

Now this purely subjective (aesthetic) judging of the object, or of
the representation through which it is given, is antecedent to the
pleasure in it, and is the basis of this pleasure in the harmony of
the cognitive faculties. Again, the above-described universality of the
subjective conditions of judging objects forms the sole foundation of
this universal subjective validity of the delight which we connect
with the representation of the object that we call beautiful.

That an ability to communicate one’s state of mind, even though
it be only in respect of our cognitive faculties, is attended with a plea-
ure, is a fact which might easily be demonstrated from the natural
propensity of mankind to social life, i.e. empirically and psychologic-
ally. But what we have here in view calls for something more than
this. In a judgement of taste the pleasure felt by us is expected from
everyone else as necessary, just as if, when we call something beauti-
ful, beauty was to be regarded as a quality of the object forming part
of its inherent determination according to concepts; although beauty
is for itself, apart from any reference to the feeling of the subject,
nothing. But the discussion of this question must be reserved until
we have answered the further one of whether, and how, aesthetic judgements are possible *a priori*.

At present we are exercised with the lesser question of the way in which we become conscious, in a judgement of taste, of a reciprocal subjective common accord of the powers of cognition. Is it aesthetically by sensation and our mere inner sense? Or is it intellectually by consciousness of our intentional activity in bringing these powers into play?

Now if the given representation occasioning the judgement of taste were a concept which united understanding and imagination in the judgement of the object so as to give a cognition of the object, the consciousness of this relation would be intellectual (as in the objective schematism of judgement dealt with in the *Critique*). But, then, in that case the judgement would not be laid down with respect to pleasure and displeasure, and so would not be a judgement of taste. But, now, the judgement of taste determines the object, independently of concepts, in respect of delight and of the predicate of beauty. There is, therefore, no other way for the subjective unity of the relation in question to make itself known than by sensation. The enlivening of both faculties (imagination and understanding) to an indeterminate, but yet, thanks to the given representation, harmonious activity, such as belongs to cognition generally, is the sensation whose universal communicability is postulated by the judgement of taste. An objective relation can, of course, only be thought, yet in so far as, in respect of its conditions, it is subjective, it may be felt in its effect upon the mind, and, in the case of a relation (like that of the powers of representation to a faculty of cognition generally) which does not rest on any concept, no other consciousness of it is possible beyond that through the sensation of its effect upon the mind—an effect consisting in the more lightened play of both mental powers (imagination and understanding) as enlivened by their mutual accord. A representation which is singular and independent of comparison with other representations, and, being such, yet accords with the conditions of the universality that is the general concern of understanding, is one that brings the cognitive faculties into that proportionate accord which we require for all cognition and which we therefore deem valid for everyone who is so constituted as to judge by means of understanding and the senses in combination (i.e. for everyone).
DEFINITION OF THE BEAUTIFUL DRAWN FROM
THE SECOND MOMENT
The *beautiful* is that which, apart from a concept, pleases universally.

THIRD MOMENT
OF JUDGEMENTS OF TASTE: MOMENT OF
THE *RELATION* OF THE ENDS BROUGHT UNDER
REVIEW IN SUCH JUDGEMENTS

§ 10

*Purposiveness in general*

Let us define the meaning of ‘an end’ in transcendental terms (i.e. without presupposing anything empirical, such as the feeling of pleasure). An end is the object of a concept so far as this concept is regarded as the cause of the object (the real ground of its possibility); and the causality of a *concept* in respect of its *object* is *purposiveness* (*forma finalis*). Where, then, not the cognition of an object merely, but the object itself (its form or real existence) as an effect, is thought to be possible only through a concept of it, there we imagine an end. The representation of the effect is here the determining ground of its cause and precedes the latter. The consciousness of the causality of a representation in respect of the state of the subject as one tending to *preserve a continuance* of that state, may here be said to denote in a general way what is called pleasure; whereas displeasure is that representation which contains the ground for converting the state of the representations into their opposite (for hindering or removing them).

The faculty of desire, so far as it is determinable only through concepts, i.e. so as to act in conformity with the representation of an end, would be the will. But an object, or state of mind, or even an action may, although its possibility does not necessarily presuppose the representation of an end, be called purposive simply on account of its possibility being only explicable and intelligible for us by virtue of an assumption on our part of a fundamental causality according to ends, i.e. a will that would have so ordained it according to a
certain represented rule. Purposiveness, therefore, may exist apart from a purpose, in so far as we do not locate the causes of this form in a will, but yet are able to render the explanation of its possibility intelligible to ourselves only by deriving it from a will. Now we are not always obliged to look with the eye of reason into what we observe (i.e. to consider it in its possibility). So we may at least observe a purposiveness with respect to form, and trace it in objects—though by reflection only—without resting it on an end (as the material of the nexus finalis).

\[\text{§ 11}\]

*The sole foundation of the judgement of taste is the form of purposiveness of an object (or mode of representing it)*

Whenever an end is regarded as a source of delight it always imports an interest as determining ground of the judgement on the object of pleasure. Hence the judgement of taste cannot rest on any subjective end as its ground. But neither can any representation of an objective end, i.e. of the possibility of the object itself on principles of purposive connexion, determine the judgement of taste, and, consequently, neither can any concept of the good. For the judgement of taste is an aesthetic and not a cognitive judgement, and so does not deal with any concept of the character or of the internal or external possibility, by this or that cause, of the object, but simply with the relation of the powers of representation to one another in so far as they are determined by a representation.

Now this relation, present when an object is characterized as beautiful, is coupled with the feeling of pleasure. This pleasure is by the judgement of taste pronounced valid for everyone; hence an agreeableness attending the representation is just as incapable of containing the determining ground of the judgement as the representation of the perfection of the object or the concept of the good. We are thus left with the subjective purposiveness in the representation of an object, exclusive of any end (objective or subjective)—consequently the bare form of purposiveness in the representation whereby an object is given to us, so far as we are conscious of it—as that which is alone capable of constituting the delight which, apart from any concept, we judge as universally communicable, and so of forming the determining ground of the judgement of taste.
§ 12

The judgement of taste rests upon a priori grounds

To determine a priori the connexion of the feeling of pleasure or displeasure as an effect, with some representation or other (sensation or concept) as its cause, is utterly impossible; for that would be a causal relation which (with objects of experience) is always one that can only be cognized a posteriori and with the help of experience. True, in the Critique of Practical Reason we did actually derive a priori from universal moral concepts the feeling of respect (as a particular and peculiar modification of this feeling which does not strictly answer either to the pleasure or displeasure which we receive from empirical objects). But there we were further able to pass beyond the limits of experience and call in aid a causality resting on a supersensible attribute of the subject, namely that of freedom. But even there it was not this feeling exactly that we deduced from the idea of the moral as cause, but from this was derived simply the determination of the will. But the mental state of a will determined by anything whatsoever is already in itself a feeling of pleasure and identical with it, and so does not issue from the latter as an effect. Such an effect must only be assumed where the concept of the moral as a good precedes the determination of the will by the law; for in that case it would be futile to derive the pleasure combined with the concept from this concept as a mere cognition.

Now the pleasure in aesthetic judgements stands on a similar footing: only that here it is merely contemplative and does not bring about an interest in the object; whereas in the moral judgement it is practical. The consciousness of mere formal purposiveness in the play of the cognitive faculties of the subject attending a representation whereby an object is given, is the pleasure itself, because it involves a determining ground of the subject’s activity in respect of the enlivening of its cognitive powers, and thus an internal causality (which is purposive) in respect of cognition generally, but without being limited to any determinate cognition, and consequently a mere form of the subjective purposiveness of a representation in an aesthetic judgement. This pleasure is also in no way practical, neither resembling that from the pathological ground of agreeableness nor that from the intellectual ground of the represented good. But still it
involves an inherent causality, that, namely, of preserving a continuance of the state of the representation itself and the active engagement of the cognitive powers without ulterior aim. We dwell on the contemplation of the beautiful because this contemplation strengthens and reproduces itself. The case is analogous (but analogous only) to the way we dwell upon a charm in the representation of an object which keeps arresting the attention, the mind all the while remaining passive.

§ 13

The pure judgement of taste is independent of charm and emotion

Every interest vitiates the judgement of taste and robs it of its impartiality. This is especially so where instead of, like the interest of reason, allowing purposiveness to precede the feeling of pleasure, it grounds it upon this feeling—which is what always happens in aesthetic judgements upon anything so far as it gratifies or pains. Hence judgements so influenced can either lay no claim at all to a universally valid delight, or else must diminish their claim in proportion as sensations of the kind in question enter into the determining grounds of taste. Taste that requires an added element of charm and emotion for its delight, not to speak of adopting this as the measure of its approval, has not yet emerged from barbarism.

And yet charms are frequently not only ranked with beauty (which ought properly to be a question merely of the form) as contributory to the aesthetic universal delight, but they have been accredited as beauties in themselves, and consequently the matter of delight passed off for the form. This is a misconception which, like many others that have still an underlying element of truth, may be removed by a careful definition of these concepts.

A judgement of taste which is uninfluenced by charm or emotion, (though these may be associated with the delight in the beautiful), and whose determining ground, therefore, is simply purposiveness of form, is a pure judgement of taste.

§ 14

Elucidation by means of examples

Aesthetic, just like theoretical (logical) judgements, are divisible into empirical and pure. The first are those by which agreeableness
or disagreeableness, the second those by which beauty, is predicated
of an object or its mode of representation. The former are judgements
of the senses (material aesthetic judgements), the latter (as formal)
alone judgements of taste proper.

A judgement of taste, therefore, is only pure so far as its determining
ground is commingled with no merely empirical delight. But this
always transpires where charm or emotion have a share in the judge-
ment by which something is to be described as beautiful.

Here now there is a recrudescence of a number of specious objec-
tions that go so far as to claim that charm is not merely a necessary
ingredient of beauty, but is even of itself sufficient to merit the
name of beautiful. A mere colour, such as the green of a plot of grass,
or a mere tone (as distinguished from sound or noise), like that of a
violin, is described by most people as in itself beautiful, notwith-
standing the fact that both seem to depend merely on the matter of
the representations—in other words, simply on sensation, which
only entitles them to be called agreeable. But it will at the same time
be observed that sensations of colour as well as of tone are only
entitled to be immediately regarded as beautiful where, in either case,
they are pure. This is a determination which directly concerns their
form, and it is the only one which these representations possess that
admits with certainty of being universally communicated. For it is
not to be assumed that even the quality of the sensations agrees in all
subjects, and we can hardly take it for granted that the agreeableness
of a colour, or of the tone of a musical instrument, which we judge to
be preferable to that of another, will be similarly judged by everyone.

Assuming with Euler* that colours are isochronous vibrations
(pulsus) of the aether, as tones are of the air set in vibration by sound,
and, what is most important, that the mind not only perceives by the
senses their effect in stimulating the organs, but also, by reflection,
the regular play of the impressions (and consequently the form in
which different representations are united)—which I, still, in no way
doubt—then colour and tone would not be mere sensations. They
would be nothing short of formal determinations of the unity of a
manifold of sensations, and in that case could even be ranked as
beauties in their own right.

But the purity of a simple mode of sensation means that its uni-
formity is not disturbed or broken by any foreign sensation. It belongs
merely to the form; for abstraction may there be made from the
quality of the mode of such sensation (what colour or tone, if any, it represents). For this reason all simple colours are regarded as beautiful in so far as they are pure. Composite colours do not possess this advantage because, not being simple, there is no standard for judging whether they should be called pure or impure.

But as for the beauty ascribed to the object on account of its form, and the supposition that it is capable of being enhanced by charm, this is a common error and one very prejudicial to genuine, uncorrupted, sincere taste. Nevertheless charms may be added to beauty to lend to the mind, beyond a bare delight, a further interest in the representation of the object, and thus to advocate taste and its cultivation. This applies especially where taste is as yet crude and untrained. But they are positively subversive of the judgement of taste, if allowed to obtrude themselves as grounds of judging beauty. For so far are they from contributing to beauty, that it is only where taste is still weak and untrained, that, like aliens, they are admitted as a favour, and only on terms that they do not disturb that beautiful form.

In painting, sculpture, and in fact in all the formative arts, in architecture and horticulture, in so far as they are fine arts, the design is what is essential. Here it is not what gratifies in sensation but merely what pleases by its form, that is the fundamental prerequisite for taste. The colours which give brilliancy to the sketch are part of the charm. They may no doubt, in their own way, enliven the object for sensation, but make it really worth looking at and beautiful they cannot. Indeed, more often than not the requirements of the beautiful form restrict them to a very narrow compass, and, even where charm is admitted, it is only this form that serves to ennoble them.

All form of objects of the senses (both of outer and also, mediately, of inner sense) is either figure or play. In the latter case it is either play of figures (in space: mime and dance), or mere play of sensations (in time). The charm of colours, or of the agreeable tones of instruments, may be added: but the design in the former and the composition in the latter constitute the proper object of the pure judgement of taste. To say that the purity alike of colours and of tones, or their variety and contrast, seem to contribute to beauty, is by no means to imply that, because in themselves agreeable, they therefore yield an addition to the delight in the form and one on a par with it. The real meaning rather is that they make this form more clearly, definitely, and
completely perceptible, and besides enliven the representation by their charm, as they excite and sustain the attention directed to the object itself.

Even what is called *ornamentation* (*parerga*), i.e. what is only an adjunct, and not an intrinsic constituent in the complete representation of the object, in augmenting the delight of taste does so only by means of its form. Thus it is with the frames of pictures or the drapery on statues, or the colonnades of palaces. But if the ornamentation does not itself enter into the composition of the beautiful form—if it is introduced like a gold frame merely to win approval for the picture by means of its charm—it is then called *finery* and takes away from the genuine beauty.

Emotion—a sensation where an agreeable feeling is produced merely by means of a momentary check followed by a more powerful outpouring of the vital force—is quite foreign to beauty. Sublimity (with which the feeling of emotion is connected) requires, however, a different standard of judging from that which underlies taste. A pure judgement of taste has, then, for its determining ground neither charm nor emotion, in a word, no sensation as matter of the aesthetic judgement.

§ 15

The judgement of taste is entirely independent of the concept of perfection

*Objective* purposiveness can only be cognized by means of a reference of the manifold to a determinate end, and hence only through a concept. This alone makes it clear that the beautiful, which is judged on the ground of a mere formal purposiveness, i.e. a purposiveness without a purpose, is wholly independent of the representation of the good. For the latter presupposes an objective purposiveness, i.e. the reference of the object to a determinate end.

Objective purposiveness is either external, i.e. the *utility*, or internal, i.e. the *perfection*, of the object. That the delight in an object on account of which we call it beautiful is incapable of resting on the representation of its utility, is abundantly evident from the two preceding moments; for in that case, it would not be an immediate delight in the object, which latter is the essential condition of the judgement upon beauty. But in an objective, internal purposiveness, i.e. perfection, we have
what is more akin to the predicate of beauty, and so this has been held
even by philosophers of reputation to be convertible with beauty,
though subject to the qualification: where it is thought in a confused way.
In a critique of taste it is of the utmost importance to decide whether
beauty is really reducible to the concept of perfection.

For judging objective purposiveness we always require the concept
of an end, and, where such purposiveness has to be, not an external
one (utility), but an internal one, the concept of an internal end con-
taining the ground of the internal possibility of the object. Now an
end is in general that, the concept of which may be regarded as the
ground of the possibility of the object itself. So in order to represent
an objective purposiveness in a thing we must first have a concept of
what sort of a thing it is to be. The agreement of the manifold in a
thing with this concept (which supplies the rule of its synthesis) is
the qualitative perfection of the thing. Quantitative perfection is
entirely distinct from this. It consists in the completeness of anything
after its kind, and is a mere concept of quantity (of totality). In its
case the question of what the thing is to be is regarded as definitely dis-
posed of, and we only ask whether it is possessed of all the requisites
that go to make it such. What is formal in the representation of a
thing, i.e. the agreement of its manifold with a unity (i.e. irrespective
of what it is to be) does not, of itself, afford us any cognition whatso-
ever of objective purposiveness. For since abstraction is made from
this unity as end (what the thing is to be) nothing is left but the sub-
jective purposiveness of the representations in the mind of the sub-
ject intuiting. This gives a certain purposiveness of the representing
state of the subject, in which the subject feels itself quite at home in
its effort to grasp a given form in the imagination, but no perfection
of any object, the latter not being here thought through any concept
of an end. For instance, if in a forest I light upon a plot of grass,
round which trees stand in a circle, and if I do not then form any
representation of an end, such as that it is meant to be used, say, for
country dances, then not the least hint of a concept of perfection is
given by the mere form. To suppose a formal objective purposiveness
that is yet devoid of any purpose, i.e. the mere form of a perfection
(apart from any matter or concept of that with which it is to agree,
even though there was the mere general idea of a conformity to law)
is a veritable contradiction.
Now the judgement of taste is an aesthetic judgement, i.e. one resting on subjective grounds. No concept can be its determining ground, and hence not one of a determinate end. Beauty, therefore, as a formal subjective purposiveness, involves no thought whatsoever of a perfection of the object, as a would-be formal purposiveness which yet, for all that, is objective: and the distinction between the concepts of the beautiful and the good, which represents both as differing only in their logical form, the first being merely a confused, the second a clearly defined, concept of perfection, while otherwise alike in content and origin, all goes for nothing: for then there would be no specific difference between them, but the judgement of taste would be just as much a cognitive judgement as one by which something is described as good—just as the man in the street, when he says that deceit is wrong, bases his judgement on confused, but the philosopher on clear grounds, while both appeal in reality to the same principles of reason. But I have already stated that an aesthetic judgement is quite unique, and affords absolutely no (not even a confused) knowledge of the object. It is only through a logical judgement that we get knowledge. The aesthetic judgement, on the other hand, refers the representation, by which an object is given, solely to the subject, and brings to our notice no character of the object, but only the purposive form in the determination of the powers of representation engaged upon it. The judgement is called aesthetic for the very reason that its determining ground cannot be a concept, but is rather the feeling (of inner sense) of the concerted play of the mental powers as something only capable of being felt. If, on the other hand, confused concepts, and the objective judgement based on them, are going to be called aesthetic, we shall find ourselves with an understanding judging by sense, or a sense representing its objects by concepts—a mere choice of contradictions. The faculty of concepts, whether they be confused or clear, is understanding; and although understanding has (as in all judgements) its rôle in the judgement of taste, as an aesthetic judgement, its rôle there is not that of a faculty for cognizing an object, but of a faculty for determining that judgement and its representation (without a concept) according to its relation to the subject and its inner feeling, and for doing so in so far as that judgement is possible according to a universal rule.
§ 16

A judgement of taste by which an object is described as beautiful under the condition of a determinate concept is not pure.

There are two kinds of beauty: free beauty (*pulchritudo vaga*), or beauty which is merely dependent (*pulchritudo adhaerens*). The first presupposes no concept of what the object should be; the second does presuppose such a concept and, with it, an answering perfection of the object. Those of the first kind are said to be (self-subsisting) beauties of this thing or that thing; the other kind of beauty, being attached to a concept (conditioned beauty), is ascribed to objects which come under the concept of a particular end.

Flowers are free beauties of nature. Hardly anyone but a botanist knows the true nature of a flower, and even he, while recognizing in the flower the reproductive organ of the plant, pays no attention to this natural end when using his taste to judge of its beauty. Hence no perfection of any kind—no internal purposiveness, as something to which the arrangement of the manifold is related—underlies this judgement. Many birds (the parrot, the humming-bird, the bird of paradise), and a number of marine crustacea, are self-subsisting beauties which have nothing to do with any object defined with respect to its end, but please freely and on their own account. So designs *à la grecque,* foliage for framework or on wall-papers, etc., have no intrinsic meaning; they represent nothing—no object under a determinate concept—and are free beauties. We may also rank in the same class what in music are called fantasias (without a theme), and, indeed, all music that is not set to words.

In the judgement of a free beauty (according to mere form) we have the pure judgement of taste. No concept is here presupposed of any end for which the manifold should serve the given object, and which the latter, therefore, should represent—an incumbrance which would only restrict the freedom of the imagination that, as it were, is at play in the contemplation of the outward form.

But the beauty of man (including under this head that of a man, woman, or child), the beauty of a horse, or of a building (such as a church, palace, arsenal, or summer-house), presupposes a concept of the end that defines what the thing has to be, and consequently a concept of its perfection; and is therefore merely adherent beauty. Now, just
as it hinders the purity of the judgement of taste to have the agreeable (of sensation) joined with beauty to which properly only the form is relevant, so to combine the good with beauty (the good, namely, of the manifold to the thing itself according to its end) mars its purity.

Much might be added to a building that would immediately please the eye, were it not intended for a church. A figure might be beautified with all manner of flourishes and light but regular lines, as is done by the New Zealanders with their tattooing, were we dealing with anything but the figure of a human being. And here is one whose rugged features might be softened and given a more pleasing countenance, only he has got to be a man, or is, perhaps, a warrior that has to have a warlike appearance.

Now the delight in the manifold of a thing, in reference to the internal end that determines its possibility, is a delight based on a concept, whereas delight in the beautiful is such as does not presuppose any concept, but is immediately coupled with the representation through which the object is given (not through which it is thought). If, now, the judgement of taste in respect of the latter delight is made dependent upon the end involved in the former delight as a judgement of reason, and is thus placed under a restriction, then it is no longer a free and pure judgement of taste.

Taste, it is true, stands to gain by this combination of intellectual delight with the aesthetic. For it becomes fixed, and, while not universal, it enables rules to be prescribed for it in respect of certain purposively determined objects. But these rules are then not rules of taste, but merely rules for establishing a union of taste with reason, i.e. of the beautiful with the good—rules by which the former becomes available as an intentional instrument in respect of the latter, for the purpose of bringing that temper of the mind which is self-sustaining and of subjective universal validity to the support and maintenance of that mode of thought which, while possessing objective universal validity, can only be preserved by a resolute effort. But, strictly speaking, perfection neither gains by beauty, nor beauty by perfection. The truth is rather this, when we compare the representation through which an object is given to us with the object (in respect of what it is meant to be) by means of a concept, we cannot help reviewing it also in respect of the sensation in the subject. Hence there results a gain to the entire faculty of our power of representation when harmony prevails between both states of mind.
In respect of an object with a determinate internal end, a judgement of taste would only be pure where the person judging either has no concept of this end, or else makes abstraction from it in his judgement. But in cases like this, although such a person should lay down a correct judgement of taste, since he would be judging the object as a free beauty, he would still be censured by another who saw nothing in its beauty but a dependent quality (i.e. who looked to the end of the object) and would be accused by him of false taste, though both would, in their own way, be judging correctly: the one according to what he had present to his senses, the other according to what was present in his thoughts. This distinction enables us to settle many disputes about beauty on the part of critics; for we may show them how one side is dealing with free beauty, and the other with that which is dependent: the former making a pure judgement of taste, the latter an applied judgement of taste.

§ 17

The ideal of beauty

There can be no objective rule of taste by which what is beautiful may be defined by means of concepts. For every judgement from that source is aesthetic, i.e. its determining ground is the feeling of the subject, and not any concept of an object. It is merely wasted labour to look for a principle of taste that affords a universal criterion of the beautiful by determinate concepts; because what is sought is something impossible and inherently contradictory. But in the universal communicability of the sensation (of delight or aversion)—a communicability, too, that exists apart from any concept—in the accord, so far as possible, of all ages and nations as to this feeling in the representation of certain objects, we have the empirical criterion, weak indeed and scarce sufficient to raise a presumption, of the derivation of a taste, thus confirmed by examples, from a deep-seated ground, one shared alike by all human beings, underlying their agreement in judging the forms under which objects are given to them.

For this reason some products of taste are looked on as exemplary—not meaning thereby that by imitating others taste may be acquired. For taste must be an intrinsically original faculty; whereas one who imitates a model, while showing skill commensurate with his success, only displays taste in so far as he judges this
model himself. Hence it follows that the highest model, the archetype of taste, is a mere idea, which each person must produce in his own consciousness, and according to which he must form his judgment of everything that is an object of taste, or that is an example of critical taste, and even of universal taste itself. Properly speaking, an idea signifies a concept of reason, and an ideal the representation of an individual existence as adequate to an idea. Hence this archetype of taste—which rests, indeed, upon reason’s indeterminate idea of a maximum, but is not, however, capable of being represented by means of concepts, but only in an individual presentation—may more appropriately be called the ideal of the beautiful. While not having this ideal in our possession, we still strive to produce it within us. But it is bound to be merely an ideal of the imagination, seeing that it rests, not upon concepts, but upon the presentation—the faculty of presentation being the imagination.—Now, how do we arrive at such an ideal of beauty? Is it a priori or empirically? Further, what species of the beautiful admits of an ideal?

First of all, we do well to observe that the beauty for which an ideal has to be sought cannot be a beauty that is free and at large, but must be one fixed by a concept of objective purposiveness. Hence it cannot belong to the object of an altogether pure judgement of taste, but must attach to one that is partly intellectual. In other words, whatever kind of grounds there may be for judging an ideal, there must be some underlying idea of reason according to determinate concepts, by which the end underlying the internal possibility of the object is determined a priori. An ideal of beautiful flowers, of a beautiful suite of furniture, or of a beautiful view, is unthinkable. But, it may also be impossible to represent an ideal of a beauty dependent on determinate ends, e.g. a beautiful residence, a beautiful tree, a beautiful garden, etc., presumably because their ends are not sufficiently defined and fixed by their concept, with the result that their purposiveness is nearly as free as with beauty that is quite at large. Only what has in itself the end of its existence—only the human being that is able himself to determine his ends by reason, or,

---

4 Models of taste with respect to the arts of speech must be composed in a dead and learned language; the first, to prevent their having to suffer the changes that inevitably overtake living ones, making dignified expressions become degraded, common ones antiquated, and ones newly created after a short period of time obsolete; the second to ensure its having a grammar that is not subject to the caprices of fashion, but has fixed rules of its own.
where he has to derive them from external perception, can still compare them with essential and universal ends, and then further pronounce aesthetically upon their accord with such ends, only this, among all objects in the world, admits, therefore, of an ideal of beauty, just as humanity in his person, as intelligence, alone admits of the ideal of perfection.

Two factors are here involved. First, there is the aesthetic normal idea, which is an individual intuition (of the imagination). This represents the norm by which we judge a human being as a member of a particular animal species. Secondly, there is the rational idea. This deals with the ends of humanity so far as they are incapable of sensuous representation, and converts them into a principle for judging his outward form, through which these ends are revealed in their phenomenal effect. The normal idea must draw from experience the constituents which it requires for the form of an animal of a particular kind. But the greatest purposiveness in the construction of this form—that which would serve as a universal norm for the aesthetic judging of each individual of the species in question—the image that, as it were, forms an intentional basis underlying the technic of nature, to which no separate individual, but only the species as a whole, is adequate, has its seat merely in the idea of the judging subject. Yet it is, with all its proportions, an aesthetic idea, and, as such, capable of being fully presented in concreto in a model image. Now, how is this effected? In order to render the process to some extent intelligible (for who can wrest nature’s whole secret from her?), let us attempt a psychological explanation.

It is of note that the imagination, in a manner quite incomprehensible to us, is able on occasion, even after a long lapse of time, not only to recall the signs for concepts, but also to reproduce the image and shape of an object out of a countless number of others of a different, or even of the very same, kind. And, further, if the mind is engaged upon comparisons, we may well suppose that it can in actual fact, though the process is partly unconscious, superimpose as it were one image upon another, and from the coincidence of a number of the same kind arrive at a mean contour which serves as a common standard for all. Say, for instance, a person has seen a thousand full-grown men. Now if he wishes to judge normal size determined upon a comparative estimate, then imagination (to my mind) allows
a great number of these images (perhaps the whole thousand) to fall one upon the other, and, if I may be allowed to extend to the case the analogy of optical presentation, in the space where they come most preponderantly together, and within the contour where the place is illuminated by the greatest concentration of colour, one gets a perception of the average size, which alike in height and breadth is equally removed from the extreme limits of the greatest and smallest statures; and this is the stature of a beautiful man. (The same result could be obtained in a mechanical way, by taking the measures of all the thousand, and adding together their heights, and their breadths (and thicknesses), and dividing the sum in each case by a thousand.) But the power of imagination does all this by means of a dynamical effect upon the organ of inner sense, arising from the frequent apprehension of such forms. If, again, for our average man we seek on similar lines for the average head, and for this the average nose, and so on, then we get the figure that underlies the normal idea of a beautiful man in the country where the comparison is instituted. For this reason a black man must necessarily (under these empirical conditions) have a different normal idea of the beauty of forms from what a white man has, and the Chinese person one different from the European. And the process would be just the same with the model of a beautiful horse or dog (of a particular breed).—This normal idea is not derived from proportions taken from experience as determinate rules: rather it is according to this idea that rules for judging first become possible. It is something intermediate between all singular intuitions of individuals, with their manifold variations—a floating image for the whole genus, which nature has set as an archetype underlying those of her products that belong to the same species, but which in no single case she seems to have completely attained. But the normal idea is far from giving the complete archetype of beauty in the genus. It only gives the form that constitutes the indispensable condition of all beauty, and, consequently, only correctness in the presentation of the genus. It is, as the famous Doryphorus of Polycletus was called, the rule (and Myron’s Cow* might be similarly employed for its kind). It cannot, for that very reason, contain anything specifically characteristic; for otherwise it would not be the normal idea for the genus. Further, it is not by beauty that its presentation pleases, but merely because it does not contradict any of the conditions
under which alone a thing belonging to this genus can be beautiful. The presentation is merely academically correct.  

But the *ideal* of the beautiful is still something different from its *normal idea*. For reasons already stated it is only to be sought in the *human figure*. Here the ideal consists in the expression of the *moral*, apart from which the object would not please at once universally and positively (not merely negatively in a presentation that is academically correct). The visible expression of moral ideas that govern the human being inwardly can, of course, only be drawn from experience; but their combination with all that our reason connects with the morally good in the idea of the highest purposiveness—benevolence, purity, strength, or equanimity, etc.—may be made, as it were, visible in bodily manifestation (as effect of what is internal), and this embodiment involves a union of pure ideas of reason and great imaginative power, in one who would even form a judgement of it, not to speak of being the author of its presentation. The correctness of such an ideal of beauty is evidenced by its not permitting any sensuous charm to mingle with the delight in its object, in which it still allows us to take a great interest. This fact in turn shows that judging according to such a standard can never be purely aesthetic, and that judging according to an ideal of beauty cannot be a simple judgement of taste.

**DEFINITION OF THE BEAUTIFUL DERIVED FROM THIS THIRD MOMENT**

*Beauty* is the form of *purposiveness* in an object, so far as this is perceived in it *apart from the representation of an end*.  

---

1 It will be found that a perfectly regular face—one that a painter might fix his eye on for a model—ordinarily conveys nothing. This is because it is devoid of anything characteristic, and so the idea of the species is expressed in it rather than the specific qualities of a person. The exaggeration of what is characteristic in this way, i.e. exaggeration violating the normal idea (the purposiveness of the species), is called *caricature*. Also experience shows that these quite regular faces indicate as a rule only an inwardly mediocre human being; presumably—if one may assume that nature in its external form expresses the proportions of the inner—because, where none of the mental qualities exceed the proportion requisite to constitute an individual free from faults, nothing can be expected in the way of what is called *genius*, in which nature seems to make a departure from its usual relations of the mental powers in favour of some special one.

2 As telling against this explanation, the instance may be adduced, that there are things in which we see a form suggesting adaptation to an end, without any end being cognized in them—as, for example, the stone implements frequently obtained from
FOURTH MOMENT
OF THE JUDGEMENT OF TASTE: MOMENT OF
THE MODALITY OF THE DELIGHT IN THE OBJECT

§ 18
Character of the modality in a judgement of taste

I may assert in the case of every representation that the connection of
a pleasure with the representation (as a cognition) is at least possible.
Of what I call agreeable I assert that it actually causes pleasure in me.
But what we have in mind in the case of the beautiful is a necessary
reference on its part to delight. However, this necessity is of a special
kind. It is not a theoretical objective necessity — such as would let us
cognize a priori that everyone will feel this delight in the object that
is called beautiful by me. Nor yet is it a practical necessity, in which
case, thanks to concepts of a pure rational will in which free agents
are supplied with a rule, this delight is the necessary consequence of
an objective law, and simply means that one ought absolutely (without ulterior aim) to act in a certain way. Rather, being such a necessity as is thought in an aesthetic judgement, it can only be termed exemplary. In other words it is a necessity of the assent of all to a judgement regarded as exemplifying a universal rule which cannot be formulated. Since an aesthetic judgement is not an objective or cognitive judgement, this necessity is not derivable from determinate concepts, and so is not apodictic. Much less is it inferable from the universality of experience (of a complete agreement of judgements about the beauty of a certain object). For, apart from the fact that experience would hardly furnish sufficient evidence for this purpose, empirical judgements do not afford any foundation for a concept of the necessity of these judgements.

sepulchral tumuli and supplied with a hole, as if designed for a handle; and although these by their shape manifestly indicate a purposiveness, the end of which is unknown, they are not on that account described as beautiful. But the very fact of their being regarded as artificial products involves an immediate recognition that their shape is attributed to some purpose or other and to a definite end. For this reason there is no immediate delight whatever in their contemplation. A flower, on the other hand, such as a tulip, is regarded as beautiful, because we meet with a certain purposiveness in its perception, which, in our judgement of it, is not referred to any end whatever.
§ 19
The subjective necessity attributed to a judgement of taste is conditioned

The judgement of taste expects agreement from everyone; and a person who describes something as beautiful insists that everyone ought to give the object in question his approval and follow suit in describing it as beautiful. The ought in aesthetic judgements, therefore, despite an accordance with all the requisite data for passing judgement, is still only pronounced conditionally. We are suitors for agreement from everyone else, because we are fortified with a ground common to all. Further, we would be able to count on this agreement, provided we were always assured of the correct subsumption of the case under that ground as the rule of approval.

§ 20
The condition of the necessity advanced by a judgement of taste is the idea of a common sense

If judgements of taste (like cognitive judgements) were in possession of a definite objective principle, then one who in his judgement followed such a principle would claim unconditioned necessity for it. Again, if they were devoid of any principle, as are those of the mere taste of the senses, then no thought of any necessity on their part would enter one’s head. Therefore they must have a subjective principle, and one which determines what pleases or displeases, by means of feeling only and not through concepts, but yet with universal validity. Such a principle, however, could only be regarded as a common sense. This differs essentially from common understanding, which is also sometimes called common sense (sensus communis): for the judgement of the latter is not one by feeling, but always one by concepts, though usually only in the shape of obscurely represented principles.

The judgement of taste, therefore, depends on our presupposing the existence of a common sense. (But this is not to be taken to mean some external sense, but the effect arising from the free play
of our powers of cognition.) Only under the presupposition, I repeat, of such a common sense, are we able to lay down a judgement of taste.

§ 21

Have we any ground for presupposing a common sense?

Cognitions and judgements must, together with their attendant conviction, admit of being universally communicated; for otherwise no correspondence with the object could be ascribed to them. They would all amount to nothing but a mere subjective play of the powers of representation, just as scepticism would have it. But if cognitions are to admit of communication, then our state of mind, i.e. the way the cognitive powers are attuned for cognition generally, and, in fact, the relative proportion suitable for a representation (by which an object is given to us) from which cognition is to result, must also admit of communication, since, without this, which is the subjective condition of the act of knowing, knowledge, as an effect, would not arise. And this is always what actually happens where a given object, through the intervention of the senses, sets the imagination to work in combining the manifold, and the imagination, in turn, sets the understanding to work in unifying the manifold under concepts. But this disposition of the cognitive powers has a relative proportion differing with the diversity of the objects that are given. However, there must be one in which this internal ratio suitable for enlivening (one faculty by the other) is best adapted for both mental powers in respect of cognition (of given objects) generally; and this disposition can only be determined through feeling (and not by concepts). Since, now, this disposition itself must admit of being universally communicated, and hence also the feeling of it (in the case of a given representation), while again, the universal communicability of a feeling presupposes a common sense: it follows that our assumption of it is well founded. And here, too, we do not have to take our stand on psychological observations, but we assume a common sense as the necessary condition of the universal communicability of our knowledge, which is presupposed in every logic and every principle of knowledge that is not one of scepticism.
§ 22

The necessity of the universal assent that is thought in a judgement of taste, is a subjective necessity which, under the presupposition of a common sense, is represented as objective.

In all judgements by which we describe anything as beautiful we tolerate no one else being of a different opinion, and yet we do not rest our judgement upon concepts, but only on our feeling. Accordingly we introduce this underlying feeling not as a private feeling, but as a common one. Now, for this purpose, experience cannot be made the ground of this common sense, for the latter is invoked to justify judgements containing an 'ought'. The assertion is not that everyone will fall in with our judgement, but rather that everyone ought to agree with it. Here I put forward my judgement of taste as an example of the judgement of common sense, and attribute to it on that account exemplary validity. Hence common sense is a mere ideal norm. With this as presupposition, a judgement that accords with it, as well as the delight in an object expressed in that judgement, is rightly converted into a rule for everyone. For the principle, while it is only subjective, being yet assumed as subjectively universal (a necessary idea for everyone), could, in what concerns the consensus of different judging subjects, demand universal assent like an objective principle, provided we were assured of our subsumption under it being correct.

This indeterminate norm of a common sense is, as a matter of fact, presupposed by us; as is shown by our presuming to lay down judgements of taste. But does such a common sense in fact exist as a constitutive principle of the possibility of experience, or is it formed for us as a regulative principle by a still higher principle of reason, that for higher ends first seeks to produce in us a common sense? Is taste, in other words, a natural and original faculty, or is it only the idea of one that is artificial and to be acquired by us, so that a judgement of taste, with its expectation of universal assent, is but a demand of reason for generating such unanimity in this sensing, and does the 'ought', i.e. the objective necessity of the coincidence of the feeling of all with the particular feeling of each, only betoken the possibility of arriving at some sort of agreement in these matters, and the judgement of taste only adduce an example of the application of this principle? These are questions which as yet we are neither
willing nor in a position to investigate. For the present we have only to resolve the faculty of taste into its elements, and to unite these ultimately in the idea of a common sense.

**DEFINITION OF THE BEAUTIFUL DRAWN FROM THE FOURTH MOMENT**

The beautiful is that which, apart from a concept, is cognized as object of a *necessary* delight.

**GENERAL REMARK ON THE FIRST SECTION OF THE ANALYTIC**

The result to be extracted from the foregoing analysis is in effect this: that everything comes down to the concept of taste as a faculty for judging an object in reference to the *free conformity to law* of the imagination. If, now, imagination must in the judgement of taste be regarded in its freedom, then, to begin with, it is not taken as reproductive, as in its subjection to the laws of association, but as productive and active in its own right (as originator of arbitrary forms of possible intuitions). And although in the apprehension of a given object of the senses it is tied down to a determinate form of this object and, to that extent, does not enjoy free play (as it does in poetry), still it is easy to conceive that the object may supply ready-made to the imagination just such a form of the arrangement of the manifold, as the imagination, if it were left to itself, would freely project in harmony with the general *conformity to law of the understanding*. But that the imagination should be both free and of itself *conformable to law*, i.e. carry autonomy with it, is a contradiction. The understanding alone gives the law. Where, however, the imagination is compelled to follow a course laid down by a determinate law, then what the form of the product is to be is determined by concepts; but, in that case, as already shown, the delight is not delight in the beautiful, but in the good, (in perfection, though it be no more than formal perfection), and the judgement is not one due to taste. Hence it is only a conformity to law without a law, and a subjective harmonizing of the imagination and the understanding without an objective one—which latter would mean that the representation was referred to a determinate concept of the object—that is consistent with the *free conformity to law* of the understanding (which has also been called purposiveness without a purpose) and with the specific character of a judgement of taste.
Now geometrically regular figures, a circle, a square, a cube, and the like, are commonly brought forward by critics of taste as the most simple and unquestionable examples of beauty. And yet the very reason why they are called regular, is because the only way of representing them is by looking on them as mere presentations of a determinate concept by which the figure has its rule (according to which alone it is possible) prescribed for it. One or other of these two views must, therefore, be wrong: either the verdict of the critics that attributes beauty to such figures, or else our own, which makes purposiveness apart from any concept necessary for beauty.

One would scarce think it necessary for a person with taste to take more delight in a circle than in a scrawled outline, in an equilateral and equiangular quadrilateral than in one that is all lopsided, and, as it were, deformed. The requirements of common understanding ensure such a preference without the least demand upon taste. Where some purpose is perceived, as, for instance, that of judging the area of a plot of land, or rendering intelligible the relation of divided parts to one another and to the whole, then regular figures, and those of the simplest kind, are needed; and the delight does not rest immediately upon the way the figure strikes the eye, but upon its serviceability for all manner of possible purposes. A room with the walls making oblique angles, a plot laid out in a garden in a similar way, even any violation of symmetry, as well in the figure of animals (e.g. being one-eyed) as in that of buildings, or of flower-beds, is displeasing because of its counter-purposive form, not only in a practical way in respect of some definite use to which the thing may be put, but for a judgement that looks to all manner of possible purposes. With the judgement of taste the case is different. For, when it is pure, it combines delight or aversion immediately with the bare contemplation of the object irrespective of its use or of any end.

The regularity that conduces to the concept of an object is, in fact, the indispensable condition (conditio sine qua non) of grasping the object as a single representation and giving to the manifold its determinate form. This determination is an end in respect of knowledge; and in this connexion it is invariably coupled with delight (such as attends the accomplishment of any, even problematical, purpose). Here, however, we have merely the value set upon the solution that satisfies the problem, and not a free and indeterminately purposive entertainment of the powers of the mind with what is called beautiful.
In the latter case understanding is at the service of imagination, in the former this relation is reversed.

With a thing that owes its possibility to a purpose, a building, or even an animal, its regularity, which consists in symmetry, must express the unity of the intuition accompanying the concept of its end, and belongs with it to cognition. But where all that is intended is the maintenance of a free play of the powers of representation (subject, however, to the condition that there is to be nothing for understanding to take exception to), in ornamental gardens, in the decoration of rooms, in all kinds of tasteful implements etc., regularity that betrays constraint is to be avoided as far as possible. Thus English taste in gardens, and baroque taste in furniture, push the freedom of imagination to the verge of what is grotesque—the idea being that in this divorce from all constraint of rules the precise instance is being afforded where taste can exhibit its perfection in projects of the imagination to the fullest extent.

All stiff regularity (such as that which borders on mathematical regularity) is inherently repugnant to taste, in that the contemplation of it affords us no lasting entertainment. Indeed, where it has neither cognition nor some determinate practical end expressly in view, we get heartily tired of it. On the other hand, anything that gives the imagination scope for unstudied and purposive play is always fresh to us. We do not grow weary of the very sight of it. Marsden in his description of Sumatra* observes that the free beauties of nature so surround the beholder on all sides that they cease to have much attraction for him. On the other hand he found a pepper garden full of charm, on coming across it in mid-forest with its rows of parallel stakes on which the plant twines itself. From all this he infers that wild, and in its appearance quite irregular beauty, is only pleasing as a change to one whose eyes have become surfeited with regular beauty. But he need only have made the experiment of passing one day in his pepper garden to realize that once the regularity has enabled the understanding to put itself in accord with the order that is its constant requirement, instead of the object diverting him any longer, it imposes an irksome constraint upon the imagination: whereas nature subject to no constraint of artificial rules, and lavish, as it there is, in its luxuriant variety can supply constant nourishment for his taste. — Even a bird’s song, which we can reduce to no musical rule, seems to have more freedom in it, and thus to offer more for
taste, than the human voice singing in accordance with all the rules that the art of music prescribes; for we grow tired much sooner of frequent and lengthy repetitions of the latter. Yet here most likely our sympathy with the joy of a dear little creature is confused with the beauty of its song, for if exactly imitated by a human being (as has been sometimes done with the notes of the nightingale) it would strike our ear as wholly destitute of taste.

Further, beautiful objects have to be distinguished from beautiful views of objects (where the distance often prevents a clear perception). In the latter case taste appears to fasten, not so much on what the imagination grasps in this field, as on the encouragement it receives in the way of invention, i.e. in the peculiar fantasies with which the mind entertains itself as it is being continually stirred by the variety that strikes the eye. It is just as when we watch the changing shapes of the fire in the hearth or of a rippling brook: neither of which are things of beauty, but nonetheless convey a charm to the imagination, because they sustain its free play.
SECOND BOOK

ANALYTIC OF THE SUBLIME

§ 23

Transition from the faculty of judging the beautiful to that of judging the sublime

The beautiful and the sublime agree on the point of pleasing on their own account. Further they agree in not presupposing either a judgement of the senses or a logically determining judgement, but one of reflection. Hence it follows that the delight does not depend upon a sensation, as with the agreeable, nor upon a definite concept, as does the delight in the good, although it has, for all that, an indeterminate reference to concepts. Consequently the delight is connected with the mere presentation or faculty of presentation, and is thus taken to express the accord, in a given intuition, of the faculty of presentation, or the imagination, with the faculty of concepts that belongs to understanding or reason, in the sense of the former faculty assisting the latter. Hence both kinds of judgements are singular, and yet such as profess to be universally valid in respect of every subject, despite the fact that their claims are directed merely to the feeling of pleasure and not to any knowledge of the object.

There are, however, also important and striking differences between the two. The beautiful in nature is a question of the form of the object, and this consists in limitation, whereas the sublime is to be found in an object even devoid of form, so far as it immediately involves, or else by its presence provokes, a representation of limitlessness, yet with a super-added thought of its totality. Accordingly the beautiful seems to be regarded as a presentation of an indeterminate concept of the understanding, the sublime as a presentation of an indeterminate concept of reason. Hence the delight is in the former case coupled with the representation of quality, but in this case with that of quantity. Moreover, the former delight is very different from the latter in kind. For the beautiful is directly attended with a feeling of the furtherance of life, and is thus compatible with charms and a playful imagination. On the other hand, the feeling of the sublime is a pleasure that only arises indirectly, being brought about by the feeling of a
momentary check to the vital forces followed at once by a discharge all the more powerful, and so it is an emotion that seems to be no play, but a serious matter in the exercise of the imagination. Hence charms are also incompatible with it; and, since the mind is not simply attracted by the object, but is also alternately repelled thereby, the delight in the sublime does not so much involve positive pleasure as admiration or respect, i.e. merits the name of a negative pleasure.

But the most important and vital distinction between the sublime and the beautiful is certainly this: that if, as is allowable, we here confine our attention in the first instance to the sublime in objects of nature (that of art being always restricted by the conditions of an agreement with nature), we observe that whereas natural beauty (such as is self-subsisting) conveys a purposiveness in its form making the object appear, as it were, already adapted to our power of judgement, so that it thus forms of itself an object of our delight, that which, without our indulging in any refinements of thought, but, simply in our apprehension of it, excites the feeling of the sublime, may appear, indeed, in point of form to contravene the ends of our power of judgement, to be ill-adapted to our faculty of presentation, and to do violence, as it were, to the imagination, and yet it is judged all the more sublime on that account.

From this it may be seen at once that we express ourselves on the whole inaccurately if we term any object of nature sublime, although we may with perfect propriety call many such objects beautiful. For how can that which is apprehended as inherently counter-purposive be noted with an expression of approval? All that we can say is that the object lends itself to the presentation of a sublimity discoverable in the mind. For the sublime, in the strict sense of the word, cannot be contained in any sensuous form, but rather concerns ideas of reason, which, although no adequate presentation of them is possible, may be aroused and called to mind by that very inadequacy itself which does admit of sensuous presentation. Thus the broad ocean agitated by storms cannot be called sublime. The sight of it is horrible, and one must have stored one’s mind in advance with a wealth of ideas, if such an intuition is to attune it to a feeling which is itself sublime—sublime because the mind has been incited to abandon sensibility, and employ itself upon ideas involving a higher purposiveness.

Self-subsisting natural beauty reveals to us a techin of nature which shows it in the light of a system ordered in accordance with
laws the principle of which is not to be found within the range of our entire faculty of understanding. This principle is that of a purposiveness relative to the employment of judgement in respect of phenomena which have thus to be assigned, not merely to nature regarded as aimless mechanism, but also to nature regarded after the analogy of art. Hence it gives a veritable extension, not, of course, to our knowledge of objects of nature, but to our conception of nature itself—nature as mere mechanism being enlarged to the conception of nature as art—an extension inviting profound inquiries as to the possibility of such a form. But in what we are wont to call sublime in nature there is such an absence of anything leading to particular objective principles and corresponding forms of nature, that it is rather in its chaos, or in its wildest and most irregular disorder and desolation, provided it gives signs of magnitude and power, that nature chiefly excites the ideas of the sublime. Hence we see that the concept of the sublime in nature is far less important and rich in consequences than that of its beauty. It gives on the whole no indication of anything purposive in nature itself, but only in the possible employment of our intuitions of it in inducing a feeling in our own selves of a purposiveness quite independent of nature. For the beautiful in nature we must seek a ground external to ourselves, but for the sublime one merely in ourselves and the attitude of mind that introduces sublimity into the representation of nature. This is a very needful preliminary remark. It entirely separates the ideas of the sublime from that of a purposiveness of nature, and makes the theory of the sublime a mere appendage to the aesthetic judgement of the purposiveness of nature, because it does not give a representation of any particular form in nature, but involves no more than the development of a purposive employment by the imagination of its own representation.

§ 24

On the division of an investigation of the feeling of the sublime

In the division of the moments of an aesthetic estimate of objects in respect of the feeling of the sublime, the course of the analytic will be able to follow the same principle as in the analysis of judgements of taste. For, the judgement being one of the aesthetic reflective judgement, the delight in the sublime, just like that in the beautiful, must in its quantity be shown to be universally valid, in its quality
independent of interest, in its relation subjective purposiveness, and
the latter, in its modality, necessary. Hence the method here will not
depart from the lines followed in the preceding section: unless some-
thing is made of the point that there, where the aesthetic judgement
bore on the form of the object, we began with the investigation of its
quality, whereas here, considering the formlessness that may belong
to what we call sublime, we begin with that of its quantity, as first
moment of the aesthetic judgement on the sublime—a divergence of
method the reason for which is evident from § 23.

But the analysis of the sublime demands a division not required by
that of the beautiful, namely one into the mathematically and the
dynamically sublime.

For the feeling of the sublime involves as its characteristic feature
a movement of the mind combined with the judging of the object,
whereas taste in respect of the beautiful presupposes that the mind is
in restful contemplation, and preserves it in this state. But this move-
ment has to be judged as subjectively purposive (since the sublime
pleases). Hence it is referred through the imagination either to the fac-
culty of cognition or to that of desire; but to whichever faculty the refer-
ence is made the finality of the given representation is judged only in
respect of these faculties (apart from end or interest). Accordingly the
first is attributed to the object as a mathematical, the second as a
dynamical, attunement of the imagination. Hence we arrive at the
above mentioned twofold mode of representing an object as sublime.

A. THE MATHEMATICALLY SUBLIME

§ 25

Definition of the term ‘sublime’

Sublime is the name given to what is absolutely great. But to be great
and to be a magnitude are entirely different concepts (magnitudo and
quantitas). In the same way to assert without qualification (simpliciter)
that something is great, is quite a different thing from saying that it is
absolutely great (absolute, non comparative magnum). The latter is
what is beyond all comparison great.—What, then, is the meaning of
the assertion that anything is great, or small, or of medium size?
What is indicated is not a pure concept of understanding, still less an
intuition of the senses; and just as little is it a concept of reason, for it does not import any principle of cognition. It must, therefore, be a concept of judgement, or have its source in one, and must introduce as basis of the judgement a subjective purposiveness of the representation with reference to the power of judgement. Given a multiplicity of the homogeneous together constituting one thing, and we may at once cognize from the thing itself that it is a magnitude (quantum). No comparison with other things is required. But to determine how great it is always requires something else, which itself has magnitude, for its measure. Now, since in the judging of magnitude we have to take into account not merely the multiplicity (number of units) but also the magnitude of the unit (the measure), and since the magnitude of this unit in turn always requires something else as its measure and as the standard of its comparison, and so on, we see that the computation of the magnitude of phenomena is, in all cases, utterly incapable of affording us any absolute concept of a magnitude, and can, instead, only afford one that is always based on comparison.

If, now, I assert without qualification that anything is great, it would seem that I have nothing in the way of a comparison present to my mind, or at least nothing involving an objective measure, for no attempt is thus made to determine how great the object is. But, despite the standard of comparison being merely subjective, the claim of the judgement is nonetheless one to universal agreement; the judgements: ‘That man is beautiful’ and ‘He is tall’ do not purport to speak only for the judging subject, but, like theoretical judgements, they demand the assent of everyone.

Now in a judgement that without qualification describes anything as great, it is not merely meant that the object has a magnitude, but greatness is ascribed to it pre-eminently among many other objects of a like kind, yet without the extent of this pre-eminence being determined. Hence a standard is certainly laid at the basis of the judgement, which standard is presupposed to be one that can be taken as the same for everyone, but which is available only for an aesthetic judging of the greatness, and not for one that is logical (mathematically determined), for the standard is a merely subjective one underlying the reflective judgement upon the greatness. Furthermore, this standard may be empirical, as, let us say, the average size of the men known to us, of animals of a certain kind, of trees, of houses, of mountains, and so forth. Or it may be a standard given a priori, which
by reason of the imperfections of the judging subject is restricted to subjective conditions of presentation *in concreto*: as, in the practical sphere, the greatness of a particular virtue, or of public liberty and justice in a country; or, in the theoretical sphere, the greatness of the accuracy or inaccuracy of an experiment or measurement, etc.

Here, now, it is noteworthy that, although we have no interest whatever in the object, i.e. its real existence may be a matter of no concern to us, still its mere greatness, regarded even as devoid of form, is able to convey a universally communicable delight and so involve the consciousness of a subjective purposiveness in the employment of our cognitive faculties, but not, be it remembered, a delight in the object, for the latter may be formless, but, in contradistinction to what is the case with the beautiful, where the reflective judgement finds itself set to a key that is final in respect of cognition generally, a delight in an extension affecting the imagination itself.

If (under the aforementioned restriction) we say of an object, without qualification, that it is great, this is not a mathematically determining, but a mere reflective judgement upon its representation, which is subjectively purposive for a particular employment of our cognitive faculties in the judging of magnitude, and we then always couple with the representation a kind of respect, just as we couple a kind of contempt with what we call absolutely small. Moreover, the judging of things as great or small extends to everything, even to all their qualities. Thus we call even their beauty great or small. The reason for this is to be found in the fact that we have only got to present a thing in intuition, as the faculty of judgement directs (consequently to represent it aesthetically), for it to be in its entirety a phenomenon, and hence a quantum.

If, however, we call anything not merely great, but, without qualification, absolutely, and in every respect (beyond all comparison) great, that is to say, sublime, we soon perceive that for this it is not permissible to seek an appropriate standard outside itself, but merely in itself. It is a greatness comparable to itself alone. Hence it comes that the sublime is not to be looked for in the things of nature, but only in our own ideas. But it must be left to the deduction to show in which of them it resides.

The above definition may also be expressed in this way: *that is sublime in comparison with which all else is small*. Here we readily see that nothing can be given in nature, no matter how great we may judge it
to be, which, regarded in some other relation, may not be degraded
to the level of the infinitely little, and nothing so small which in com-
parison with some still smaller standard may not for our imagination
be enlarged to the greatness of a world. Telescopes have put within
our reach an abundance of material to go upon in making the first
observation, and microscopes the same in making the second.
Nothing, therefore, which can be an object of the senses is to be
termed sublime when treated on this footing. But precisely because
there is a striving in our imagination towards progress ad infinitum,
while reason demands absolute totality, as a real idea that same
inability on the part of our faculty for the estimation of the magni-
tude of things of the world of the senses to attain to the idea, is the
awakening of a feeling of a supersensible faculty within us; and it is
the use to which judgement naturally puts particular objects on
behalf of this latter feeling, and not the object of the senses, that is
absolutely great, and every other contrasted employment small.
Consequently it is the attunement of the spirit evoked by a particu-
lar representation engaging the attention of reflective judgement, and
not the object, that is to be called sublime.

The foregoing formulae defining the sublime may, therefore, be
supplemented by yet another: The sublime is that, the mere capacity of
thinking which evidences a faculty of mind transcending every standard
of the senses.

§ 26

The estimation of the magnitude of natural things requisite
for the idea of the sublime

The estimation of magnitude by means of concepts of number (or
their signs in algebra) is mathematical, but that in mere intuition (by
the eye) is aesthetic. Now we can only get definite concepts of how
great anything is by having recourse to numbers (or, at any rate, by
getting approximate measurements by means of numerical series
progressing ad infinitum), the unit being the measure; and to this
extent all logical estimation of magnitude is mathematical. But, as the
magnitude of the measure has to be assumed as a known quantity, if,
to form an estimate of this, we must again have recourse to numbers
involving another standard for their unit, and consequently must again
proceed mathematically, we can never arrive at a first or fundamental
measure, and so cannot get any definite concept of a given magnitude. The estimation of the magnitude of the fundamental measure must, therefore, consist merely in the immediate grasp which we can get of it in intuition, and the use to which our imagination can put this in presenting the numerical concepts: i.e. all estimation of the magnitude of objects of nature is in the last resort aesthetic (i.e. subjectively and not objectively determined).

Now for the mathematical estimation of magnitude there is, of course, no greatest possible magnitude (for the power of numbers extends to infinity), but for the aesthetic estimation there certainly is, and of it I say that where it is considered an absolute measure beyond which no greater is possible subjectively (i.e. for the judging subject), it then conveys the idea of the sublime, and calls forth that emotion which no mathematical estimation of magnitudes by numbers can evoke (except in so far as the fundamental aesthetic measure is vividly preserved for the imagination): because the latter presents only the relative magnitude due to comparison with others of a like kind, whereas the former presents magnitude absolutely, so far as the mind can grasp it in an intuition.

To take in a quantum intuitively in the imagination so as to be able to use it as a measure, or unit for estimating magnitude by numbers, involves two operations of this faculty: *apprehension* (*apprehensio*) and *comprehension* (*comprehensio aesthetica*). Apprehension presents no difficulty: for this process can be carried on *ad infinitum*; but with the advance of apprehension comprehension becomes more difficult at every step and soon attains its maximum, and this is the aesthetically greatest fundamental measure for the estimation of magnitude. For if the apprehension has reached a point beyond which the representations of sensuous intuition in the case of the parts first apprehended begin to disappear from the imagination as this advances to the apprehension of yet others, as much, then, is lost at one end as is gained at the other, and for comprehension we get a maximum which the imagination cannot exceed.

This explains Savary’s observations in his account of Egypt,* that in order to get the full emotional effect of the size of the pyramids we must avoid coming too near just as much as remaining too far away. For in the latter case the representation of the apprehended parts (the tiers of stones) is merely obscure, and produces no effect upon the aesthetic judgement of the subject. In the former, however,
it takes the eye some time to complete the apprehension from the base to the summit; but in this interval the first tiers always in part disappear before the imagination has taken in the last, and so the comprehension is never complete. — The same explanation may also sufficiently account for the bewilderment, or sort of perplexity, which, as is said, seizes the visitor on first entering St. Peter’s in Rome. For here a feeling comes home to him of the inadequacy of his imagination for presenting the idea of a whole within which that imagination attains its maximum, and, in its fruitless efforts to extend this limit, recoils upon itself, but in so doing succumbs to an emotional delight.

At present I am not disposed to deal with the ground of this delight, connected, as it is, with a representation in which we would least of all look for it—a representation, namely, that lets us see its own inadequacy, and consequently its subjective lack of purposiveness for our judgement in the estimation of magnitude—but confine myself to the remark that if the aesthetic judgement is to be pure (unmixed with any teleological judgement which, as such, belongs to reason), and if we are to give a suitable example of it for the critique of aesthetic judgement, we must not point to the sublime in works of art, e.g. buildings, statues and the like, where a human end determines the form as well as the magnitude, nor yet in things of nature, that in their very concept import a determinate end, e.g. animals of a recognized natural order, but in raw nature merely as involving magnitude (and only in this so far as it does not convey any charm or any emotion arising from actual danger). For in a representation of this kind nature contains nothing monstrous (nor what is either magnificent or horrible)—the magnitude apprehended may be increased to any extent provided imagination is able to grasp it all in one whole. An object is monstrous where by its size it defeats the end that forms its concept. The colossal is the mere presentation of a concept which is almost too great for presentation, i.e. borders on the relatively monstrous; for the end to be attained by the presentation of a concept is made harder to realize by the intuition of the object being almost too great for our faculty of apprehension. — A pure judgement upon the sublime must, however, have no end belonging to the object as its determining ground, if it is to be aesthetic and not to be tainted with any judgement of understanding or reason.
Since whatever is to be a source of pleasure, apart from interest, to
the merely reflective judgement must involve in its representation
subjective, and, as such, universally valid purposiveness—though
here, however, no purposiveness of the form of the object underlies
our judging (as it does in the case of the beautiful)—the question
arises: What is this subjective purposiveness, and what enables it to
be prescribed as a norm so as to yield a ground for universally valid
delight in the mere estimation of magnitude, and that, too, in a case
where it is pushed to the point at which our faculty of imagination
breaks down in presenting the concept of a magnitude, and proves
unequal to its task?

In the successive aggregation of units requisite for the representa-
tion of magnitudes the imagination of itself advances ad infinitum
without let or hindrance—understanding, however, conducting it
by means of concepts of number for which the former must supply
the schema. This procedure belongs to the logical estimation of mag-
nitude, and, as such, is doubtless something objectively purposive
according to the concept of an end (as all measurement is), but it is not
anything which for the aesthetic judgement is purposive or pleasing.

Further, in this intentional purposiveness there is nothing com-
pelling us to tax the utmost powers of the imagination, and drive it
as far as ever it can reach in its presentations, so as to enlarge the size
of the measure, and thus make the single intuition holding the many
in one (the comprehension) as great as possible. For in the estimation
of magnitude by the understanding (arithmetic) we get just as far,
whether the comprehension of the units is pushed to the number 10
(as in the decadic system) or only to 4 (as in the tetradic); the further
production of magnitude being earned out by the successive aggre-
gation of units, or, if the quantum is given in intuition, by apprehen-
sion, merely progressively (not comprehensively), according to an
adopted principle of progression. In this mathematical estimation of
magnitude understanding is as well served and as satis-
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the logical estimation of magnitude advances ad infinitum with nothing to stop it.

The mind, however, hearkens now to the voice of reason within itself, which for all given magnitudes—even for those which can never be completely apprehended, though (in sensuous representation) judged as completely given—requires totality, and consequently comprehension in one intuition, and which calls for a presentation answering to all the above members of a progressively increasing numerical series, and does not exempt even the infinite (space and time past) from this requirement, but rather renders it inevitable for us to regard this infinite (in the judgement of common reason) as completely given (i.e. given in its totality).

But the infinite is absolutely (not merely comparatively) great. In comparison with this all else (in the way of magnitudes of the same order) is small. But the point of capital importance is that the mere ability even to think it as a whole indicates a faculty of mind transcending every standard of the senses. For the latter would entail a comprehension yielding as unit a standard bearing to the infinite a definite ratio expressible in numbers, which is impossible. Still the mere ability even to think the given infinite without contradiction, is something that requires the presence in the human mind of a faculty that is itself supersensible. For it is only through this faculty and its idea of a noumenon, which latter, while not itself admitting of any intuition, is yet introduced as substrate underlying the intuition of the world as mere phenomenon, that the infinite of the sensible world, in the pure intellectual estimation of magnitude, is completely comprehended under a concept, although in the mathematical estimation by means of numerical concepts it can never be completely thought. Even a faculty enabling the infinite of supersensible intuition to be regarded as given (in its intelligible substrate), transcends every standard of sensibility, and is great beyond all comparison even with the faculty of mathematical estimation: not, of course, from a theoretical point of view that looks to the interests of our faculty of knowledge, but as a broadening of the mind that from another (the practical) point of view feels itself empowered to pass beyond the narrow confines of sensibility.

Nature, therefore, is sublime in such of its phenomena as in their intuition convey the idea of their infinity. But this can only occur through the inadequacy of even the greatest effort of our imagination
in the estimation of the magnitude of an object. But, now, in the case of the mathematical estimation of magnitude imagination is quite competent to supply a measure equal to the requirements of any object. For the numerical concepts of the understanding can by progressive synthesis make any measure adequate to any given magnitude. Hence it must be the aesthetic estimation of magnitude in which we get at once a feeling of the effort towards a comprehension that exceeds the faculty of imagination for mentally grasping the progressive apprehension in a whole of intuition, and, with it, a perception of the inadequacy of this faculty, which has no bounds to its progress, for taking in and using for the estimation of magnitude a fundamental measure that understanding could turn to account without the least trouble. Now the proper unchangeable fundamental measure of nature is its absolute whole, which, with it, regarded as a phenomenon, means infinity comprehended. But, since this fundamental measure is a self-contradictory concept (owing to the impossibility of the absolute totality of an endless progression), it follows that where the size of a natural object is such that the imagination spends its whole faculty of comprehension upon it in vain, it must carry our concept of nature to a supersensible substrate (underlying both nature and our faculty of thought) which is great beyond every standard of the senses. Thus, instead of the object, it is rather the disposition of the mind in estimating it that we have to judge as sublime.

Therefore, just as the aesthetic judgement in its judgement of the beautiful refers the imagination in its free play to the understanding, to bring out its agreement with the concepts of the latter in general (apart from their determination): so in its judging of a thing as sublime it refers that faculty to reason to bring out its subjective accord with ideas of reason (indeterminately indicated), i.e. to induce a disposition of the mind conformable to that which the influence of definite (practical) ideas would produce upon feeling, and in common accord with it.

This makes it evident that true sublimity must be sought only in the mind of the judging subject, and not in the object of nature that occasions this disposition by the judgement formed of it. Who would apply the term ‘sublime’ even to shapeless mountain masses towering one above the other in wild disorder, with their pyramids of ice, or to the dark tempestuous ocean, or such like things? But in the contemplation of them, without any regard to their form, the mind abandons
itself to the imagination and to a reason placed, though quite apart from any definite end, in conjunction therewith, and merely broadening its view, and it feels itself elevated in its own judgement of itself on finding all the might of imagination still unequal to its ideas.

We get examples of the mathematically sublime of nature in mere intuition in all those instances where our imagination is afforded, not so much a greater numerical concept as a large unit as measure (for shortening the numerical series). A tree judged by the height of a human being gives, at all events, a standard for a mountain; and, supposing this is, say, a mile high, it can serve as unit for the number expressing the earth’s diameter, so as to make it intuitable; similarly the earth’s diameter for the known planetary system; this again for the system of the Milky Way; and the immeasurable host of such systems, which go by the name of nebulae, and most likely in turn themselves form such a system, holds out no prospect of a limit. Now in the aesthetic judging of such an immeasurable whole, the sublime does not lie so much in the greatness of the number, as in the fact that in our onward advance we always arrive at proportionately greater units. The systematic division of the cosmos conduces to this result. For it represents all that is great in nature as in turn becoming little; or, to be more exact, it represents our imagination in all its boundlessness, and with it nature, as sinking into insignificance before the ideas of reason, once their adequate presentation is attempted.

§ 27

Quality of the delight in the judging of the sublime

The feeling of our incapacity to attain to an idea that is a law for us, is respect. Now the idea of the comprehension of any phenomenon whatever, that may be given us, in a whole of intuition, is an idea imposed upon us by a law of reason, which recognizes no definite, universally valid and unchangeable measure except the absolute whole. But our imagination, even when taxing itself to the uttermost on the score of this required comprehension of a given object in a whole of intuition (and so with a view to the presentation of the idea of reason), betrays its limits and its inadequacy, but still, at the same time, its proper vocation of making itself adequate to the same as a law. Therefore the feeling of the sublime in nature is respect for our own vocation, which we attribute to an object of nature by a certain
subreption (substitution of a respect for the object in place of one for
the idea of humanity in our own self—the subject); and this feeling
renders, as it were, intuitable the supremacy of our cognitive facul-
ties on the rational side over the greatest faculty of sensibility.

The feeling of the sublime is, therefore, at once a feeling of dis-
pleasure, arising from the inadequacy of imagination in the aesthetic
estimation of magnitude to attain to its estimation by reason, and a
simultaneously awakened pleasure, arising from this very judgement
of the inadequacy of the greatest faculty of sense being in accord with
ideas of reason, so far as the effort to attain to these is for us a law.
It is, in other words, for us a law (of reason), which belongs to our
vocation, that we should esteem as small in comparison with ideas of
reason everything which for us is great in nature as an object of the
senses; and that which makes us alive to the feeling of this supersens-
ible side of our being harmonizes with that law. Now the greatest
effort of the imagination in the presentation of the unit for the esti-
mation of magnitude involves in itself a reference to something
absolutely great, consequently a reference also to the law of reason that
this alone is to be adopted as the supreme measure of what is great.
Therefore the inner perception of the inadequacy of every standard
of sense to serve for the rational estimation of magnitude is a coming
into accord with reason’s laws, and a displeasure that arouses the
feeling of our own supersensible vocation, according to which it is
purposive, and consequently a pleasure, to find every standard of
sensibility falling short of the ideas of reason.

The mind feels itself set in motion in the representation of the
sublime in nature; whereas in the aesthetic judgement upon what is
beautiful therein it is in restful contemplation. This movement, espe-
cially in its inception, may be compared with a shaking, i.e. with a
rapidly alternating repulsion and attraction produced by one and the
same object. This excess for the imagination (towards which it is
driven in the apprehension of the intuition) is like an abyss in which
it fears to lose itself; yet again for the rational idea of the supersens-
ible it is not excessive, but conformable to law, and directed to elic-
ting such an effort on the part of the imagination: and so in turn as
much a source of attraction as it was repellent to mere sensibility. But
the judgement itself all the while steadfastly preserves its aesthetic
character, because it represents, without being grounded on any deter-
minate concept of the object, merely the subjective play of the mental
powers (imagination and reason) as harmonious by virtue of their very contrast. For just as in the judging of the beautiful imagination and understanding by their concord generate a subjective purposiveness of the mental faculties, so imagination and reason do so here by their conflict—that is to say they induce a feeling of our possessing a pure and self-sufficient reason, or a faculty for the estimation of magnitude, whose pre-eminence can only be made intuitively evident by the inadequacy of that faculty which in the presentation of magnitudes (of objects of the senses) is itself unbounded.

Measurement of a space (as apprehension) is at the same time a description of it, and so an objective movement in the imagination and a progression. On the other hand the comprehension of the manifold in the unity, not of thought, but of intuition, and consequently the comprehension of the successively apprehended parts at one glance, is a retrogression that removes the time-condition in the progression of the imagination, and renders co-existence intuitable. Therefore, since the time-series is a condition of inner sense and of an intuition, it is a subjective movement of the imagination by which it does violence to inner sense—a violence which must be proportionately more striking the greater the quantum which the imagination comprehends in one intuition. The effort, therefore, to receive in a single intuition a measure for magnitudes which it takes an appreciable time to apprehend, is a mode of representation which, subjectively considered, is counter-purposive, but, objectively, is requisite for the estimation of magnitude, and is consequently purposive. Here the very same violence that is wrought on the subject through the imagination is judged as purposive with respect to the entire vocation of the mind.

The quality of the feeling of the sublime consists in its being, in respect of the faculty of aesthetic judging, a feeling of displeasure at an object, which yet, at the same time, is represented as purposive—a representation which derives its possibility from the fact that the subject’s very incapacity betrays the consciousness of an unlimited capacity of the same subject, and that the mind can aesthetically judge the latter only through the former.

In the case of the logical estimation of magnitude the impossibility of ever arriving at absolute totality by the progressive measurement of things of the sensible world in time and space was cognized as an objective impossibility, i.e. one of thinking the infinite as given, and not as simply subjective, i.e. an incapacity for grasping it; for nothing
turns there on the amount of the comprehension in one intuition, as measure, but everything depends on a numerical concept. But in an aesthetic estimation of magnitude the numerical concept must drop away or undergo a change. The only thing that is purposive for such estimation is the comprehension on the part of imagination in respect of the unit of measure (the concept of a law of the successive production of the concept of magnitude being consequently avoided).—If, now, a magnitude begins to tax the utmost stretch of our faculty of comprehension in an intuition, and numerical magnitudes—in respect of which we are conscious of the boundlessness of our faculty—still call upon the imagination for aesthetic comprehension in a greater unit, the mind then gets a feeling of being aesthetically confined within bounds. Nevertheless, with a view to the extension of imagination necessary for adequacy with what is unbounded in our faculty of reason, namely the idea of the absolute whole, the attendant displeasure, and, consequently, the lack of purposiveness in our faculty of imagination is still represented as purposive for ideas of reason and their arousal. But in this very way the aesthetic judgement itself is subjectively purposive for reason as source of ideas, i.e. of such an intellectual comprehension as makes all aesthetic comprehension small, and the object is received as sublime with a pleasure that is only possible by means of a displeasure.
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B. The Dynamically Sublime in Nature

§ 28

Nature as Might

*Might* is a power which is superior to great hindrances. It is termed *dominion* if it is also superior to the resistance of that which itself possesses might. Nature considered in an aesthetic judgement as might that has no dominion over us, is *dynamically sublime.*

If we are to judge nature as dynamically sublime, it must be represented as a source of fear (though the converse, that every object that is a source of fear is, in our aesthetic judgement, sublime, does not hold). For in forming an aesthetic judgement (no concept being present) the superiority to hindrances can only be judged according to the greatness of the resistance. Now that which we strive to resist
is an evil, and, if we do not find our powers commensurate to the task, an object of fear. Hence the aesthetic judgement can only deem nature a might, and so dynamically sublime, in so far as it is looked upon as an object of fear.

But we may look upon an object as fearful, and yet not be afraid of it, if, that is, our judgement takes the form of our simply picturing to ourselves the case of our wishing to offer some resistance to it, and recognizing that all such resistance would be quite futile. So the righteous man fears God without being afraid of him, because he regards the case of his wishing to resist God and his commandments as one which need cause him no anxiety. But in every such case, regarded by him as not intrinsically impossible, he cognizes him as one to be feared.

One who is in a state of fear can no more play the part of a judge of the sublime of nature than one captivated by inclination and appetite can of the beautiful. He flees from the sight of an object filling him with dread; and it is impossible to take delight in terror that is seriously entertained. Hence the agreeableness arising from the cessation of an uneasiness is a state of joy. But this, depending upon deliverance from a danger, is a rejoicing accompanied with a resolve never again to put oneself in the way of the danger: in fact we do not like bringing back to mind how we felt on that occasion—not to speak of going in search of an opportunity for experiencing it again.

Bold, overhanging, and, as it were, threatening rocks, thunder-clouds piled up the vault of heaven, borne along with flashes and peals, volcanoes in all their violence of destruction, hurricanes leaving desolation in their track, the boundless ocean rising with rebellious force, the high waterfall of some mighty river, and the like, make our power of resistance of trifling moment in comparison with their might. But, provided our own position is secure, their aspect is all the more attractive for its fearfulness; and we readily call these objects sublime, because they raise the forces of the soul above the height of vulgar commonplace, and discover within us a power of resistance of quite another kind, which gives us courage to be able to measure ourselves against the seeming omnipotence of nature.

In the immeasurableness of nature and the inadequacy of our faculty for adopting a standard proportionate to the aesthetic estimation of the magnitude of its realm, we found our own limitation. But with this we also found in our rational faculty another non-sensuous standard,
one which has that infinity itself under it as unit, and in comparison with which everything in nature is small, and so found in our minds a pre-eminence over nature even in its immeasurability. Now in just the same way the irresistibility of the might of nature forces upon us the recognition of our physical helplessness as beings of nature, but at the same time reveals a faculty of judging ourselves as independent of nature, and discovers a pre-eminence above nature that is the foundation of a self-preservation of quite another kind from that which may be assailed and brought into danger by external nature. This saves humanity in our own person from humiliation, even though as human beings we would have to submit to external violence. In this way external nature is not aesthetically judged as sublime in so far as it arouses fear, but rather because it summons our power (one not of nature) to regard as small those things of which we are inclined to be solicitous (worldly goods, health, and life), and hence to regard its might (to which in these matters we are no doubt subjected) as exercising over us and our personality no such rude dominion that we should bow down before it, once the question becomes one of our highest principles and of our asserting or forsaking them. Therefore nature is here called sublime merely because it elevates the imagination to a presentation of those cases in which the mind can come to feel the sublimity of its own vocation even over nature.

This self-esteem loses nothing by the fact that we must see ourselves safe in order to feel this soul-stirring delight—a fact from which it might seemingly be argued that, as there is no seriousness in the danger, so there is just as little seriousness in the sublimity of our spiritual faculty. For here the delight only concerns the vocation of our faculty disclosed in such a case, in so far as this faculty has its root in our nature although its development and exercise is left to ourselves and remains our responsibility. Here indeed there is truth—no matter how conscious we may be, when we stretch our reflection so far, of our actual present helplessness.

This principle has, doubtless, the appearance of being too far-fetched and subtle, and so of lying beyond the reach of an aesthetic judgement. But observation of human beings proves the reverse, and that it may be the foundation of the commonest judgements, although one is not always conscious of its presence. For what is it that, even to the savage, is the object of the greatest admiration? It is someone who is undaunted, who knows no fear, and who, therefore, does not
give way to danger, but sets vigorously to work with full deliberation. Even where civilization has reached a high pitch there remains this special reverence for the soldier; only that there is then further required of him that he should also exhibit all the virtues of peace — gentleness, sympathy and even proper care for his own person; and for the reason that in this we recognize that his mind is above the threats of danger. And so, comparing the statesman and the general, men may argue as they please as to the pre-eminently respect which is due to either above the other; but the verdict of the aesthetic judgement is for the latter. War itself, provided it is conducted with order and a sacred respect for the rights of civilians, has something sublime about it, and gives nations that carry it on in such a manner a stamp of mind only the more sublime the more numerous the dangers to which they are exposed, and which they are able to meet with fortitude. On the other hand, a prolonged peace favours the predominance of a mere commercial spirit, and with it a debasing self-interest, cowardice, and weakness, and tends to degrade the character of the people.

So far as sublimity is predicated of might, this solution of the concept of it appears at variance with the fact that we tend to represent God in the tempest, the storm, the earthquake, and the like, as presenting himself in his wrath, but at the same time also in his sublimity, and yet here it would be alike folly and presumption to imagine a pre-eminence of our minds over the operations and, as it appears, even over the direction of such might. Here, instead of a feeling of the sublimity of our own nature, submission, prostration, and a feeling of utter helplessness seem more to constitute the attitude of mind befitting the manifestation of such an object, and to be that also more customarily associated with the idea of it on the occasion of a natural phenomenon of this kind. In religion, as a rule, prostration, adoration with bowed head, coupled with contrite, timorous posture and voice, seems to be the only becoming demeanour in presence of the Divinity, and accordingly most peoples have assumed and still observe it. Yet this cast of mind is far from being intrinsically and necessarily involved in the idea of the sublimity of a religion and of its object. The individual that is actually in a state of fear, finding in himself good reason to be so, because he is conscious of offending with his evil disposition against a might directed by a will at once irresistible and just, is far from being in the frame of mind for
admiring divine greatness, for which a mood of calm reflection and a quite free judgement are required. Only when he becomes conscious of having a disposition that is upright and acceptable to God, do those operations of might serve to stir within him the idea of the sublimity of this being, so far as he recognizes the existence in himself of a sublimity of disposition consonant with the divine will, and is thus raised above the dread of such operations of nature, in which he no longer sees God pouring forth his wrath. Even humility, taking the form of an uncompromising judgement upon his shortcomings, which, with the consciousness of good intentions, might readily be glossed over on the ground of the frailty of human nature, is a sublime temper of the mind voluntarily to undergo the pain of remorse as a means of more and more effectually eradicating its cause. In this way religion is intrinsically distinguished from superstition, which latter rears in the mind, not reverence for the sublime, but dread and apprehension of the all-powerful being to whose will terror-stricken man sees himself subjected, yet without according him due honour. From this nothing can arise but grace-begging and vain adulation, instead of a religion consisting in a good life.

Sublimity, therefore, does not reside in any of the things of nature, but only in our own mind, in so far as we may become conscious of our superiority over nature within, and thus also over nature without us (as exerting influence upon us). Everything that provokes this feeling in us, including the might of nature which challenges our strength, is then, though improperly, called sublime, and it is only under presupposition of this idea within us, and in relation to it, that we are capable of attaining to the idea of the sublimity of that being which inspires deep respect in us, not by the mere display of its might in nature, but more by the faculty which is harboured in us of judging that might without fear, and of regarding our vocation as sublimely exalted above it.

§ 29

Modality of the judgement on the sublime in nature

Beautiful nature contains countless things as to which we at once take everyone as in their judgement concurring with our own, and as to which we may further expect this concurrence without going very far wrong. But in respect of our judgement upon the sublime in nature
we cannot so easily vouch for its ready acceptance by others. For a far higher degree of culture, not merely of the aesthetic judgement, but also of the faculties of cognition which lie at its basis, seems to be requisite to enable us to lay down a judgement upon this high distinction of natural objects.

The mental mood appropriate for a feeling of the sublime requires the mind’s susceptibility for ideas, since it is precisely in the failure of nature to attain to these—and consequently only under presupposition of this susceptibility and of the straining of the imagination to use nature as a schema for ideas—that there is something forbidding to sensibility, but which, for all that, has an attraction for us, arising from the fact of its being a dominion which reason exercises over sensibility with a view to extending it to the requirements of its own realm (the practical) and letting it look out beyond itself into the infinite, which for it is an abyss. In fact, without the development of moral ideas, that which, thanks to preparatory culture, we call sublime, merely strikes the untutored individual as terrifying. He will see in the evidences which the ravages of nature give of her dominion, and in the vast scale of her might, compared with which his own is diminished to insignificance, only the misery, peril, and distress that would encompass those who were thrown to its mercy. So the simple-minded, and, for the most part, intelligent Savoyard peasant (as Herr von Saussure relates)* unhesitatingly called all lovers of snow-mountains fools. And who can tell whether he would have been so wide of the mark, if that student of nature had taken the risk of the dangers to which he exposed himself merely, as most travellers do, for a fad, or so as some day to be able to give a moving account of his adventures? But the mind of Saussure was bent on the instruction of mankind, and soul-stirring sensations that excellent man indeed enjoyed, and the reader of his travels got them thrown into the bargain.

But the fact that culture is requisite for the judgement upon the sublime in nature (more than for that upon the beautiful) does not involve its being an original product of culture and something introduced in a more or less conventional way into society. Rather is it in human nature that its foundations are laid, and, in fact, in that which, at once with common understanding, we may expect everyone to possess and may require of them, namely, a native capacity for the feeling for (practical) ideas, i.e. for moral feeling.
This, now, is the foundation of the necessity of that agreement between other people's judgements upon the sublime and our own, which we make our own imply. For just as we taunt a person who is quite inappreciative when judging an object of nature in which we see beauty, with lack of taste, so we say of a person who remains unaffected in the presence of what we consider sublime, that he has no feeling. But we demand both taste and feeling of everyone, and, granted some degree of culture, we give them credit for both. Still, we do so with this difference: that, in the case of the former, since judgement there refers the imagination merely to the understanding, as the faculty of concepts, we make the requirement as a matter of course, whereas in the case of the latter, since here the judgement refers the imagination to reason, as a faculty of ideas, we do so only under a subjective presupposition (which, however, we believe we are warranted in making), namely that of the moral feeling in human beings. And, on this assumption, we attribute necessity to the latter aesthetic judgement also.

In this modality of aesthetic judgements, namely their assumed necessity, lies what is for the critique of judgement a moment of capital importance. For this is exactly what makes an a priori principle apparent in their case, and lifts them out of the sphere of empirical psychology, in which otherwise they would remain buried amid the feelings of gratification and pain (only with the senseless epithet of finer feeling), so as to place them, and, thanks to them, to place the faculty of judgement itself, in the class of judgements of which the basis of an a priori principle is the distinguishing feature, and, thus distinguished, to introduce them into transcendental philosophy.

GENERAL REMARK UPON THE EXPOSITION OF AESTHETIC REFLECTIVE JUDGEMENTS

In relation to the feeling of pleasure an object is to be counted either as agreeable, or beautiful, or sublime, or good (absolutely), (iucundum, pulchrum, sublime, honestum).

As the motive of desires the agreeable is invariably of one and the same kind, no matter what its source or how specifically different the representation (of sense and sensation objectively considered). Hence in judging its influence upon the mind the multitude of its charms (simultaneous or successive) is alone relevant, and so only, as it were, the mass of the agreeable sensation, and it is only by its quantity,
therefore, that this can be made intelligible. Further it in no way conduces to our culture, but belongs only to mere enjoyment.—The *beautiful*, on the other hand, requires the representation of a certain *quality* of the object, that permits also of being understood and reduced to concepts, (although in the aesthetic judgement it is not so reduced), and it cultivates, as it instructs us to attend to purposiveness in the feeling of pleasure.—The *sublime* consists merely in the *relation* exhibited by the judgement of the serviceability of the sensible in the representation of nature for a possible supersensible employment.—

The *absolutely good*, judged subjectively according to the feeling it inspires, (the object of the moral feeling,) as the determinability of the powers of the subject by means of the representation of an *absolutely necessitating* law, is principally distinguished by the *modality* of a necessity resting upon concepts *a priori*, and involving not a mere *claim*, but a *command* upon everyone to assent, and belongs intrinsically not to the aesthetic, but to the pure intellectual judgement. Further, it is not ascribed to nature but to freedom, and that in a determining and not a merely reflective judgement. But the *determinability of the subject* by means of this idea, and, what is more, that of a subject which can be sensible, in the way of a *modification of its state*, to *hindrances* on the part of sensibility, while, at the same time, it can by surmounting them feel superiority over them—a determinability, in other words, as moral feeling—is still so allied to aesthetic judgement and its *formal conditions* as to be capable of being pressed into the service of the aesthetic representation of the conformity to law of action from duty, i.e. of the representation of this as sublime, or even as beautiful, without forfeiting its purity—an impossible result were one to make it naturally bound up with the feeling of the agreeable.

The effective result to be extracted from the exposition so far given of both kinds of aesthetic judgements may be summed up in the following brief definitions:

The *beautiful* is what pleases in the mere judging of it (consequently not by intervention of any feeling of sense in accordance with a concept of the understanding). From this it follows at once that it must please apart from all interest.

The *sublime* is what pleases immediately through its resistance to the interest of the senses.
Both, as definitions of aesthetic universally valid judging, have reference to subjective grounds. In the one case the reference is to grounds of sensibility, in so far as these are purposive on behalf of the contemplative understanding, in the other case in so far as, in their opposition to sensibility, they are, on the contrary, purposive in reference to the ends of practical reason. Both, however, as united in the same subject, are purposive in reference to the moral feeling. The beautiful prepares us to love something, even nature, apart from any interest: the sublime to esteem something highly even in opposition to our (sensuous) interest.

The sublime may be described in this way: It is an object (of nature) the representation of which determines the mind to regard the elevation of nature beyond our reach as equivalent to a presentation of ideas.

In a literal sense and according to their logical import, ideas cannot be presented. But if we enlarge our empirical faculty of representation (mathematical or dynamical) with a view to the intuition of nature, reason inevitably steps forward, as the faculty concerned with the independence of the absolute totality, and calls forth the effort of the mind, unavailing though it be, to make the representation of sense adequate to this totality. This effort, and the feeling of the unattainability of the idea by means of imagination, is itself a presentation of the subjective purposiveness of our mind in the employment of the imagination in the interests of the mind’s supersensible vocation, and compels us subjectively to think nature itself in its totality as a presentation of something supersensible, without our being able to produce this presentation objectively.

For we readily see that nature in space and time falls entirely short of the unconditioned, consequently also of the absolutely great, which still the commonest reason demands. And by this we are also reminded that we have only to do with nature as phenomenon, and that this itself must be regarded as the mere presentation of a nature in itself (which exists in the idea of reason). But this idea of the supersensible, which no doubt we cannot further determine—so that we cannot cognize nature as its presentation, but only think it as such—is awakened in us by an object the aesthetic judging of which strains the imagination to its utmost, whether in respect of its extension (mathematical), or of its might over the mind (dynamical). For it is founded upon the feeling of a sphere of the mind which altogether exceeds the realm of nature (i.e. upon the moral feeling),
with regard to which the representation of the object is judged as subjectively purposive.

As a matter of fact, a feeling for the sublime in nature is hardly thinkable unless in association with a disposition of mind resembling the moral. And though, like that feeling, the immediate pleasure in the beautiful in nature presupposes and cultivates a certain liberality of thought, i.e. makes our delight independent of any mere enjoyment of sense, still it represents freedom rather as in play than as exercising a law-governed activity, which is the genuine characteristic of human morality, where reason has to impose its dominion upon sensibility. There is, however, this qualification, that in the aesthetic judgement upon the sublime this dominion is represented as exercised through the imagination itself as an instrument of reason.

Thus, too, delight in the sublime in nature is only negative (whereas that in the beautiful is positive): that is to say it is a feeling of imagination by its own act depriving itself of its freedom by receiving a purposive determination in accordance with a law other than that of its empirical employment. In this way it gains an extension and a might greater than that which it sacrifices. But the ground of this is hidden from it, and in its place it feels the sacrifice or deprivation, as well as its cause, to which it is subjected. The astonishment amounting almost to terror, the horror and sacred awe, that seizes us when gazing upon the prospect of mountains ascending to heaven, deep ravines and torrents raging there, deep-shadowed solitudes that invite to brooding melancholy, and the like—all this, when we are assured of our own safety, is not actual fear. Rather is it an attempt to gain access to it through imagination, for the purpose of feeling the might of this faculty in combining the movement of the mind thereby aroused with its serenity, and of thus being superior to internal and, therefore, to external, nature, so far as the latter can have any bearing upon our feeling of well-being. For the imagination, in accordance with laws of association, makes our state of contentment dependent upon physical conditions. But acting in accordance with principles of the schematism of judgement (consequently so far as it is subordinated to freedom) it is at the same time an instrument of reason and its ideas. But in this capacity it is a might enabling us to assert our independence as against the influences of nature, to degrade what is great in respect of the latter to the level of what is little, and thus to locate the absolutely great only in the proper vocation of the subject.
This reflection of aesthetic judgement by which it raises itself to the point of adequacy with reason, though without any determinate concept of reason, is still a representation of the object as subjectively purposive, by virtue even of the objective inadequacy of the imagination in its greatest extension for meeting the demands of reason (as the faculty of ideas).

Here we have to attend generally to what has been already adverted to, that in the transcendental aesthetic of judgement there must be no question of anything but pure aesthetic judgements. Consequently examples are not to be selected from such beautiful or sublime objects as presuppose the concept of an end. For then the purposiveness would be either teleological, or based upon mere sensations of an object (gratification or pain) and so, in the first case, not aesthetic, and, in the second, not merely formal. So, if we call the sight of the starry heaven sublime, we must not found our judgement of it upon any concepts of worlds inhabited by rational beings, with the bright spots, which we see filling the space above us, as their suns moving in orbits prescribed for them with the wisest regard to ends. But we must take it, just as it strikes the eye, as a broad and all-embracing canopy: and it is merely under such a representation that we may posit the sublimity which the pure aesthetic judgement attributes to this object. Similarly, as to the prospect of the ocean, we are not to regard it as we, with our minds stored with knowledge on a variety of matters (which, however, is not contained in the immediate intuition), are accustomed to represent it in thought, as, let us say, a spacious realm of aquatic creatures, or as the mighty reservoirs from which are drawn the vapours that fill the air with clouds of moisture for the good of the land, or yet as an element which no doubt divides continent from continent, but at the same time affords the means of the greatest commercial intercourse between them — for in this way we get nothing beyond teleological judgements. Instead of this we must be able to see sublimity in the ocean, regarding it, as the poets do, according to what the impression upon the eye reveals, as, let us say, in its calm, a clear mirror of water bounded only by the heavens, or, be it disturbed, as threatening to overwhelm and engulf everything. The same is to be said of the sublime and beautiful in the human form. Here, for determining grounds of the judgement, we must not have recourse to concepts of ends subserved by all its limbs and members, or allow their accordance with these ends to influence...
our aesthetic judgement (in such case no longer pure), although it is certainly also a necessary condition of aesthetic delight that they should not conflict with these ends. Aesthetic purposiveness is the conformity to law of judgement in its freedom. The delight in the object depends upon the reference which we seek to give to the imagination, namely that it is to entertain the mind in a free activity. If, on the other hand, something else,—be it sensation or concept of the understanding—determines the judgement, it is then conformable to law, no doubt, but not an act of free judgement.

Hence to speak of intellectual beauty or sublimity is to use expressions which, in the first place, are not quite correct. For these are aesthetic modes of representation which would be entirely foreign to us were we merely pure intelligences (or if we even put ourselves in thought in the position of such). Secondly, although both, as objects of an intellectual (moral) delight, are compatible with aesthetic delight to the extent of not resting upon any interest, still, on the other hand, there is a difficulty in the way of their alliance with such delight, since their function is to produce an interest, and, on the assumption that the presentation has to accord with delight in the aesthetic judging, this interest could only be effected by means of an interest of the senses combined with it in the presentation. But in this way the intellectual purposiveness would be violated and rendered impure.

The object of a pure and unconditioned intellectual delight is the moral law in the might which it exerts in us over all antecedent motives of the mind. Now, since it is only through sacrifices that this might makes itself known to us aesthetically, (and this involves a deprivation of something—though in the interests of inner freedom—whilst in turn it reveals in us an unfathomable depth of this supersensible faculty, the consequences of which extend beyond our visible reach), it follows that the delight, looked at from the aesthetic side (in reference to sensibility) is negative, i.e. opposed to this interest, but from the intellectual side, positive and bound up with an interest. Hence it follows that the intellectual and intrinsically purposive (moral) good, estimated aesthetically, instead of being represented as beautiful, must rather be represented as sublime, with the result that it arouses more a feeling of respect (which disdains charm) than of love or of the heart being drawn towards it—for human nature does not of its own proper motion accord with the good, but only by virtue of the dominion which reason exercises over sensibility. Conversely, that,
too, which we call sublime in external nature, or even internal nature (e.g. certain affects) is only represented as a might of the mind enabling it to overcome this or that hindrance of sensibility by means of moral principles, and it is from this that it derives its interest.

I must dwell a while on the latter point. The idea of the good connected with affect is enthusiasm. This state of mind appears to be sublime: so much so that there is a common saying that nothing great can be achieved without it. But now every affect is blind either as to the choice of its end, or, supposing this has been furnished by reason, in the way it is effected—for it is that movement of the mind whereby the exercise of free deliberation upon fundamental principles, with a view to determining oneself accordingly, is rendered impossible. On this account it cannot merit any delight on the part of reason. Yet, from an aesthetic point of view, enthusiasm is sublime, because it is an effort of one’s powers called forth by ideas which give to the mind an impetus of far stronger and more enduring efficacy than the stimulus afforded by sensible representations. But (as seems strange) even freedom from affect (apatheia, phlegma in significatu bono) in a mind that strenuously follows its unswerving principles is sublime, and that, too, in a manner vastly superior, because it has at the same time the delight of pure reason on its side. Such a stamp of mind is alone called noble. This expression, however, comes in time to be applied to things—such as buildings, a garment, literary style, a person’s bearing, and the like—provided they do not so much excite astonishment (the affect attending the representation of novelty exceeding expectation) as admiration (an astonishment which does not cease when the novelty wears off)—and this obtains where ideas undesignedly and artlessly accord in their presentation with aesthetic delight.

Every affect of the strenuous type (such, that is, as excites the consciousness of our power of overcoming every resistance (animi strenui)) is aesthetically sublime, e.g. anger, even desperation (the rage of forlorn hope but not faint-hearted despair). On the other hand,

There is a specific distinction between affects and passions. Affects are related merely to feeling; passions belong to the faculty of desire, and are inclinations that hinder or render impossible all determinability of the power of choice through principles. Affects are impetuous and irresponsible: passions are abiding and deliberate. Thus resentment, in the form of anger, is an affect; but in the form of hatred (vindictiveness) it is a passion. Under no circumstances can the latter be called sublime; for, while the freedom of the mind is, no doubt, impeded in the case of affects, in passion it is abrogated.
affect of the languid type (which converts the very effort of resistance into an object of displeasure (animum languidum)) has nothing noble about it, though it may take its rank as possessing beauty of the sensuous order. Hence the emotions capable of attaining the strength of an affect are very diverse. We have spirited, and we have tender emotions. When the strength of the latter reaches that of an affect they can be turned to no account. The propensity to indulge in them is sentimantality. A sympathetic grief that refuses to be consolated, or one that has to do with imaginary misfortune to which we deliberately give way so far as to allow our fantasy to delude us into thinking it actual fact, indicates and goes to make a tender, but at the same time weak, soul, which shows a beautiful side, and may no doubt be called fanciful, but never enthusiastic. Romances, maudlin dramas, shallow homilies, which trifle with so-called (though falsely so) noble sentiments, but in fact make the heart enervated, insensitive to the stern precepts of duty, and incapable of respect for the worth of humanity in our own person and the rights of human beings (which is something quite other than their happiness), and in general incapable of all firm principles; even a religious discourse which recommends a cringing and abject grace-begging and favour-seeking, abandoning all reliance on our own ability to resist the evil within us, in place of the vigorous resolution to try to get the better of our inclinations by means of those powers which, frail though we may be, are still left to us; that false humility by which self-abasement, whining hypocritical repentance and a merely passive frame of mind are set down as the method by which alone we can become acceptable to the Supreme Being—these have nothing to do with what may be reckoned to belong to beauty, not to speak of the sublimity of mental temperament.

But even impetuous movements of the mind—whether they be allied under the name of edification with ideas of religion, or, as pertaining merely to culture, with ideas involving a social interest—no matter how much they strain the imagination, can in no way lay claim to the honour of a sublime presentation, if they do not leave behind them a temper of mind which, though it be only indirectly, has an influence upon the consciousness of the mind’s strength and resoluteness in respect of that which carries with it pure intellectual purposiveness (the supersensible). For, in the absence of this, all these emotions belong only to motion, which we welcome in the
interests of good health. The agreeable lassitude that follows upon being stirred up in that way by the play of the affects, is a fruition of the state of well-being arising from the restoration of the equilibrium of the various vital forces within us. This, in the last resort, comes to no more than what the Eastern voluptuaries find so soothing when they get their bodies massaged, and all their muscles and joints softly pressed and bent; only that in the first case the principle that occasions the movement is chiefly internal, whereas here it is entirely external. Thus, many an individual believes himself edified by a sermon in which there is no establishment of anything (no system of good maxims); or thinks himself improved by a tragedy, when he is merely glad at having relieved himself of boredom. Thus the sublime must in every case have reference to our way of thinking, i.e. to maxims directed to giving to the intellectual side of our nature and to the ideas of reason supremacy over sensibility.

We have no reason to fear that the feeling of the sublime will suffer from an abstract mode of presentation like this, which is altogether negative with regard to the sensuous. For though the imagination, no doubt, finds nothing beyond the sensible world on which it can lay hold, still this thrusting aside of the sensible barriers gives it a feeling of being unbounded; and that removal is thus a presentation of the infinite. As such it can never be anything more than a negative presentation—but still it expands the soul. Perhaps there is no more sublime passage in the Jewish Law than the commandment: Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven or on earth, or under the earth, etc. This commandment can alone explain the enthusiasm which the Jewish people, in their moral period, felt for their religion when comparing themselves with others, or the pride inspired by Mohammedanism. The very same holds good of our representation of the moral law and of our intrinsic capacity for morality. The fear that, if we divest this representation of everything that can commend it to the senses, it will thereupon be attended only with a cold and lifeless approbation and not with any moving force or emotion, is wholly unwarranted. The very reverse is the truth. For when nothing any longer presents itself to the senses, and the unmistakable and ineffaceable idea of morality is all that now remains, there would be need rather of tempering the ardour of an unbounded imagination to prevent it rising to enthusiasm, than of seeking to lend these ideas the aid of images and childish
devices for fear of their lack of power. For this reason governments have gladly let religion be fully equipped with these accessories, seeking in this way to relieve their subjects of the exertion, but to deprive them, at the same time, of the ability, required for expanding their spiritual powers beyond the limits arbitrarily laid down for them, and this makes it all the easier to treat them as though they were merely passive.

This pure, elevating, merely negative presentation of morality involves, on the other hand, no fear of fanaticism, which is a delusion that would will some vision beyond all the bounds of sensibility; i.e. would dream according to principles (rational raving). The safeguard is the purely negative character of the presentation. For the inscrutability of the idea of freedom precludes all positive presentation. The moral law, however, is a sufficient and original source of determination within us: so it does not for a moment permit us to cast about for a ground of determination external to itself. If enthusiasm is comparable to delirium, fanaticism may be compared to mania. Of these the latter is least of all compatible with the sublime, for it is profoundly ridiculous. In enthusiasm, as an affect, the imagination is unbridled; in fanaticism, as a deep-seated, brooding passion, it is ungoverned. The first is a transitory state to which the healthiest understanding is liable to become at times the victim; the second is an undermining disease.

Simplicity (artless purposiveness) is, as it were, the style adopted by nature in the sublime. It is also that of morality. The latter is a second (supersensible) nature, whose laws alone we know, without being able to attain to an intuition of the supersensible faculty within us—that which contains the ground of this legislation.

One further remark. The delight in the sublime, no less than in the beautiful, by reason of its universal communicability is not only plainly distinguished from other aesthetic judgements, but also from this same property acquires an interest in society (in which it admits of such communication). Yet, despite this, we have to note the fact that isolation from all society is looked upon as something sublime, provided it rests upon ideas which disregard all sensible interest. To be self-sufficing, and so not to stand in need of society, yet without being unsociable, i.e. without shunning it, is something approaching the sublime—a remark applicable to all superiority over needs. On the other hand, to shun our fellow human beings from misanthropy, because of enmity towards them, or from anthropophobia, because we
imagine the hand of everyone is against us, is partly odious, partly contemptible. There is, however, a misanthropy, (most improperly so called,) the tendency towards which is to be found with advancing years in many right-minded people, that, as far as good will goes, is, no doubt, philanthropic enough, but as the result of long and sad experience, is widely removed from delight in mankind. We see evidences of this in the propensity to reclusiveness, in the fanciful desire for a retired country seat, or else (with the young) in the dream of the happiness of being able to spend one’s life with a little family on an island unknown to the rest of the world — material of which novelists or writers of Robinsonades know how to make such good use. Falsehood, ingratitude, injustice, the puerility of the ends which we ourselves look upon as great and momentous, and to attain which we inflict upon our fellow human beings all imaginable evils — these all so contradict the idea of what people might be if they only would, and are so at variance with our active wish to see them better, that, to avoid hating where we cannot love, it seems but a slight sacrifice to forgo all the joys of fellowship with our kind. This sadness which is not directed to the evils which fate brings down upon others (a sadness which springs from sympathy), but to those which they inflict upon themselves (one which is based on antipathy in questions of principle), is sublime because it is founded on ideas, whereas that springing from sympathy can only be accounted beautiful. — Saussure, who was no less ingenious than profound, in the description of his Alpine travels remarks of Bonhomme, one of the Savoy mountains, ‘There reigns there a certain insipid sadness.’ He recognized, therefore, that, besides this, there is an interesting sadness, such as is inspired by the sight of some desolate place into which men might gladly withdraw themselves so as to hear no more of the world without, and be no longer versed in its affairs, a place, however, which must yet not be so altogether inhospitable as only to afford a most miserable retreat for a human being. — I only make this observation as a reminder that even sorrow (but not dispirited sadness) may take its place among the vigorous affections, provided it has its root in moral ideas. If, however, it is grounded upon sympathy, and, as such, is lovable, it belongs only to the languid affections. And this serves to call attention to the mental temperament which in the first case alone is sublime.
The transcendental exposition of aesthetic judgements now brought to a close may be compared with the physiological one, as worked out by Burke and many acute men among us, so that we may see where a merely empirical exposition of the sublime and beautiful would bring us. Burke, who deserves to be called the foremost author in this method of treatment, deduces, on these lines, 'that the feeling of the sublime is grounded on the impulse towards self-preservation and on fear, i.e. on a pain, which, since it does not go the length of disordering the bodily parts, calls forth movements which, as they clear the vessels, whether fine or gross, of a dangerous and troublesome encumbrance, are capable of producing delight; not pleasure but a sort of delightful horror, a sort of tranquillity tinged with terror.' The beautiful, which he grounds on love (from which, still, he would have desire kept separate), he reduces to 'the relaxing, slackening, and enervating of the fibres of the body, and consequently a softening, a dissolving, a languor, and a fainting, dying, and melting away for pleasure'. And this explanation he supports, not alone by instances in which the feeling of the beautiful as well as of the sublime is capable of being excited in us by the imagination in conjunction with the understanding, but even by instances when it is in conjunction with sensations.—As psychological observations these analyses of our mental phenomena are extremely fine, and supply a wealth of material for the favourite investigations of empirical anthropology. But, besides that, there is no denying the fact that all representations within us, no matter whether they are objectively merely sensible or wholly intellectual, are still subjectively associable with gratification or pain, however imperceptible either of these may be. (For these representations one and all affect the feeling of life, and none of them, so far as it is a modification of the subject, can be indifferent.) We must even admit that, as Epicurus maintained, gratification and pain though proceeding from the imagination or even from representations of the understanding, are always in the last resort corporeal, since apart from any feeling of the bodily organ life would be merely a consciousness of one’s existence, and could not include any feeling of well-being or the reverse, i.e. of the furtherance or hindrance of the vital forces. For, of itself alone, the
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mind is all life (the life-principle itself), and hindrance or furtherance has to be sought outside it, and yet in the human being himself, consequently in the connexion with his body.

But if we attribute the delight in the object wholly and entirely to the gratification which it affords through charm or emotion, then we must not expect from anyone else agreement with the aesthetic judgement passed by us. For in such matters each person rightly consults his own personal feeling alone. But in that case there is an end of all censure in matters of taste—unless the example afforded by others as the result of a contingent coincidence of their judgements is to be held over us as commanding our assent. But this principle we would presumably resent, and appeal to our natural right of submitting a judgement to our own sense, where it rests upon the immediate feeling of personal well-being, instead of submitting it to that of others.

Hence if the import of the judgement of taste, where we appraise it as a judgement entitled to require the concurrence of everyone, cannot be egoistic, but must necessarily, from its inner nature, be allowed a pluralistic validity, i.e. on account of what taste itself is, and not on account of the examples which others give of their taste, then it must found upon some a priori principle (whether it be subjective or objective), and no amount of prying into the empirical laws of the changes that go on within the mind can succeed in establishing such a principle. For these laws only yield a knowledge of how we do judge, but they do not give us a command as to how we ought to judge, and, what is more, such a command as is unconditioned—and commands of this kind are presupposed by judgements of taste, inasmuch as they require delight to be taken as immediately connected with a representation. Accordingly, though the empirical exposition of aesthetic judgements may be a first step towards accumulating the material for a higher investigation, yet a transcendental examination of this faculty is possible, and forms an essential part of the critique of taste. For, if taste were not in possession of a priori principles, it could not possibly sit in judgement upon the judgements of others, and pass sentence of commendation or condemnation upon them, with even the least semblance of authority.

The remaining part of the Analytic of aesthetic judgement contains first of all the:—
DEDUCTION OF PURE AESTHETIC JUDGEMENTS

§ 30

The deduction of aesthetic judgements* upon objects of nature must not be directed to what we call sublime in nature, but only to the beautiful

The claim of an aesthetic judgement to universal validity for every subject, being a judgement which must rely on some a priori principle, stands in need of a deduction (i.e. a derivation of its title). Further, where the delight or aversion turns on the form of the object this has to be something over and above the exposition of the judgement. Such is the case with judgements of taste upon the beautiful in nature. For there the purposiveness has its foundation in the object and its outward form—although it does not signify the reference of this to other objects according to concepts (for the purpose of cognitive judgements), but is merely concerned in general with the apprehension of this form so far as it proves accordant in the mind with the faculty of concepts as well as with that of their presentation (which is identical with that of apprehension). With regard to the beautiful in nature, therefore, we may start a number of questions touching the cause of this purposiveness of their forms: e.g. How we are to explain why nature has scattered beauty abroad with so lavish a hand, even in the depth of the ocean where it can but seldom be glimpsed by the human eye—for which alone it is purposive.

But the sublime in nature—if we pass upon it a pure aesthetic judgement unmixed with concepts of perfection, as objective purposiveness, which would make the judgement teleological—may be regarded as completely lacking in form or figure, and nonetheless be looked upon as an object of pure delight, and indicate a subjective purposiveness of the given representation. So, now, the question suggests itself, whether in addition to the exposition of what is thought in an aesthetic judgement of this kind, we may be called upon to give a deduction of its claim to some (subjective) a priori principle.

This we may meet with the reply that the sublime in nature is improperly so called, and that sublimity should, in strictness, be attributed merely to the attitude of thought, or, rather, to that which serves as the basis for this in human nature. The apprehension of an
object otherwise formless and in conflict with ends supplies the mere occasion for our coming to a consciousness of this basis; and the object is in this way put to a subjectively purposive use, but it is not judged as subjectively-purposive on its own account and because of its form. (It is, as it were, a species finalis accepta, non data.) Consequently the exposition we gave of judgements upon the sublime in nature was at the same time their deduction. For in our analysis of the reflection on the part of judgement in this case we found that in such judgements there is a purposive relation of the cognitive faculties, which has to be laid a priori at the basis of the faculty of ends (the will), and which is therefore itself a priori purposive. This, then, at once involves the deduction, i.e. the justification of the claim of such a judgement to universally-necessary validity.

Hence we may confine our search to one for the deduction of judgements of taste, i.e. of judgements upon the beauty of things of nature, and this will satisfactorily dispose of the problem for the entire aesthetic faculty of judgement.

§ 31

Of the method of the deduction of judgements of taste

The obligation to furnish a deduction, i.e. a guarantee of the legitimacy of judgements of a particular kind, only arises where the judgement lays claim to necessity. This is the case even where it requires subjective universality, i.e. the agreement of everyone, even though the judgement is not a cognitive judgement, but only one of pleasure or displeasure in a given object, i.e. an assumption of a subjective purposiveness that has a thorough-going validity for everyone, and which, since the judgement is one of taste, is not to be grounded upon any concept of the thing.

Now, in the latter case, we are not dealing with a judgement of cognition—neither with a theoretical one based on the concept of a nature in general, supplied by the understanding, nor with a (pure) practical one based on the idea of freedom, as given a priori by reason—and so we are not called upon to justify a priori the validity of a judgement which represents either what a thing is, or that there is something which I ought to do in order to produce it. Consequently, if for judgement generally we demonstrate the universal validity of a singular judgement expressing the subjective purposiveness of an empirical
representation of the form of an object, we shall do all that is needed
to explain how it is possible that something can please in the mere
judging of it (without sensation or concept), and how, just as the
judging of an object for the sake of a cognition generally has universal
rules, the delight of any one person may be pronounced as a rule for
every other.

Now if this universal validity is not to be based on a collection of
votes and interrogation of others as to what sort of sensations they ex-
perience, but is to rest, as it were, upon an autonomy of the subject pass-
ing judgement on the feeling of pleasure (in the given representation),
i.e. upon his own taste, and yet is also not to be derived from
concepts; then it follows that such a judgement—and such the judge-
ment of taste in fact is—has a double and also logical peculiarity. For,
first, it has universal validity a priori, yet without having a logical uni-
versality according to concepts, but only the universality of a singular
judgement. Secondly, it has a necessity (which must invariably rest
upon a priori grounds) but one which depends upon no a priori proofs
by the representation of which it would be competent to enforce the
assent which the judgement of taste demands of everyone.

The solution of these logical peculiarities, which distinguish a
judgement of taste from all cognitive judgements, will of itself suffi-
cise for a deduction of this strange faculty, provided we abstract at the
outset from all content of the judgement, namely from the feeling of
pleasure, and merely compare the aesthetic form with the form of
objective judgements as prescribed by logic. We shall first try, with
the help of examples, to illustrate and bring out these characteristic
properties of taste.

§ 32

First peculiarity of the judgement of taste

The judgement of taste determines its object in respect of delight (as
a thing of beauty) with a claim to the agreement of everyone, just as
if it were objective.

To say: This flower is beautiful, is tantamount to repeating its
own proper claim to the delight of everyone. The agreeableness of its
smell gives it no claim at all. One person revels in it, but it gives
another a headache. Now what else are we to suppose from this than
that its beauty is to be taken for a property of the flower itself which
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does not adapt itself to the diversity of heads and the individual senses of the multitude, but to which they must adapt themselves, if they are going to pass judgement upon it. And yet this is not the way the matter stands. For the judgement of taste consists precisely in a thing being called beautiful solely in respect of that quality in which it adapts itself to our mode of receiving it.

Besides, every judgement which is to show the taste of the individual, is required to be an independent judgement of the individual in question. There must be no need of groping about among other people’s judgements and getting previous instruction from their delight in or aversion to the same object. Consequently his judgement should be given out *a priori*, and not as an imitation relying on the general pleasure a thing gives as a matter of fact. One would think, however, that a judgement *a priori* must involve a concept of the object for the cognition of which it contains the principle. But the judgement of taste is not grounded on concepts, and is in no way a cognition, but only an aesthetic judgement.

Hence it is that a youthful poet refuses to allow himself to be dissuaded from the conviction that his poem is beautiful, either by the judgement of the public or of his friends. And even if he lends them an ear, he does so, not because he has now come to a different judgement, but because, though the whole public, at least so far as his work is concerned, should have false taste, he still, in his desire for recognition, finds good reason to accommodate himself to the popular error (even against his own judgement). It is only later, when his judgement has been sharpened by exercise, that of his own free will and accord he deserts his former judgements—behaving in just the same way as with those of his judgements which depend wholly upon reason. Taste lays claim simply to autonomy. To make the judgements of others the determining ground of one’s own would be heteronomy.

The fact that we recommend the works of the ancients as models, and rightly too, and call their authors classical, as constituting a sort of nobility among writers that leads the way and thereby gives laws to the people, seems to indicate *a posteriori* sources of taste, and to contradict the autonomy of taste in each individual. But we might just as well say that the ancient mathematicians, who, to this day, are looked upon as the almost indispensable models of perfect thoroughness and elegance in synthetic methods, prove that reason also is on our part only imitative, and that it is incompetent with the deepest
intuition to produce of itself rigorous proofs by means of the construction of concepts. There is no employment of our powers, no matter how free, not even of reason itself (that must draw all its judgements from the common *a priori* source), which, if each individual had always to start afresh with the crude equipment of his natural state, would not get itself involved in blundering attempts, if those of others did not lie before it as a warning. Not that predecessors make those who follow in their steps mere imitators, but by their methods they set others upon the track of seeking in themselves for the principles, and so of adopting their own, often better, course. Even in religion—where undoubtedly everyone has to derive his rule of conduct from himself, seeing that he himself remains responsible for it, and, when he goes wrong, cannot shift the blame upon others as teachers or leaders—general precepts learned at the feet either of priests or philosophers, or even drawn from one’s own resources, are never so efficacious as an example of virtue or holiness, which, historically portrayed, does not dispense with the autonomy of virtue drawn from the spontaneous and original idea of morality (*a priori*), or convert this into a mechanical process of imitation. Following which has reference to a precedent, and not imitation, is the proper expression for all influence which the products of an exemplary author may exert upon others—and this means no more than going to the same sources for a creative work as those to which he went for his creations, and learning from one’s predecessor no more than the mode of availing oneself of such sources. Taste, just because its judgement cannot be determined by concepts or precepts, is among all faculties and talents the very one that stands most in need of examples of what has in the course of culture maintained itself longest in esteem. Thus it avoids an early lapse into crudity, and a return to the rudeness of its earliest efforts.

§ 33

*Second peculiarity of the judgement of taste*

Proofs are of no avail whatever for determining the judgement of taste, and in this connexion matters stand just as they would were that judgement simply subjective.

If anyone does not think a building, view, or poem beautiful, then, *in the first place* he refuses, so far as his inmost conviction goes, to
allow approval to be wrung from him by a hundred voices all lauding it to the skies. Of course he may affect to be pleased with it, so as not to be considered as wanting in taste. He may even begin to harbour doubts as to whether he has formed his taste upon an acquaintance with a sufficient number of objects of a particular kind (just as one who in the distance recognizes, as he believes, something as a wood, which everyone else regards as a town, becomes doubtful of the judgement of his own eyesight). But, for all that, he clearly perceives that the approval of others affords no valid proof, available for the judging of beauty. He recognizes that others, perchance, may see and observe for him, and that, what many have seen in one and the same way may, for the purpose of a theoretical, and therefore logical judgement, serve as an adequate ground of proof for him, albeit he believes he saw otherwise, but that what has pleased others can never serve him as the ground of an aesthetic judgement. The judgement of others, where unfavourable to ours, may, no doubt, rightly make us suspicious in respect of our own, but convince us that it is wrong it never can. Hence there is no empirical ground of proof that can coerce anyone's judgement of taste.

In the second place, a proof a priori according to definite rules is still less capable of determining the judgement as to beauty. If anyone reads me his poem, or brings me to a play, which, all said and done, fails to commend itself to my taste, then let him adduce Batteux or Lessing,* or still older and more famous critics of taste, with all the host of rules laid down by them, as a proof of the beauty of his poem; let certain passages particularly displeasing to me accord completely with the rules of beauty, (as set out by these critics and universally recognized): I stop my ears: I do not want to hear any reasons or any arguing about the matter. I would prefer to suppose that those rules of the critics were at fault, or at least have no application, than to allow my judgement to be determined by a priori proofs. I take my stand on the ground that my judgement is to be one of taste, and not one of understanding or reason.

This would appear to be one of the chief reasons why this faculty of aesthetic judgement has been given the name of taste. For someone may recount to me all the ingredients of a dish, and observe of each and everyone of them that it is just what I like, and, in addition, rightly commend the wholesomeness of the food; yet I am deaf to all these arguments. I try the dish with my own tongue and palate, and I pass
judgement according to their verdict (not according to universal principles).

As a matter of fact the judgement of taste is invariably laid down as a singular judgement upon the object. The understanding can, from the comparison of the object, in point of delight, with the judgements of others, form a universal judgement, e.g. ‘All tulips are beautiful’. But that judgement is then not one of taste, but is a logical judgement which converts the reference of an object to our taste into a predicate belonging to things of a certain kind. But it is only the judgement whereby I regard an individual given tulip as beautiful, i.e. regard my delight in it as of universal validity, that is a judgement of taste. Its peculiarity, however, consists in the fact that, although it has merely subjective validity, still it extends its claims to all subjects, as unreservedly as it would if it were an objective judgement, resting on grounds of cognition and capable of being proved by demonstration.

§ 34

An objective principle of taste is not possible

A principle of taste would mean a fundamental premiss under the condition of which one might subsume the concept of an object, and then, by a syllogism, draw the inference that it is beautiful. That, however, is absolutely impossible. For I must feel the pleasure immediately in the representation of the object, and I cannot be talked into it by any grounds of proof. Thus although critics, as Hume says,* are able to reason more plausibly than cooks, they must still share the same fate. For the determining ground of their judgement they are not able to look to the force of demonstrations, but only to the reflection of the subject upon his own state (of pleasure or displeasure), to the exclusion of precepts and rules.

There is, however, a matter upon which it is competent for critics to exercise their subtlety, and upon which they ought to do so, so long as it tends to the rectification and extension of our judgements of taste. But that matter is not one of exhibiting the determining ground of aesthetic judgements of this kind in a universally applicable formula — which is impossible. Rather it is the investigation of the faculties of cognition and their function in these judgements, and the illustration, by the analysis of examples, of their mutual subjective
purposiveness, the form of which in a given representation has been shown above to constitute the beauty of their object. Hence with regard to the representation whereby an object is given, the critique of taste itself is only subjective; viz. it is the art or science of reducing the mutual relation of the understanding and the imagination in the given representation (without reference to antecedent sensation or concept), consequently their accordance or discordance, to rules, and of determining them with regard to their conditions. It is art if it only illustrates this by examples; it is science if it deduces the possibility of such judging from the nature of these faculties as faculties of knowledge in general. It is only with the latter, as transcendental critique, that we have here any concern. Its proper scope is the development and justification of the subjective principle of taste, as an a priori principle of judgement. As an art, critique merely looks to the physiological (here psychological), and, consequently, empirical rules, according to which in actual fact taste proceeds (passing by the question of their possibility), and seeks to apply them in judging its objects. The latter critique criticizes the products of fine art, just as the former does the faculty of judging them.

§ 35

The principle of taste is the subjective principle of the general power of judgement

The judgement of taste is differentiated from logical judgement by the fact that, whereas the latter subsumes a representation under a concept of the object, the judgement of taste does not subsume under a concept at all—for, if it did, necessary and universal approval would be capable of being enforced by proofs. And yet it does bear this resemblance to the logical judgement, that it asserts a universality and necessity, not, however, according to concepts of the object, but a universality and necessity that are, consequently, merely subjective. Now the concepts in a judgement constitute its content (what belongs to the cognition of the object). But the judgement of taste is not determinable by means of concepts. Hence it can only have its ground in the subjective formal condition of a judgement in general. The subjective condition of all judgements is the judging faculty itself, or the power of judgement. Employed in respect of a representation
whereby an object is given, this requires the harmonious accordance of two powers of representation. These are, the imagination (for the intuition and the arrangement of the manifold of intuition), and the understanding (for the concept as a representation of the unity of this arrangement). Now, since no concept of the object underlies the judgement here, it can consist only in the subsumption of the imagination itself (in the case of a representation whereby an object is given) under the conditions enabling the understanding in general to advance from the intuition to concepts. That is to say, since the freedom of the imagination consists precisely in the fact that it schematizes without a concept, the judgement of taste must found upon a mere sensation of the mutually enlivening activity of the imagination in its freedom, and of the understanding with its conformity to law. It must therefore rest upon a feeling that allows the object to be estimated by the purposiveness of the representation (by which an object is given) for the furtherance of the cognitive faculties in their free play. Taste, then, as a subjective power of judgement, contains a principle of subsumption, not of intuitions under concepts, but of the faculty of intuitions or presentations, i.e. of the imagination, under the faculty of concepts, i.e. the understanding, so far as the former in its freedom accords with the latter in its conformity to law.

For the discovery of this title by means of a deduction of judgements of taste, we can only avail ourselves of the guidance of the formal peculiarities of judgements of this kind, and consequently the mere consideration of their logical form.

§ 36

The problem of a deduction of judgements of taste

To form a cognitive judgement we may immediately connect with the perception of an object the concept of an object in general, the empirical predicates of which are contained in that perception. In this way a judgement of experience is produced. Now this judgement rests on the foundation of a priori concepts of the synthetic unity of the manifold of intuition enabling it to be thought as the determination of an object. These concepts (the categories) call for a deduction, and such was supplied in the Critique of Pure Reason. That deduction enabled us to solve the problem, How are synthetic a priori
cognitive judgements possible? This problem had, accordingly, to do with the *a priori* principles of pure understanding and its theoretical judgements.

But we may also immediately connect with a perception a feeling of pleasure (or displeasure) and a delight attending the representation of the object and serving it instead of a predicate. In this way there arises a judgement which is aesthetic and not cognitive. Now, if such a judgement is not merely one of sensation, but a formal judgement of reflection that demands this delight from everyone as necessary, something must lie at its basis as its *a priori* principle. This principle may, indeed, be a mere subjective one (supposing an objective one should be impossible for judgements of this kind), but, even as such, it requires a deduction to make it intelligible how an aesthetic judgement can lay claim to necessity. That, now, is what lies at the bottom of the problem upon which we are at present engaged, i.e. How are judgements of taste possible? This problem, therefore, is concerned with the *a priori* principles of pure judgement in *aesthetic* judgements, i.e. not those in which (as in theoretical judgments) it has merely to subsume under objective concepts of understanding, and in which it comes under a law, but rather those in which it is itself, subjectively, object as well as law.

We may also put the problem in this way: How is a judgement possible which, going merely upon the individual’s own feeling of pleasure in an object independent of the concept of it, judges this as a pleasure attached to the representation of the same object in every *other individual*, and does so *a priori*, i.e. without being allowed to wait and see if other people will be of the same mind?

It is easy to see that judgements of taste are synthetic, for they go beyond the concept and even the intuition of the object, and join as predicate to that intuition something which is not even a cognition at all, namely, the feeling of pleasure (or displeasure). But, although the predicate (the *personal* pleasure that is connected with the representation) is empirical, still we need not go further than what is involved in the expressions of their claim to see that, so far as concerns the agreement required of *everyone*, they are *a priori* judgements, or mean to pass for such. This problem of the critique of the power of judgement, therefore, is part of the general problem of transcendental philosophy: How are synthetic *a priori* judgements possible?
§ 37

What exactly it is, that is asserted a priori of an object in a judgement of taste

The immediate connection of the representation of an object with pleasure can only be a matter of internal perception, and, if nothing more than this were at issue, would only yield a mere empirical judgement. For with no representation can I a priori connect a determinate feeling (of pleasure or displeasure) except where I rely upon the basis of an a priori principle in reason determining the will. The truth is that the pleasure (in the moral feeling) is the consequence of the determination of the will by the principle. It cannot, therefore, be compared with the pleasure in taste. For it requires a determinate concept of a law: whereas the pleasure in taste has to be connected immediately with the mere judging prior to any concept. For the same reason, also, all judgements of taste are singular judgements, for they unite their predicate of delight, not to a concept, but to a given singular empirical representation.

Hence, in a judgement of taste, what is represented a priori as a universal rule for the judgement and as valid for everyone, is not the pleasure but the universal validity of this pleasure perceived, as it is, to be combined in the mind with the mere judging of an object. A judgement to the effect that it is with pleasure that I perceive and judge some object is an empirical judgement. But if it asserts that I think the object beautiful, i.e. that I may attribute that delight to everyone as necessary, it is then an a priori judgement.

§ 38

Deduction of judgements of taste

Admitting that in a pure judgement of taste the delight in the object is connected with the mere judging of its form, then what we feel to be associated in the mind with the representation of the object is nothing else than its subjective purposiveness for judgement. Since, now, in respect of the formal rules of judging, apart from all matter (whether sensation or concept), judgement can only be directed to the subjective conditions of its employment in general (which is not restricted to the particular mode of the senses nor to a
particular concept of the understanding) and so can only be directed to that subjective factor which we may presuppose in all human beings (as requisite for a possible experience generally), it follows that the accordance of a representation with these conditions of the judgement must admit of being assumed valid a priori for everyone. In other words, we are warranted in expecting from everyone the pleasure or subjective purposiveness of the representation in respect of the relation of the cognitive faculties engaged in the judging of a sensible object in general.9

Remark

What makes this deduction so easy is that it is spared the necessity of having to justify the objective reality of a concept. For beauty is not a concept of the object, and the judgement of taste is not a cognitive judgement. The latter simply claims that we are justified in presupposing that the same subjective conditions of judgement which we find in ourselves are universally present in everyone, and further that we have rightly subsumed the given object under these conditions. The latter, no doubt, has to face unavoidable difficulties which do not affect the logical judgement. (For there the subsumption is under concepts; whereas in the aesthetic judgement it is under a mere sensible relation of the imagination and understanding mutually harmonizing with one another in the represented form of the object, in which case the subsumption may easily prove fallacious.) But this in no way detracts from the legitimacy of the claim of the judgement to count upon universal agreement—a claim which amounts to no more than this: the correctness of the principle of judging validly for everyone upon subjective grounds. For as to the difficulty and uncertainty concerning the correctness of the subsumption under that principle, it no more casts a doubt upon the legitimacy of the claim to this validity on

9 In order to be justified in claiming universal agreement for an aesthetic judgement merely resting on subjective grounds it is sufficient to assume: (1) that the subjective conditions of this faculty of aesthetic judgement are identical in all human beings in what concerns the relation of the cognitive faculties, there brought into action, with a view to a cognition in general. This must be true, as otherwise human beings would be incapable of communicating their representations or even their knowledge; (2) that the judgement has paid regard merely to this relation (consequently merely to the formal condition of the faculty of judgement), and is pure, i.e. is free from confusion either with concepts of the object or sensations as determining grounds. If any mistake is made in this latter point this only touches the incorrect application to a particular case of the right which a law gives us, and does not do away with the right generally.
the part of an aesthetic judgement generally, or, therefore, upon the principle itself, than the mistakes (though not so often or easily incurred) to which the subsumption of the logical judgement under its principle is similarly liable, can render the latter principle, which is objective, open to doubt. But if the question were: How is it possible to assume a priori that nature is a sum of objects of taste? the problem would then have reference to teleology, because it would have to be regarded as an end of nature belonging essentially to its concept that it should exhibit forms that are purposive for our judgement. But the correctness of this assumption may still be seriously questioned, while the actual existence of beauties of nature is clear to experience.

§ 39

The communicability of a sensation

Sensation, as the real in perception, where referred to knowledge, is called bodily sensation and its specific quality may be represented as completely communicable to others in a like mode, provided we assume that everyone has a like sense to our own. This, however, is an absolutely inadmissible presupposition in the case of a bodily sensation. Thus a person who is without a sense of smell cannot have a sensation of this kind communicated to him, and, even if he does not suffer from this deficiency, we still cannot be certain that he gets precisely the same sensation from a flower that we get from it. But still more divergent must we consider individuals to be in respect of the agreeableness or disagreeableness derived from the sensation of one and the same object of the senses, and it is absolutely out of the question to require that pleasure in such objects should be acknowledged by everyone. Pleasure of this kind, since it enters into the mind through the senses—our rôle, therefore, being a passive one—may be called the pleasure of enjoyment.

On the other hand delight in an action on the score of its moral character is not a pleasure of enjoyment, but one of self-activity and its correspondence with the idea of what it is meant to be. But this feeling, which is called the moral feeling, requires concepts, and is the presentation of a purposiveness, not free, but according to law. It, therefore, admits of communication only by means of reason and, if the pleasure is to be of the same kind for everyone, by means of very determinate practical concepts of reason.
The pleasure in the sublime in nature, as one of contemplation subtly involving reason, lays claim also to universal participation, but still it presupposes another feeling, that, namely, of our supersensible vocation, which feeling, however obscure it may be, has a moral foundation. But there is absolutely no authority for my presupposing that others will pay attention to this, and take a delight in beholding the uncouth dimensions of nature (one that in truth cannot be ascribed to the sight of it, which is terrifying rather than otherwise). Nevertheless, having regard to the fact that attention ought to be paid upon every appropriate occasion to this moral predisposition, we may still demand that delight from everyone; but we can do so only through the moral law, which, in its turn, rests upon concepts of reason.

The pleasure in the beautiful is, on the other hand, neither a pleasure of enjoyment nor of an activity according to law, nor yet one of a contemplation involving subtle reasoning in accordance with ideas, but rather of mere reflection. Without any guiding-line of end or principle this pleasure attends the ordinary apprehension of an object by means of the imagination, as the faculty of intuition, but with a reference to the understanding as faculty of concepts, and through the operation of a process of judgement which has also to be invoked in order to obtain the commonest experience. In the latter case, however, its functions are directed to perceiving an empirical objective concept, whereas in the former (in the aesthetic mode of judging) merely to perceiving the adequacy of the representation for engaging both faculties of knowledge in their freedom in an harmonious (subjectively-purposive) employment, i.e. to feeling with pleasure the subjective bearings of the representation. This pleasure must of necessity depend for everyone upon the same conditions, seeing that they are the subjective conditions of the possibility of a cognition in general, and the proportion of these cognitive faculties, which is requisite for taste is requisite also for ordinary sound understanding, the presence of which we are entitled to presuppose in everyone. And, for this reason also, one who judges with taste (provided he does not make a mistake as to this consciousness, and does not take the matter for the form, or charm for beauty), can impute the subjective purposiveness, i.e. his delight in the object, to everyone else, and suppose his feeling universally communicable, and that, too, without the mediation of concepts.
§ 40

Taste as a kind of sensus communis

The name of 'sense' is often given to judgement where what attracts attention is not so much its reflective act as merely its result. So we speak of a sense of truth, of a sense of propriety, or of justice, and so forth. And yet, of course, we know, or at least ought well enough to know, that an empirical sense cannot be the true abode of these concepts, not to speak of its being competent, even in the slightest degree, to pronounce universal rules. On the contrary, we recognize that a representation of this kind, whether it be of truth, propriety, beauty, or justice, could never enter our thoughts were we not able to raise ourselves above the level of the senses to that of higher faculties of cognition. Common human understanding which, as mere sound (not yet cultivated) understanding, is looked upon as the least we can expect from anyone claiming the name of a human being, has therefore the doubtful honour of having the name of common sense (sensus communis) bestowed upon it; and bestowed, too, in an acceptance of the word common (not merely in our own language, where it actually has a double meaning, but also in many others) which makes it amount to what is vulgar—what is everywhere to be met with—a quality which by no means confers credit or distinction upon its possessor.

However, by the name sensus communis is to be understood the idea of a public sense, i.e. a faculty of judging which in its reflective act takes account (a priori) of the mode of representation of everyone else, in order, as it were, to weigh its judgement with the collective reason of mankind, and thereby avoid the illusion arising from subjective and personal conditions which could readily be taken for objective, an illusion that would exert a prejudicial influence upon its judgement. This is accomplished by weighing the judgement, not so much with actual, as rather with the merely possible, judgements of others, and by putting ourselves in the position of everyone else, as the result of a mere abstraction from the limitations which contingently affect our own judging. This, in turn, is effected by so far as possible leaving out the element of matter, i.e. sensation, in our general state of representational activity, and confining attention to the formal peculiarities of our representation or general state of representational activity.
Now it may seem that this operation of reflection is too artificial to be attributed to the faculty which we call common sense. But this is an appearance due only to its expression in abstract formulae. In itself nothing is more natural than to abstract from charm and emotion where one is looking for a judgement intended to serve as a universal rule.

While the following maxims of common human understanding do not properly come in here as constituent parts of the critique of taste, they may still serve to elucidate its fundamental propositions. They are these: (1) to think for oneself; (2) to think from the standpoint of everyone else; (3) always to think consistently. The first is the maxim of unprejudiced thought, the second that of broadened thought, the third that of consistent thought. The first is the maxim of a never-passive reason. To be given to such passivity, consequently to heteronomy of reason, is called prejudice; and the greatest of all prejudices is that of fancying nature not to be subject to rules which the understanding by virtue of its own essential law lays at its basis, i.e. superstition. Emancipation from superstition is called enlightenment;\(^\text{10}\) for although this term applies also to emancipation from prejudices generally, still superstition deserves pre-eminently (in sensu eminenti) to be called a prejudice. For the condition of blindness into which superstition places us, and which it even demands from us as an obligation, makes the need of being led by others, and consequently the passive state of the reason, all too evident. As to the second maxim belonging to our habits of thought, we have become accustomed to calling a man narrow (narrow, as opposed to being of broadened mind) whose talents fall short of what is required for employment upon work of any magnitude (especially that involving intensity). But the question here is not one of the faculty of cognition, but of the mental habit of making a purposive use of it. This, however small the range and degree to which a person’s natural endowments extend, still indicates an individual of broadened mind: if he detaches himself from the subjective personal conditions of his judgement, which cramp the minds of so

\(^{10}\) We readily see that enlightenment, while easy, no doubt, \textit{in thesi}, \textit{in hypothesi} is difficult and slow of realization. For not to be passive with one’s reason, but always to be self-legislative is doubtless quite an easy matter for one who only desires to live up to his essential end, and does not seek to know what is beyond his understanding. But as the tendency in the latter direction is hardly avoidable, and others are always coming and promising with full assurance that they are able to satisfy one’s curiosity, it must be very difficult to preserve or restore in the mind (and particularly in the public mind) that merely negative attitude (which constitutes enlightenment proper).
many others, and reflects upon his own judgement from a universal standpoint (which he can only determine by shifting his ground to the standpoint of others). The third maxim—that, namely, of consistent thought—is the hardest of attainment, and is only attainable by the union of both the former, and after constant attention to them has made one at home in their observance. We may say: the first of these is the maxim of understanding, the second that of judgement, the third that of reason.

I resume the thread of the discussion interrupted by the above digression, and I say that taste can with more justice be called a sensus communis than can sound understanding; and that the aesthetic, rather than the intellectual, judgement can bear the name of a public sense, i.e. taking it that we are prepared to use the word ‘sense’ of an effect that mere reflection has upon the mind; for then by sense we mean the feeling of pleasure. We might even define taste as the faculty of judging what makes our feeling in a given representation universally communicable without the mediation of a concept.

The aptitude of human beings for communicating their thoughts requires, also, a relation between the imagination and the understanding, in order to connect intuitions with concepts, and concepts, in turn, with intuitions, which both unite in cognition. But there the agreement of both mental powers is according to law, and under the constraint of determinate concepts. Only when the imagination in its freedom stirs the understanding, and the understanding apart from concepts sets the imagination into regular play, does the representation communicate itself not as thought, but as an internal feeling of a purposive state of the mind.

Taste is, therefore, the faculty of judging a priori the communicability of the feelings that, without the mediation of a concept, are connected with a given representation.

Supposing, now, that we could assume that the mere universal communicability of our feeling must of itself carry with it an interest for us (an assumption, however, which we are not entitled to draw as a conclusion from the character of a merely reflective judgement), we should then be in a position to explain how the feeling in the judgement of taste comes to be expected from everyone as a sort of duty.

11 Taste may be designated a sensus communis aestheticus, common human understanding a sensus communis logicus.