

# Review of: "Symbolic art of the highest Artist: natural purposes in Kant's third Critique"

Amiao Wu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hong Kong Baptist University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting and substantive piece of writing that engages with the interpretation of the third Kantian Critique. What fascinates me is the author's stimulating approach of a reverse reading of CPJ, humorously described as "following the trail of the fox back to his den." This layout can be seen as either schematic or symbolic, resulting in an effect of seamlessly integrating the various parts into an organic whole. I consider it to be a commendable example of a non-dual, non-dogmatic stance in unveiling aspects of a symbolic world.

The author adeptly demonstrates this position in relation to the interplay between parts and whole, phenomenon and noumenon, and the objective world and subjective experience. There are many moments of eloquent thought in this essay. In particular, I appreciate the following interpretation of Kant's ideas on aesthetic existence: "Beautiful forms are a ciphered writing [*Chifferschrift*] by which nature speaks to us about moral feelings. Our satisfaction in aesthetic and moral judgment is experienced as universally-binding..." This gives rise to how Kant's philosophy of a non-dually interconnected existence should be understood properly.

Based on this, the author interprets why the superhuman art revealed in living things confirms the dictates of pure practical reason, how the sublime symbolizes ideas of reason within us, and why symbols convey concepts that cannot be expressed directly. Overall, the meticulous analysis of the parts sufficiently supports a complementary interpretation of how "symbols of the prowess and goodness of a supreme artist confirm and support us in our pursuit of moral ends."

This sophisticated work is recommended for publication. However, considering the novelty of the author's interpretation, and the central role of symbols in expressing the ineffable, it may benefit from a more explicit explanation of the author's preference for using the term "symbols" instead of Kant's "indirect presentations" or "representations." This added clarification may further highlight the originality of the research.