

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Schiller's Critique of Kant's Aesthetic Philosophy

Hamideh. Jafari¹ ¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Art, Faculty of Art and Architecture, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran




* Corresponding author email address: h_jafari@azad.ac.ir

Received: 2024-04-14

Revised: 2024-06-22

Accepted: 2024-07-01

Published: 2024-07-20

EDITOR:Yusuf Mohamed Department of Architecture and City Design, King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia
yusufmohamed@kfupm.edu.sa**REVIEWER 1:**Mehmet Yaşar Department of Sociology, Boğaziçi University, 34342 Bebek, Istanbul, Turkey
mehmetyasardo@bogazici.edu.tr**REVIEWER 2:**Sandeep Kotwal Knowledge Management Division, National Health Systems Resource Centre, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi, India
sandkotwal@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement, "Schiller's aesthetics integrates the ethical dimension into the realm of beauty, suggesting that aesthetic experience has a profound impact on human moral development" (Introduction), lacks evidence from primary sources. Consider providing direct citations from Schiller's works to support this claim.

In the section "Schiller's critique of Kant," the term "subjectivist view of beauty" is used to describe Kant's position. It would be useful to explain why Kant's view is described as "subjectivist" and contrast it more explicitly with Schiller's "objective" perspective.

The statement, "Schiller argues that aesthetic education fosters moral development by aligning human desires with rational imperatives" (Schiller's Perspective), is a central claim. However, it would benefit from additional references to Schiller's primary texts or reputable secondary sources for a stronger foundation.

While discussing Schiller's "play drive," you reference Sharp (1991) but don't delve into Sharp's interpretation. Including more of Sharp's analysis would provide a richer context to the argument being made here.

In the sentence, "For Kant, perhaps the most important definition of aesthetics comes under the category of 'relation'," the term "relation" should be explicitly defined within Kant's framework, as it has multiple meanings depending on the context.

The argument that "Schiller considers beauty to be objective" (Schiller's Perspective) should be expanded to include how Schiller reconciles this with Kant's subjective universality of aesthetic judgments. This tension between objectivity and subjectivity deserves more thorough exploration.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The phrase "Kant's aesthetic theory...posits that aesthetic experience is an autonomous domain distinct from practical reason" needs clarification. Since Kant's autonomy is a nuanced concept, it would benefit from more detailed explanation of how this autonomy relates to his broader philosophical framework.

The transition from Kant's theory of aesthetics to Schiller's in the Introduction feels abrupt. I recommend adding a concluding sentence to the Kant section to summarize his aesthetic stance before introducing Schiller's critique to improve the flow.

In the section "Explanation of Beauty and Aesthetic Perception from Kant's Perspective," the term "play" is mentioned, but its philosophical significance in Kant's thought is not fully explained. Expanding on how Kant defines and utilizes the concept of play in relation to imagination and understanding will enrich this discussion.

In the section on Kant's aesthetics, there seems to be a lack of clarity in the explanation of "purposiveness without purpose." This is a complex Kantian concept and needs a deeper explanation with relevant philosophical nuances and examples from the Critique of Judgment.

In the paragraph beginning with "Schiller attempted to derive aesthetic perception from the sensory-rational capacities," the structure of the argument is somewhat fragmented. Consider restructuring this section to clearly separate Schiller's two opposing drives before introducing the "play" drive as the resolution.

The term "formalism" is used several times in the Kantian critique section. However, the term is never defined in the context of aesthetic theory. Adding a brief definition of formalism and how it relates to Kant's aesthetic principles would benefit readers unfamiliar with the term.

The critique of Kant's dualism by Schiller is pivotal to the article, but it would be helpful to expand on why Schiller found Kant's dichotomy of sense and reason problematic. Provide more philosophical arguments or examples to illustrate this point.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.