

### D. N. Razeyev. I. Kant's teleology

The monograph by D. N. Razeyev "I. Kant's teleology" is a fundamental work opening a new layer of meanings, which touch upon one of the key concepts for understanding Kant's philosophical system, to Russian readers.

Topical character of the problems discussed by the author of the monograph is obvious. The point is that not so much attention has been paid to the importance of Kant's teleology for his epistemology in Russian philosophical literature. As the author rightly notes, "there is no separate systematic work in Russian philosophy, which would be devoted to the consideration of the role of transcendentalism in addressing teleological problem" (p. 9)<sup>1</sup>.

D. N. Razeyev sets out in his work not only to point out the organic relationships between teleology and knowledge in the system of the Koenigsberg thinker, but also to prove that the former is the heuristic principle of the latter, regardless of the fact whether the subject comprehends the world of freedom and nature. The author writes that "Kant paved a radically new way in teleology, having revealed epistemological potential of the teleological principle in science and having proposed a solution that made it possible to overcome both immanent and transcendent objectivity in teleology, which had been inherent and preceding in the tradition of teleology, and subsequently use it in science as teleonomism" (p. 7–8).

The author of the book also reviews the global status of the third criticism. He argues that the "Critique of Judgment" should be interpreted "not only as a fundamental treatise on aesthetics, but primarily as a programmatic work on the philosophy and methodology of science" (p. 224). This, in its turn, is somewhat contrary to the familiar for Russian philosophical tradition understanding of the essence of the third criticism, which was also supported by one of the most outstanding interpreters of Kant's work A. V. Gulyga, with whom D. N. Razeyev enters into a debate.

The monograph by D. N. Razeyev is very much structured. It consists of three chapters: "Kant's 'Critique of Judgment' is an essay on the philosophy of science", "Reconstruction of the philosophical and methodological ideas of Kant in the 'Critique of Teleological Judgment'", "Kant's transcendental argument in the context of objectification" and the appendix, which contains the articles, "which may cast additional light upon the understanding of Kant's philosophy as a whole" (p. 14). Each chapter, according to the best traditions of academic practice, is divided into three sections and ends with clearly formulated conclusions, which is absolutely necessary for any serious research, but which is often omitted by other authors.

As the author himself notes, "the first and second chapters are... 'weak' interpretations of Kant's philosophy, because there we follow his thought step by step... unlike the third chapter, which significantly deviates from the authentic reading of Kant and so can be conditionally called a 'strong' interpretation" (p. 14).

The first chapter provides a thorough analysis of the first and second introduction to the "Critique of Judgment". It is made in order to prove that the third

---

<sup>1</sup> Here and hereafter the pages of the reviewed work are given.

"Critique" is a work not only and not so much on aesthetics, but on the philosophy and methodology of science. Comparing the differences between the two texts and using, in particular, the quantitative methods, D.N. Razeyev comes to conclusion that the original "Critique of Judgment" was designed by Kant as a work on aesthetics, but when working on it the philosopher makes an unexpected discovery. It makes the Koenigsberger reconsider the value of teleological judgments and, at the same time, some of the ideas of the third criticism and its global status in the philosophical system of transcendental rationalism. In short, the meaning of the discovery is that "the teleological judgment is guided by an independent transcendental principle, which cannot be narrowed down to our other higher cognitive abilities" (p. 50).

D.N. Razeyev emphasizes that the need to write the second introduction to the "Critique of Judgment" was precisely due to this discovery. In the end, following the author, "according to this revised sense, the "Critique of Judgment" is a necessary systematic completion of the critical project as a whole, and the very ability of judgment is a binding element between the law of nature and the laws of freedom. Since the aesthetic ability of judgment is not capable of fulfilling this binding function, it falls on to the teleological ability of judgment" (p. 50). Thus, according to the author of the monograph, while working on the "Critique of Judgment", Kant essentially changes the initial design. Instead of the work only on aesthetics he produces the work of a more global character, where the emphasis is shifted to the philosophy and methodology of science, where the fundamental analysis of the principle of expediency is provided and where the study of its importance for cognition is presented.

The second chapter "describes in detail the nature of Kant's transcendental argument applied by him to judgment" (p. 14). Here the author offers the reader an in-depth study of the principle of expediency, its role and importance in the process of cognition and its relation to judgment. D.N. Razeyev comes to conclusion that the principle of expediency is a methodological and heuristic principle of cognition of nature; that due to this principle the subject can compare the specific in nature, i.e. some empirical laws with others; that the principle of expediency, which is the basis for both aesthetic and teleological judgment, is transcendental. It is as much important for cognition as the a priori forms of sensibility and reason; and just like them is rooted in the consciousness of the subject and cannot be derived solely from experience. At the same time the author emphasizes the fact that "at the heart of teleological judgment made by the subject in the process of cognition of nature there is not an expedient structure of the objects of nature, but the mechanism of their structuring peculiar to the cognizing subject" (p. 225). This chapter, after considering the physical teleology, provides the study of Kant's moral teleology, which is the only possible basis, as Kant believed, for building up a science of supersensible ideas of reason (p. 186).

In the third chapter, the author, summarizing the results obtained in the previous two sections, offers the reader a new interpretation of the "Critique of Judgment" in a complete form and deduces from it the consequences heuristically valuable to epistemology. In particular, D.N. Razeyev offers a new interpretation of objectivity in Kant's philosophy. It should be noted that here the author, by his own confession, gives himself the maximum of freedom for an interpreter estimating the problem of objectivity not only from Kantian but also from phenomenological positions.

The appendix is rather a compilation of different articles of earlier years. Here one can come across D.N. Razeyev's ideas about Kant's doctrine of phe-

nomenality – a topic, which the author devoted a lot of works to, as well as about aesthetics, philosophy of education and religion.

The monograph by D.N. Razeyev is distinguished by clarity of thought, precise formulations, validity of theses, strong evidence base and literary style. It is important to emphasize that the author is characterized by academic honesty. He does not try to present his thoughts as Kant's ideas and whenever he provides his own interpretation he clearly states that this is an interpretation or reconstruction. And even when it comes to reconstruction, in order to provide proofs, D.N. Razeyev tries to precisely stick to the intellectual frameworks determined by Kant.

Throughout the whole monograph D.N. Razeyev constantly refers to foreign sources, bringing out concepts and meanings that had not been involved in the Russian philosophical discourse before. The excellent work of the author with Kant's original texts should also be noted. As far as D.N. Razeyev has a good knowledge of the German language, which is easy to see from his other works, it makes important comments to the Russian translations of Kant's works. For example, he noticed that in the edition of the "Critique of Judgment" of 1994 (p. 265), which deals with the considerations about the idealism of expediency, "there was an egregious blunder: the German original says about 'casuality' (*Kasualität*), but in the Russian translation this Kant's term is confused with 'causality' (*Kausalität*)" (p. 84), which, as the author rightly notes, seriously distorts the meaning.

Due to its accomplishments, the relevance of the topics touched upon by D.N. Razeyev, the clarity of style, his monograph promises to be a significant work not only in Russian philosophical discourse but also abroad.

V. V. Balanovsky