Comments and endorsements for

*Cosmological Aesthetics through the Kantian Sublime and Nietzschean Dionysian*

This is a deeply impressive book. Well researched and argued it proposes nothing less than a principle of motion/transition that operates prior to the subject/object – or phenomena/noumena - split. This principle – which Kaplama names cosmological – means that the world, before it is anything else, is aesthetic in character, and indeed, that aesthetic productions are themselves the most adequate means of ‘showing’ these primal ‘forces of motion’. The author finds the circumstance to conduct this argument in Kant’s *Opus Postumum* which is read as a revision of the Critical philosophy (though also a continuation of some of some of the themes of the *Third Critique*) insofar as it marks a return to metaphysical territory. Further evidence is garnered from Nietzsche and his notion of the Dionysian, again, understood as a principle of motion, and then also from various Heraclitean fragments. The fourth philosopher, present throughout the book is Heidegger, who perhaps comes closest to Kaplama’s own style of moving between *ethos* and *phusis*, whilst attending very specifically to the etymology of these and other philosophical concepts. However, throughout it is really the different articulations of the bridge – or the transition - that organizes the logic of the book, whether this is the *logos*, the ‘cosmological principle’, the Greek Chorus, Dionysus, the sublime, or genius. In each case the term discussed operates to deepen the understanding of this *arche* principle.

There are many highly original parts. To take two examples: the passages on the sublime which is figured as a moment when the subject realizes they are not separate but part of the object; and the reading of eternal recurrence and the will to power as two names – inhuman and human – for the same principle. For myself, however, the excursus is the most exciting and compelling part of this work. I am very taken with the image of the spiral, and, indeed, with the reading of Van Gogh’s *Starry Night*. As regards the former, one feels that the thesis itself – the trawl through Kant, then Nietzsche, Heidegger, is a preparation of sorts for this less exegetic part where the author’s own voice comes through strongly and persuasively. Indeed, there are parts here that are beautifully written, poetic and grand.